

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1960

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

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

Our Father, God, fronting unfinished tasks calling for courage and wisdom, we bow again in this hallowed shrine of our dear-bought liberties, asking that Thy completeness may flow around our incompleteness. With all our missing the mark, make us fit servants of Thy will in all the earth.

Upon those here entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's welfare, pour, we beseech Thee, a double portion of Thy enabling grace.

May no ugly moods of thought or speech spoil the music of a united fellowship. May criticism be tempered with charity, convictions with tolerance, appraisals with magnanimity, and even judgments of disapproval with appreciation for honest motives and work well done, as we ascribe to others the patriotism without alloy we claim for ourselves.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 24, 1960, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

SATELLITES AND PEACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in light of the current world situation, the successful effort to launch an experimental Midas satellite by the Air Force could easily be one of the most significant events of the year. It could easily outmode a great deal of current thinking, and could make academic many of the disputes which now divide the world.

The immediate objective of the Midas satellite family, of course, is to provide early warning of any possible ballistic missile attack against the United States. Should the experiment now under way be successful, the time in which we would learn of such an assault would be materially increased.

Behind the Midas satellite, there is the reconnaissance satellite. This instrument—still in the future—can give us accurate information as to what is happening on the face of the globe.

It seems to me, however, that we must look upon these developments as more than merely weapons added to the military arsenal of the United States. If our vision is limited to methods of destruction, we shall not obtain the only truly worthwhile goal—a world of peace and a world of freedom.

The reconnaissance satellite, once it is in operation, will bring to a reality President Eisenhower's proposal for open skies. The issues of "overflights" and espionage will become dim echoes out of the past.

We live in a country which can flourish best in a world where secrecy and suspicion have been abolished. We have a system that can stand up under the closest scrutiny of other people seeking to find flaws in our way of life.

It is not necessary for our great country to build walls to keep people out or to shut our own people in. We can exist confident in the strength of our system which provides both freedom and prosperity to an extent never before known in history.

For this reason, it would seem to me, as I have suggested before, that it would be wise for our country to launch a crash program to develop the reconnaissance satellite. Once it is in orbit, we should offer in good faith to turn over the information that it would get to the United Nations.

A nation which is not an aggressor, but which truly desires to live in peace, has nothing to lose from such a step. It has, on the contrary, a great deal to gain.

We need a world in which people do not have to live under the haunting shadow of fear that a devastating attack may be launched at any time against their whole land. That world can become a possibility; and it may be that our able scientists and our great technicians and our great leaders in Government in their restless and eager quest for new knowledge may put into our hands instruments that can lead to peace.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN IOWA, KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND WISCONSIN

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Badger Creek and Mill-Picayune Creek, Iowa, Marsh Creek, Ky., and Tenn., Persimmon and Burnt Corn Creek, Miss., Tabo Creek, Mo., Fishing Creek, S.C., and Bad Axe, Wis. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal year 1960, has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS ISSUED UNDER SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a temporary increase in the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN OKLAHOMA, TENNESSEE, KENTUCKY, AND TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Upper Black Bear Creek, Okla., Reelfoot-Indian Creek, Tenn. and Ky., and Olmitos and Garcias Creeks, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Memorials were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The memorial of Robert H. Kelly, of Houston, Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 94) relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain disputes hereafter arising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorial, signed by Ralph Marsh, and several other citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 94) relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain disputes hereafter arising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1957. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic tin (Rept. No. 1421).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Ante Tonic (Tunic), his wife, Elizabeth Tunic, and their two minor children, Ante Tunic, Jr., and Joseph Tunic (Rept. No. 1434);

S. 2089. A bill for the relief of Henry K. Lee (Hyun Kui) (Rept. No. 1435);

S. 2176. A bill for the relief of Antonio Abele Tarabocchia (Rept. No. 1436);

S. 2571. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act for the relief of Karl Ullstein" (Rept. No. 1437);

S. 2646. A bill for the relief of Lloyd C. Kimm (Rept. No. 1438);

S. 2717. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Floriana Vardjan (Rept. No. 1439);

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu (Rept. No. 1440);

S. 2817. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Paquette (Rept. No. 1441);

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Hatta (Rept. No. 1442);

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of Boris Priestly (Rept. No. 1443);

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Zeldi Bornsteyn (Rept. No. 1444);

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ming-Chen Hsu (nee Nal-Fu Mo) (Rept. No. 1445);

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of James (Demetrios) Dourakos (Rept. No. 1446);

S. 2967. A bill for the relief of Huan-pin Tso (Rept. No. 1447);

S. 3016. A bill for the relief of Walter F. Beecroft (Rept. No. 1448);

S. 3027. A bill for the relief of Samir Anab-tawi (Rept. No. 1449);

S. 3091. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Mira (Rept. No. 1450);

S. 3142. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa Martinez (Rept. No. 1452);

S. 3143. A bill for the relief of Angel Ardaiz Martinez (Rept. No. 1451);

S. 3168. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Georgiou Stavropoulos (Rept. No. 1453);

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Rubio (Rept. No. 1454);

H.R. 471. An act to amend chapter 561 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall have the same authority to remit indebtedness of enlisted members upon discharge as the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force have (Rept. No. 1455);

H.R. 2588. An act for the relief of Buck Yuen Sah (Rept. No. 1456);

H.R. 4549. An act for the relief of Jacob Naggar (Rept. No. 1457);

H.R. 4834. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Turchi (Rept. No. 1458);

H.R. 5150. An act for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church (Rept. No. 1459);

H.R. 5880. An act for the relief of Nels Lund (Rept. No. 1460);

H.R. 6712. An act for the relief of Sam J. Buzzanca (Rept. No. 1461);

H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday (Rept. No. 1462);

H.R. 8417. An act for the relief of Grand Lodge of North Dakota, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons (Rept. No. 1463);

H.R. 9106. An act for the relief of John E. Simpson (Rept. No. 1464);

H.R. 9170. An act for the relief of John J. Finn, Jr. (Rept. No. 1465);

H.R. 9249. An act for the relief of Marlene A. Grant (Rept. No. 1466);

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Charles Bradford LaRue (Rept. No. 1467);

H.R. 9563. An act for the relief of Josef Enzinger (Rept. No. 1468);

H.R. 9921. An act to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard (Rept. No. 1469);

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. 1483);

S. Res. 98. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1284) for the relief of William E. Stone (Rept. No. 1431);

S. Res. 107. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1651) for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr. (Rept. No. 1432); and

S. Res. 140. Resolution referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2243) for the relief of Ralph Feffer and Sons (Rept. No. 1433).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Emiko Nagamine (Rept. No. 1470);

S. 2237. A bill for the relief of Mico Delic (Rept. No. 1471);

S. 2964. A bill for the relief of Kang Sun Ok (Rept. No. 1472);

S. 2982. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Giron Rodriguez (Rept. No. 1473);

S. 2991. A bill for the relief of Ah See Lee Chin (Rept. No. 1474);

H.R. 2645. An act for the relief of Jesus Cruz-Figueroa (Rept. No. 1476);

H.R. 6816. An act to amend section 57a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93(a)) and section 152, title 18, United States Code (Rept. No. 1477);

H.R. 8888. An act for the relief of Angela Maria (Rept. No. 1478); and

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1475).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Manuel Alves DeCarvalho (Rept. No. 1479);

S. 2639. A bill for the relief of Tong Mo Loui (Rept. No. 1480);

S. 3038. A bill for the relief of Pak Jung Hi (Rept. No. 1481); and

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution relating to deportation of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1482).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 285. A bill for the relief of John A. Skenandore (Rept. No. 1422).

By Mr. COTTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1321. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to consent, on behalf of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, to a modification of the terms of a trust instrument executed by James B. Wilbur (Rept. No. 1423).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Patton (Rept. No. 1424).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 7577. An act to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1425).

By Mr. CARROLL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi (Rept. No. 1426).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment.

S.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week (Rept. No. 1428).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 6121. An act for the relief of Placid J. Pecoraro, Gabrielle Pecoraro, and their minor child, Joseph Pecoraro (Rept. No. 1427).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1430) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254(c)):

A-4337830, Balian, Hetoum.
A-3796156, Cocchiara, Francesco.
A-5805886, Diachuk, Anton.
A-3217992, Donati, Dante Joseph.
A-5957256, Friesen, Jacob T.
A-10367234, Goethals, David.
A-6683188, Gustafson, Elmer Knute.
A-5398546, Hing, Lee.

A-3753202, Kirsch, Helen Ann Hudson.
A-4678924, Knalsky, Alex.
A-2916574, Krasinski, Felix Frank.
A-1843781, Kulesza, Stanley.
A-5062680, Lebel, Morris.
A-4084621, Leto, Gaetano.
A-3479810, Loeb, Harry.
A-2278968, Matusiak, Walter.
A-5958294, Morten, William Richard.
A-3399434, Padilla, Joe.
A-5164925, Parsin, Nicholas.
A-5761121, Reyes-Perez, Manuel.
A-6953945, Rosen, Reuben.
A-2833184, Rentrera, Rocco.
A-4535016, Vlahos, Anastasio.
A-6948450, Zarate, Lorenzo.
A-3785377, Vitagliano, Feleciano.
A-10949520, Cicchetti, Biaggio John.
A-6782676, Viekind, Joseph Rudolph.
A-6401740, Willumeit, Otto Albert.
A-10087628, Cheung, Pat Kwok.
A-1853197, Ignatius, Leonas Louis.
A-5070555, Kulakowski, James.
A-5751283, Lara, Lupe Rincon.
A-4454891, Nestroy, Joseph.
A-3207150, Plevinsky, John J.
A-10845906, Woon, Huey Gim.
A-1291890, Andrade-Marrero, Francisco.
A-2950893, Bigras, Norman John Leonard.
A-8874149, Hurtado, Raymond.
A-5206377, Ketzenzis, Basilios Demos.
A-5175516, McKay, Julia Elizabeth.
A-3028956, Moy, Yee.
A-8190474, Nadzam, John Andrew.
A-2561599, De Hernandez, Angelina Diaz.
A-3183469, Pagnozzi, Joseph Pepe.
A-5652064, Bagliore, Frank.
A-5731476, Folkers, Herman Richard.
A-11166168, Guillen-Porras, Marcos.
A-3173438, Herskovitz, Lajos.
A-1734315, Yeargle, Roy A.
A-5750516, Deutsch, Frank.
A-2079872, Glasser, Charles.
A-5480212, Hirscheta-Rodriguez, Anacelto.
A-10198028, Lora, Primitivo.
A-4682905, Russo, Guy Thomas.
A-10432443, Walter, George.
A-2323922, Phiskunoff, Peter.
A-2753700, Lopez, Manuel.
A-4963677, Andrews, Michael.
A-5938328, Hollander, Per Erik Gunnar.
A-5206147, Stern, Herman.
A-2610759, Alvanos, Bilas.
A-10392830, Leppa, Michael.
A-1090977, Velasquez-Refugio, Francisco.
A-2539330, Mikkelsen, Hans Christian Gunnar.

COMPENSATION OF STATE OF OREGON FOR FIREFIGHTING COSTS—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution referring S. 1153 to the Court of Claims, and I submit a report (No. 1429) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 327) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1153) entitled "A bill to compensate the State of Oregon for firefighting costs", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the

United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1484)

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 61, as extended, I submit a report entitled "Administrative Practice and Procedure," together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I ask that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session.
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Alfred C. Richmond, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, to be admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard; and

James A. Hirshfield, Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, to be vice admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Iowa.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 17 flag and general officers in the Army and Navy. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations placed on the calendar are as follows:

Col. Joseph Leroy Bernier, Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Richard Steinbach, Army of the United States, colonel, U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, in the rank of major general; and

Col. Howard Allen Morris, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army); Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, U.S. Army; and Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States in the grade of brigadier general;

Rear Adm. Morris A. Hirsch, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy;

Lt. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, and sundry other officers, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; and Capt. William C. Mott, U.S. Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 3,035 nominations in the Navy and Air Force in the grade of captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Lt. Col. Virgil J. O'Connor, for appointment as permanent registrar of the U.S. Air Force Academy;

Edwin M. Bradley, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

John W. Carlson, and sundry other distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Donald Joseph Stukel and Thomas Allen Walker, cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and Alfred J. Cler, and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy), to be permanent ensigns in the Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3591. A bill for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3592. A bill for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108)

favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTION

COMPENSATION OF STATE OF OREGON FOR FIREFIGHTING COSTS—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 327) referring S. 1153 to the Court of Claims, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

NIAGARA FALLS BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. I am delighted indeed that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is presently occupying the chair, for I am sure this is a matter of great concern to him.

Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, I introduce a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, with respect to the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 198) to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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. DOUGLAS:

Address in tribute to Jane Addams, delivered by Senator DOUGLAS at Rockford College on April 29, 1960.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Excerpts from speech by Stuart Tipton, president of Air Transport Association, at Morgantown, W. Va., May 24, 1960, and excerpts from remarks by Mr. RANDOLPH at same place and time.

A TIME FOR NONPARTISAN SELF-EXAMINATION ON THE SUMMIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a Democrat, I rise to say that in my judgment the wisest and the most sensible advice on the whole U-2 plane and summit debate has been spoken by a Republican, the Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller.

The full text of his speech was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday; but because I think at least one part of his excellent remarks deserves special emphasis, I shall today read the concluding portion of Governor Rockefeller's speech, as follows:

The discussion and debate upon these matters must not degenerate into a clash of absurd partisan absolutes. It must not be allowed to become a thing of glib clichés or irresponsible invective or bitter slogans. It must be a thing of sense and substance.

CALLS FOR SELF-EXAMINATION

We know we have reason to be proud of our basic principles of policy in the world. We know we have reason to be proud of the dignity and the integrity of the President in personifying these principles.

The special and powerful faculty of the democratic process, however, is not self-congratulation but self-examination.

We owe our friends in the world—and our own consciences—something more significant than an American proclamation of national perfection.

We owe them and ourselves an example—a powerful example—of a people who are morally and intellectually competent to pursue reasoned review and criticism of their own actions.

The future is what matters.

This defines the test for both political parties: to give positive proof that we can make a difficult and stressful time a thoughtful and creative time.

Let our reasoning be rigorous, our speech fair, our judgments honest. There is no other way to discover truth or to define purpose.

This is the way, and the only way, for a free people to act their age—and for their age.

CONGRESSIONAL HYPOCRISY ON HEALTH ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we cannot ignore the just pleas of our senior citizens for adequate medical care. Neither can we sidestep the blunt charge of hypocrisy which is leveled at the Members of Congress in so many of the letters we receive—charges based on the free medical care we enjoy, supplementing our \$22,500 salaries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter that is one of the countless number which contain that charge.

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

DEAR SIR: Why is it considered to be socialistic for the aged to get a little Government help during sickness when Government bigwigs can go into Walter Reed Hospital for free and we never hear anything about that being called socialism?

I paid dues into health insurance for years but never had occasion to use it. But when I reached 65 years of age they sent me a golden years policy stating the limited amounts I would be allowed to draw and raising my dues from \$4.55 per month to \$15.10 a month. I get \$100 per month social security to live on, pay insurance, taxes, and any other expenses.

If the Forand bill is too objectionable why not set up some kind of old-age insurance that the old people can afford, so that they can be taken care of during sickness?

Yours truly,

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR CHURCH, REGRETS FOR GOVERNOR NELSON, ON DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION KEYNOTER SELECTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Democratic National Committee selected the splendid young Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] as keynoter. He deserves our hearty congratulations, and I am sure he will do a splendid job.

At the same time, I think I must express my own very deep disappointment and regret that the Governor of Wisconsin, Gaylord Nelson, a magnificent speaker who has won widespread acclaim by citizens of both parties in Wisconsin, was not selected. I understand he was, along with Senator CHURCH, one of the two leading contenders. Mr. President, I greatly respect and admire the eloquence of Members of this body. We have among us some of the most eloquent speakers in the country. Governor Nelson is a match for the best.

I am sure Governor Nelson has before him an outstanding and brilliant future.

DESIRABILITY OF REVISION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may address the Senate for 10 minutes in addition to the customary limitation in the morning hour.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in January 1960, the Social Security Administration finished 20 years of paying monthly benefits. Checks were mailed to 13¼ million men, women, and children in communities throughout the country. Since January 1940, when the first Social Security checks were received, 21 million beneficiaries have received benefits totaling \$50.4 billion. Retired workers and their dependents have received \$38.1 billion of this amount. The survivors of workers who have died received \$11.6 billion. Since July 1957, about \$750 million has been paid to eligible disabled workers and their dependents. In addition to these monthly benefits, lump-sum death payments of \$1.2 billion have been paid.

There should be pride that our social security plan, which began as a system covering only workers in commerce and industry, has won expansion, so that today practically all Americans who are earning a living are covered.

Presently, only 15.1 million persons in America's labor force are not under the Social Security system. This is out of a work force made up of 70.7 million in the United States. A breakdown of those not covered is as follows: 4.5 million are Federal, State, and local government employees; 4.1 million are unemployed; agricultural workers total 1.3 million; 1.3 million are unpaid family workers; 1 million are retired railroad workers; 0.9 million domestic workers are not covered; and miscellaneous workers total 2 million.

Liberalizations began in the 1939 amendments, when Congress recognized family need and provided benefits to dependents and survivors, as well as to the family breadwinners. Amendments extended coverage and increased benefits in 1950. In 1956, amendments provided benefits for people aged 50 and over who were so severely disabled that they could not work again.

There were other 1956 improvements, which I shall mention in a moment.

In West Virginia the effect of these programs has been dramatically illustrated. In 1950, only 46,253 persons received social security checks. By February 1959, the number totaled 159,399—almost four times the 1950 total. In 1950, monthly payments in West Virginia amounted to \$294,000 per month. In 1959, the figure stood at \$8,836,729 a month. This money means a great deal not only to the recipients, but also to the communities in which they live.

I would be the last to say, however, that the present system is perfect. For this reason, I urge lowering the eligible retirement age to 62 for men, to be the same as for women. Both should, also, receive full benefits.

The 1956 amendments provided full benefits for widows at the age of 62, and wives and women workers were given the option of accepting actuarially reduced benefits at age 62 or waiting for full benefits at age 65. I am one who has long been an advocate of a lower and more realistic retirement age for our social security program. I supported this change in 1956, even though I did not believe then, as I do not believe now, that it went far enough.

A recent collective report by the National Planning Association, entitled "Automation: Its Impact on Business and Labor," suggests some of the new job displacement problems which are already taking place and which will be multiplied in the future. The older worker is the target of such changes.

This report points out that many people fear that labor will suffer serious dislocation and hardship resulting from automation. They express deep concern that over the next 5 to 10 years, when the great changes from automation will become accentuated, there will be a growing surplus of jobseekers.

Automation has already produced graphic effects in my State. In 1950, West Virginia had 117,000 men employed in the coal fields. Today, a decade later, there are less than 40,000 men employed in West Virginia coal mines, and just as much, or more, coal can be produced.

West Virginia is not the only State so affected by automation. All States have their problems. It has been estimated that 154 engine blocks run through the production line in an hour, at the Ford plant in Cleveland, Ohio, requiring only 41 workers on the line—a production which, under the old methods, required 117 men. The Wall Street Journal reported recently that the Raytheon Manufacturing Co.'s Television and Radio Division plant is able to produce 1,000 radios a day, with just 2 workers on the line. To maintain that production rate,

standard hand assembly requires a labor force of 200 men. A new machine, called Autofab, can assemble in a little over a minute the same number of multiple-part electronic units that one worker, using conventional machinery, could do in a full day. It requires only two workers and a supervisor, and has a capacity of more than 200,000 assemblies a month, operating 40 hours a week.

I submit that we must, as one very important step in meeting the problems which automation is already creating, recognize that providing a lower retirement age under our social security system is absolutely essential.

Congress must face up to the challenge so clearly outlined for us in the report of the National Planning Association to which I have already referred. For, in the words of this report, workers—and especially older workers—displaced by automation will not automatically fit into those new jobs which will be created because—

Unskilled workers, workers with specialized skills whose jobs have been taken over by machines, and older workers who have spent a working lifetime in a job only to find their skills made obsolete overnight, all have to be retrained so that they have a chance to acquire the new skills they need to work in an automated factory or office. Older workers, skilled or unskilled, present a particular problem. It is not easy for them to learn a new skill or, since employees are notably reluctant to hire them, to find a new job.

Summarizing its findings and their implications for the future, the report points to a lower retirement age as one of the adjustments which must be made:

The effect of automation is to increase productivity, with the result that the problem of a dynamic balance between the number of jobseekers and the number of available jobs is very precarious. The solution is less work for each person, so that there is something for everybody to do. This can be achieved through the shorter workweek, through a lower retirement age, and through a raising of the age at which people enter the labor force. The balance can also be maintained by limiting the speed at which automation is introduced. If none of these steps is taken—or, if they are not all taken—the result will be mass unemployment, depression, and human suffering.

In the face of these facts, Mr. President, it is my conviction that we should take immediate steps to lower the retirement age in our social security plan from age 65 to age 62 for men, as is the case for women.

Opponents of any reduction in the retirement age maintain that such a move would be too expensive. Certainly it would cost more than the present program, but how much does it cost the Government when X number of workers are without jobs? Would not the reduced cost of public welfare and unemployment compensation programs go a long way toward equalizing the increased cost of lowering the age for retirement?

The Social Security Administration provided figures recently which indicate the cost to the employer, the employee, and the self-employed were the eligibility age reduced to 62 for men, with just men receiving full benefits.

The figures are based on the long-term or level-premium cost. For the employer and employee combined, the cost would be a fraction more than two-fifths of 1 percent of payroll—more easily understood, approximately \$1.4 billion per year. The self-employed would be required to contribute a little less than one-third of 1 percent of the payroll. Approximately 1.5 million male workers would be affected immediately.

More feasible would be the plan, as I have stressed, for both men and women to receive full benefits at age 62. The cost here would, of course, be correspondingly higher. Still working with the level premium cost, the employee and employer would each pay approximately two-fifths of 1 percent of the payroll, the self-employed would pay about three-fifths of 1 percent of the payroll. The total cost of the program on an annual basis would be about \$2½ billion, with some 2 million workers becoming eligible for retirement.

Theoretically, if each person eligible for retirement were to take advantage of the lowering of the age limit to 62, at least half of those 4 million Americans now unemployed would certainly have a better chance for a job.

Many of those eligible for retirement at age 62 would not retire, but it is conceivable that thousands—perhaps over a million—jobs would be made available.

For years I have advocated the lowering of the retirement age from 65 to 60. Opposition is strong to this. Perhaps, after hearing the feasibility of the lower age for social security retirement, those opponents could see their way clear to join me in the urging of a reduced age limitation to 62.

Columnist Walter Lippmann wrote recently:

The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can deal best with the problems that beset mankind. In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people.

It is in this spirit that I urge revision of our social security system. A voluntary retirement age of 60 for both men and women is amply justified. Half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, however. A proper step toward this goal would be to lower the age for men to 62, so to equal the retirement age for women, and pay full benefits at 62 to both.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, somewhere in the Book of Books, there is the statement that "a little child shall lead them." It was my privilege yesterday to speak to a group of more than 42 children from a high school in, as I recall, Oshkosh, Wis. Then I submitted myself to questioning.

One of the questions was related to the recent U-2 plan incident and went something like this: "Senator, if we have agreed not to continue the exploratory missions with our U-2, how are we going to know what is going on inside Russia?"

That question was asked before Midas was thrown into space—our recent wonderful demonstration that we are not behind, but that we are ahead, of the Kremlin. So perhaps that is the answer. But I could not answer the question except to say that in this age of exploration, we will find the answer or we will continue the U-2 exploratory plane missions. To me, that makes common sense.

But the little child had the answer, because what are we going to do if we do not know what is going on back of the Iron Curtain? My mail indicates clearly that that attitude exemplifies the attitude of a good many people. They realize we have got to be on our toes, that we cannot fall asleep, that as I have said many times, we have got to be adequate, that we cannot put ourselves in the position of running the risk of another Pearl Harbor. So that little child had the wisdom that some grownups do not have.

Tomorrow, or on Friday, as everyone knows, we expect to have the Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee, and, of course, a great many questions will be asked him. Some of the questions were submitted on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Ohio yesterday. Let me say that practically all of the questions have been answered. The people know the answers now, because of the discussions over the radio and over television. As a matter of fact, one of our great American reporters, whom I heard last night, intimated that the people in Europe are not a bit upset, that they understand the situation. We want to know what the Kremlin is up to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for 3 more minutes.

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

Mr. WILEY. They recognize the situation. They recognize also that spying has been going on from early days, and that there is a difference when one goes into a country in uniform, goes into that country armed, as a spy, and when a photographer, with the U-2 instrument, covers the space about which he wants to know what is going on. In other words, because we could not get behind the Iron Curtain, we had to go over it. When we got over it, we got, as many of us know, excellent pictures of what the Kremlin has built up.

One of the questions that has been asked is, "What was the underlying cause of Mr. Khrushchev's action in Paris?"

Fundamentally, I believe there were a number of factors, including:

The Soviet Premier did not want a conference, because it was evident that the allies, standing shoulder to shoulder, were not going to make concessions to the demands of the Communists.

Mr. Khrushchev, too, has troubles at home, economic and military, with the proposed reduction of armed forces, as well as political unrest.

Mao Tse-tung, opposing the relatively conciliatory line adopted by Khrushchev, needed him for a tougher policy.

The Kremlin, I frankly believe, was afraid of the tremendous impact which Mr. Eisenhower's visit would have upon

the Soviet people. After all, Ike has demonstrated his salesmanship over a great deal of this earth. The people know he speaks with conviction and that he speaks honestly. The people have faith in him. Khrushchev was afraid of the impact of his visit, there is no question about it.

One of the things I was particularly interested in was what was stated by this Russian youngster of 28 or 29 years of age, who recently left the Kremlin's espionage force. He said:

You know, there is a new generation of us youngsters in Russia. We are not satisfied with our standard of living. We are not satisfied with our voice in the government. We want something more to say.

That all intimidated to me, at least, that Khrushchev is not having such an easy time.

Mr. President, all added up—they called for Khrushchev's grabbing at straws, in this case, the U-2 incident—to call off Soviet participation in a conference that would not give them what they were expected to demand.

Is there any known explanation of Khrushchev's personal attacks on President Eisenhower?

While it is only speculative, it seems reasonable to deduce that the pressures on Khrushchev were so great that he found himself in a position not only of denouncing U.S. policy, but because of previous past, relatively friendly relations with the U.S. President, now found it necessary to denounce him personally.

If there had been no U-2 incident, would the conference have been held?

From all evidence available, it appears that if Khrushchev had not used the U-2 flight as an excuse, he would have found another reason for refusing to hold the conference.

What was the significance of Malinovsky's attendance at the conference?

The presence of the general—looking over Khrushchev's shoulder—may well indicate a stronger voice of the military in Soviet affairs. In the past, military chaperons have proved far more ominous than just a traveling companion for leaders of communism.

What is the situation now inside Russia as a result of the blowup of the conference?

For the Communists, the hard core of Stalinists apparently have won a point. For the general population, however, all evidence points toward a great uneasiness—including fear of war from the blowup of the conference. A major objective of the U.S. policy now must be aimed toward stemming this uneasiness—insofar as possible—and separating the acts of the Communists—a 4- to 6-percent minority in the Soviet Union—from the people.

What was the reason for the U-2 flight behind the Iron Curtain?

The answer is simple. We were gathering information to prevent a sneak attack upon ourselves or any other countries of the world which are targets of Communist aggression. Until now, there has not, unfortunately, been developed any ways of obtaining information in specific detail, on activities behind the

Iron, as well as the Bamboo Curtains, to provide us with the knowledge necessary to be aware of any buildup that might result in a sneak attack.

The overflights provided us with this information. They were not military attacks. The planes were not armed. The flight was an integral part of our policy of self-preservation.

If the Soviets were willing to adopt any realistic international agreements to prevent the possibility of armed aggression or sneak attack, these would not be necessary; or, if they were willing to agree to the open skies proposal as recommended by President Eisenhower, the flight would not have proved an incident at all.

We recognize, of course, that the whole field of airspace law still is relatively unexplored. The nations of the world have their job cut out for them to more clearly define national interests and boundaries in air and space.

Now, why were there seemingly contradictory statements about the U-2 flight?

Following the takeoff of the plane, it became known that the plane was not on schedule. However, there was no way of telling what had happened to it, or whether the Soviet claims of knocking it down were correct. Until this could be established by adequate evidence, there seemed some question as to whether or not it would be realistic to state that the plane had been involved in an overflight over the Soviet Union.

Could Governor Stevenson's actions have influenced Mr. Khrushchev's decision to "find an excuse" to postpone the summit conference?

From all indications, from statements made recently by the Governor, the situation is as follows: If the Democratic Party won the presidency in 1960, Governor Stevenson, if not President, would, from all indications, occupy a high place—perhaps Secretary of State—in Government.

From Mr. Stevenson's recent statements, it would certainly be reasonable to deduce that if there were a Democratic victory, the Russians might have a better chance to get what they wanted from the summit conference.

I am not, of course, inclined to say that the Democratic Party, in any way, is "soft on communism"; at the same time, Mr. Stevenson's statements indicate that if he had a voice in things, he would be far more likely to make concessions to the Soviets.

For example, I cite the translation of the article by Special Correspondent, Robert Boulay, which, though Mr. Stevenson says it "suffers from misinterpretation, or mistranslation," was published in the Paris newspaper, "Paris-Presse-Intransigent," as follows:

Question. What, according to you, Mr. Stevenson, is the most important question in the political world today?

Answer. The suspension of atomic tests—this is a prime question.

Question. Can it be achieved?

Answer. It must be possible to reach agreement through mutual concessions.

Question. I take it that you refer to agreement with precise control—inspection?

Up till now the Russians have not accepted the minimum inspection formula proposed to them by the Western Powers.

Answer. Naturally, an agreement with inspection * * * but I repeat to you that an agreement must be possible. This problem of atomic tests must be considered as absolute priority. With mutual concessions * * *.

Question. Does this problem appear to you of such importance as to justify concessions on other matters?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. Does this mean that the Western Powers should make concessions on the German problem?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. On Berlin?

Answer. Yes.

I was surprised and persisted—

Question. Do you establish a connection between atomic agreement and Germany and more particularly Berlin?

Answer. There is no connection. But an atomic agreement is basic and justifies concessions on other matters. Since you mention Berlin incidentally, the present situation cannot be maintained.

WHY 11,000

Question. But the Western Powers are not the petitioners in Berlin. It is the Russians who seem to wish to force the Western Powers to leave Berlin?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, the present situation in Berlin cannot be maintained. Strategically, the presence of 11,000 American soldiers is meaningless * * *.

Question. Must I understand that you are prepared to accept a reduction of American forces in Berlin?

Answer. Yes. * * * One could have, for instance, 7,000.

Question. Why 7,000 rather than 11,500? Would you accept 5,000, or 3,000, or none at all?

Answer. Yes, but not now; later. (I once again expressed surprise, and asked Mr. Stevenson to explain himself more fully.)

Question. Do you believe it is possible to take the political and moral risk of such a decision?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, do not be surprised. All I am telling you, I have already said and written several times.

THE NEUTRON BOMB

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in my remarks to the Senate on May 12, 1960, I indicated that there was a distinct possibility science could produce a neutron bomb, which could obliterate life without causing serious physical damage to property. I tried to point out that the nation developing this weapon first would have a tremendous advantage in limited war, strategic bombing, and defense against missile attack, and that a resumption of underground nuclear testing was necessary if we were to develop this weapon ahead of the Soviets.

I asked the President to inform the Nation of the possibility of developing a neutron bomb so that our leaders and our people might realize the critical nature of any test ban agreement which foreclosed this development, while permitting the Soviets to work on it through clandestine tests.

Thus far there has been no official response and last week, Newsweek magazine, apparently the victim of misinformation, curtly dismissed the possibility of a neutron bomb and treated it as a figment of my imagination.

An article in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report takes a different view. It states that United States and Russian scientists are working on the neutron bomb and quotes scientists to the effect that we have only a million to one chance of finding out whether Russia is secretly testing neutron bomb weapons.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the May 30 issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 30, 1960]

MOST TERRIBLE BOMB OF ALL—NEW WEAPON NOW IN SIGHT

Next—a death ray bomb?

Such a bomb is being sought here—and in Russia, too.

Once ready, it could destroy human beings by invisible streams of neutrons, leave buildings standing.

Detecting tests of this neutron bomb will be almost impossible. That's why many U.S. scientists oppose a ban on nuclear tests.

Behind closed doors in the United States and in Russia, scientists are working on a weapon that could alter the cold war. It is the neutron bomb—the bomb that no one wants to talk about.

This new weapon, when perfected, could destroy men while leaving machines and buildings undamaged.

The weapon—in one possibility being discussed—could be built as a lightweight device able to send out streams of poison radiation greater than those produced by today's big, conventional nuclear bombs.

This version would be so compact, some sources predict, that a team of soldiers could fire neutron warheads into enemy concentrations from simple launchers. A team of saboteurs could carry a small neutron bomb into an enemy country to destroy men at essential nerve centers.

Some scientists call this the death ray weapon of the future. The blast it would create would be so negligible that buildings, trees, railroads and vehicles would remain almost intact. It would produce almost no uncontrolled fallout. Yet its radiation—the real "guts" of a nuclear bomb—would be a highly effective and invisiblecrippler or killer of human beings.

USELESS BANS

At a time when a ban on nuclear tests is in the news, it is suddenly discovered that a workable neutron bomb would make meaningless any attempt at enforcing such a test ban.

The chances of finding out whether Russia was secretly testing neutron-bomb weapons, civilian scientists say, would be a million to one because the blast signals would be so weak and disguised.

This is the real worry among scientists in this country who know all the facts about the neutron bomb. They are convinced, one of them says, that the Soviets could make a mockery of any test ban, even if both sides agreed to numerous inspection sites and listening posts.

How far both sides have advanced in their research on the neutron bomb is a closely held secret. No project in recent years is held to be more sensitive by experts in the Pentagon.

From the Soviet Union come only broad hints at interest—and progress—by Soviet scientists. But some experts have asked whether the neutron bomb is the fantastic weapon Khrushchev recently predicted for the Soviet arsenal.

NO COMMENT

What is known, in fact, about the ability to produce a neutron bomb comes mainly from civilian U.S. scientists not connected with the Government. The Atomic Energy Commission, by its rules, refuses to acknowledge that the bomb exists even in theory.

It was of this secrecy that Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, complained in a speech on May 12. He said that, although such a weapon—in the hands of either the United States or Russia—might be more than 6 months from reality, the Nation is being kept in the dark about the neutron bomb.

Senator DODD said that, despite the official secrecy, he learned this:

"Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons."

DEATH-DEALING STREAMS

The story behind the neutron bomb involves these further details:

When a nuclear bomb is exploded, it releases energy in several forms, but mainly as heat and light. Heat is what causes blast and shock and the big mushroom seen after an atomic explosion.

Another emanation from a nuclear bomb is lethal radiation, always in very small amounts in present weapons—about 3 percent of the total energy. One primary form of this radiation is streams of neutrons, the particles that are kicked loose from the core of the atom. Most of them don't travel very far—now—but, when they reach human beings, neutrons deform and destroy body cells and, in sufficient dosages, cause death. A high percentage of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic victims died not from blast but from radiation.

Now it appears possible to build the kind of bomb that will cut down on the amount of blast and "hot" debris and send larger and more powerful streams of neutrons shooting out in all directions.

PICTURE OF A BOMB

One of the few reports ever published about the neutron bomb—in the Washington Post, on July 19, 1959—gives you an idea of how effective one version would be:

"To obtain the maximum range, the bomb would be exploded high enough to reach its intended victims without going through structures, trees, hills, or other barriers which might slow down the neutrons."

The neutrons would travel with enough force, however, said this article, "to go through the walls of buildings and military tanks."

The bomb would deliver "a lethal dose of radiation to a distance of 1 mile—about the range of the 20-kiloton Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs—yet produce far less damage and only about one-one thousandth of the total fallout."

Fallout in today's bombs is created when radioactive debris and dust are carried away from the immediate target area by the blast. Sometimes this "hot" debris is sucked up by winds that carry the fallout where it was not intended to go.

In the neutron bomb, only a small fission-type explosion would be needed as a trigger. This would create correspondingly less blast and fallout.

Now there is talk that TNT or another ordinary explosive could be used to set off a neutron bomb. If so, this would create a weapon with so little blast that not even the familiar atomic mushroom would appear.

ON THE BATTLEFIELD

Of what use is all this, anyway? some civilian scientists ask, when there already is enough destructive power in the world?

Such a weapon, according to one authority, could be used to great advantage tactically on a battlefield where two armies faced each

other. It could be used to knock out an enemy division without contaminating friendly forces. The bomb would maim or annihilate enemy soldiers who have invaded friendly soil without destroying the industry or homes of allies.

That advantage works both ways, this authority points out: "The reason we think this principle is so important to the Russians is that any country that wants to conquer Europe and keep the production means of Europe intact must employ this kind of weapon."

"The Russians, with neutron bombs, could reduce the population of the Ruhr in a war, and move right in and keep the factories producing by using imported slave labor or military work battalions. Because there would be so little fallout, the area would be inhabitable almost immediately."

IF RUSSIA HAD IT

The danger of a neutron bomb in the hands of Russia alone is understood by U.S. Government officials, say civilian experts, although these officials are being told not to discuss the subject.

Despite the secrecy—and even some denials of U.S. interest in the project—it has been established that research is going ahead.

Work on the neutron-bomb theory in this country is said to be centered at the University of California's Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, where advanced weapons are developed for the Atomic Energy Commission. It was at this laboratory that the hydrogen bomb was perfected.

Livermore scientists consider the challenge of the neutron bomb in many ways to be more demanding than the hydrogen bomb.

In today's bombs, neutrons that are released are slowed down and "captured" in the bomb-blast process before they get very far and do much damage. A practical way must be found at Livermore to enable more neutrons to "escape" more easily and penetrate great distances with great speed.

The neutron bomb is more than a scientific problem, scientists say. It involves the whole cold-war picture. Against that background you are told this by non-Government scientists who know the story—

The big reason why scientists from the Livermore Laboratory, such as Dr. Edward Teller, its director, have been outspoken against a test-ban agreement with the Soviets is that they are worried about the neutron bomb and other atomic developments just ahead.

How, they ask, can you ever enforce a test ban?

It also explains why Dr. Teller and others who know the facts have said this Nation should resume underground testing of nuclear weapons at the first possible moment.

They say this Nation has no time to waste.

HOW FAR AHEAD?

Much work is said to remain before the neutron bomb is perfected.

Scientists see the Russians as moving ahead with research and possibly even with secret tests of the components of a neutron bomb. There is no way, under the "moratorium" supposedly now in effect, to detect what the Russians may be doing.

All this information, now in the hands of a growing number of U.S. Government, military and scientific officials, accounts in large part for increasing opposition in this country to a test-ban agreement of any kind with the Russians.

CONTROVERSY OVER NEUTRON TESTING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 13, the New York Times published a letter from Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith which stated the argument that the risks of

continued nuclear testing were greater than the risks of secret Russian violations of the test ban.

On May 19, the Times published a letter of mine in reply to Professor Galbraith. I believe that these two letters provide a brief summary of the important points put forward by each side of the controversy over nuclear testing, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the texts of these letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1960]
HALTING ATOMIC TESTS—CHOICE OF LEAST PERILOUS COURSE BELIEVED TO BE NECESSARY
 TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent hearings before the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, like much earlier discussion, suggest the presence of a strikingly unrealistic attitude toward an agreement on halting atomic tests. I do not suggest that this attitude is universal, but it does seem sufficiently common to merit comment.

We must surely agree that our task is not to eliminate all risk from our lives—that is an impossible goal—but to find the course of policy that minimizes risk. This requires that we balance the dangers of different courses of action. In the present instance there is, on the one hand, the danger of illicit violation of any agreement to ban tests and that the violation will go undetected. On the other hand, there is the danger of continued explosions. We must choose the course which involves the least peril.

Almost everyone must agree—and most do agree—that the dangers inherent in continuing the tests are virtually total. The tempo of competitive development and testing will increase. The countries newly possessed of atomic weapons will claim their right to poison their just share of the atmosphere. Obviously those who are making tests themselves cannot deny them the privilege. All of these dangers are predictable and certain in the absence of agreement.

POSSIBLE BAD FAITH

Against this, as noted, we must reckon with the possibility of Soviet bad faith and that it will escape detection. Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feeling of recent years. And bad faith that involves risk of discovery is not without disadvantage as a practical policy.

But it is not my purpose to argue that this course is riskless. Rather, what is clear is that whatever its dangers, they must be less than the dangers of the first course, which are certain and total. Yet this is not the nature of much of the present calculation. It holds that the danger of violation must be totally eliminated or we will continue the tests. One is reminded of the man who insists on suicide unless he is fully protected against automobile accidents. Surely we are more logical than that.

Nor is it reassuring that many who advise against accepting the lesser risk believe that any test ban makes poor military sense. We have recently heard that our military security requires a new series of tests this summer or autumn. And a high official of the Defense Department has recently stressed the need to develop atomic weapons which, though they burn, blind, disintegrate, mutilate, and otherwise commit to a disenchanting death, are nonetheless clean.

CONCEALED POSITION

The danger of illicit violation has thus become part of the case against the agreement as such. It has no part of this case.

If we believe an agreement is unwise, we should say so. This position should not be concealed behind arguments over enforceability. We fool no one with such transparent devices.

But I have difficulty in imagining that responsible military opinion can face with equanimity a world of uncontrolled tests. In the annals of armies there have always been examples of excessive and myopic preoccupation with military goals. Yet thoughtful military leaders certainly agree that the purpose of the armed services is to protect the continuing life and civilization of the community. Armed services are but one means to this end and diplomacy and diplomatic agreements are among the others.

It is to see the problem whole that we have civilian control of the Armed Forces. This will on occasion require the overruling of too parochial a military view. The danger lies not in doing so, but in failing to do so.
 JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]
RISKS IN BANNING TESTS—JEOPARDY TO FREE WORLD FEARED IF CONCESSIONS ARE GRANTED
 TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Prof. Kenneth Galbraith's letter published May 13 argues that in choosing between the test ban and continued testing we must choose the course which involves the least peril. With this general proposition no one can find any fault. The only trouble is that he failed to specify what kind of test ban he had in mind.

Is it to be a total ban based on an enforceable system of inspection that offers some reasonable chance—let us say a one-in-ten chance—of detecting and verifying sneak tests? Or is it to be a total ban without inspection, in which we would have to rest the security of the free world on nothing more substantial than the Kremlin's word of honor? Obviously, it makes a big difference. I do not see how the comparative risks can intelligently be assessed unless you first know what you are comparing.

Dr. Galbraith minimized the risk of bad faith in these words: "Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feelings of recent years." With this sweepingly simple analysis of the cold war Professor Galbraith not merely succeeds in equating communism with democracy, but ignores the essential amorality of communism, its long record of perfidy and violated treaties. For my own part, I take it for granted that if there is enough to gain from cheating and if the cheating can be made reasonably safe, the Kremlin will cheat.

FACING CHOICE

What would the Kremlin gain from cheating? If the Kremlin were to get there first on the antimissile missile or the neutron bomb or on any other major technological breakthrough in nuclear weaponry, my conviction is that we would in short order find ourselves confronted with a choice between annihilation and surrender.

How easy would underground cheating be? Even the most elaborate inspection system yet proposed would provide detection capabilities only down to the level of a 20-kiloton (Hiroshima) blast. For the life of me I see no point to any detection system which would cost several billion dollars to install and probably another billion dollars a year to operate, and which would leave the Communists free to sneak test any device up to the size of a Hiroshima-type bomb.

Even at levels much lower than 20 kilotons it is possible to do a tremendous amount of significant testing. Such testing would not merely be immediately applicable to the entire range of clean, tactical nuclear weapons but would be applicable, by extrapolation, to the development of improved or radically different strategic weapons.

RISKS INVOLVED

My estimate of the relative risks differs fundamentally from Professor Galbraith's attitude. I believe that the greater our numerical and technological preponderance in nuclear weapons, the smaller the chance of war. I believe that an effective nuclear test ban, if such a thing were possible, would not decrease the danger of war by one iota. I believe that a test ban or moratorium observed only by the open societies would greatly increase the danger of a thermonuclear holocaust.

I believe that the opinion of mankind could be respected and the security of the free world served by an agreement based on President Eisenhower's proposal of February 11. This called for a ban on all tests that contaminate the atmosphere and detectable tests in space and underground, for a joint research program on detection, and for the extension of the test ban to other areas as improved means of inspection were developed.

Unfortunately, we have now departed from this position and agreed in principle to a ban on undetectable space shots and a moratorium on undetectable underground tests.

I fear that by these concessions we have placed the free world in grave jeopardy.

THOMAS J. DODD,
 U.S. Senator.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a very interesting editorial was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 17, 1960, under the caption "Conflict of Interests." I thought the significant statement in the editorial was the last, which is:

It is really a matter of determination of character. For a conflict of interest is to be found not in a man's bank box, but in his heart.

I think the editorial is worthy of reproduction and wider dissemination, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. Edward K. Mills, Jr., an attorney, has requested President Eisenhower to withdraw his nomination as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. It is impossible, Mr. Mills said, for him to divest himself of an interest in stock in the communications field to a degree that can be "regarded as sufficient."

It is impossible because the stock is held by a bank acting as trustee for a trust fund established by his family with Mr. Mills as beneficiary some years ago. It is impossible for Mr. Mills to sell his stock—as Mr. Wilson sold his General Motors stock at great personal sacrifice, as it turned out—because he doesn't own it or control it. But he could benefit from a rise in its value, or suffer from a drop in its value.

If ever a situation could point to the unrealistic policy of expecting men to divest themselves of property in order to serve their government, this one surely does so. As to Mr. Mills himself, there might be objection to some of the policies he announced he would follow on the FCC; we certainly thought that he was going far afield in his proposals to raise the "standards" of TV and radio presentations by Government "persuasion."

But the irony is that if this were to be done on a broad enough scale, the TV and radio industries believe they would have lost revenues. So if anyone believes Mr. Mills might have acted in a way that would influence the value of the communications investments in his trust, they may very well be right. Mr.

Mills might, while raising the standards of the industries he was to oversee, have succeeded also in lowering his own revenues.

We don't mean that the bars ought to be so lowered that no attention ought to be paid to possible conflicts of interest. But there are other and surer guides in our view. What is a man's reputation for honesty and integrity? That seems to us the better way to choose officials of Government agencies.

A crook could divest himself of everything and still remain a crook seeking high office for further crookery. An honest man will remain honest no matter what he owns or what temptations are placed in his way.

It is not really a matter of divestment. If it were, we ought to require all Secretaries of the Treasury to get rid even of their dollar bills—on the ground that a man might induce the Government to follow policies that could make the dollar more valuable and thus benefit himself.

It is really a matter of determination of character. For a conflict of interest is to be found not in a man's bank box but in his heart.

AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961—CONTINGENCY LANGUAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the welter of things happening yesterday I had hoped to invite attention to one item in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, but I was in and out of the Chamber so much during the day that I did not quite get around to it. However, I talked with some members of the committee and with other Senators with respect to the matter.

My comments relate to two items. First, in regard to the so-called Farmers Home Administration there was an appropriation provided and, in addition, there was language to the effect that the Administration would be entitled to spend an additional \$40 million if it were required. It was my notion that perhaps the language ought to be safeguarded by requiring approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but there was some objection to doing so. Therefore, I did not offer the amendment.

I understand, however, that under the language as now carried in the bill, if the Administrator feels it is necessary to spend the money and goes to the Bureau of the Budget and insists upon having the additional money made available, the money must be made available.

The interesting thing about this matter is simply that we enlarge the expenditures for fiscal year 1961, but the enlargement does not show up in the budget total for that particular department.

A comparable provision was carried in the bill with respect to the Rural Electrification Administration, and made available an additional \$60 million for telephone loans and \$60 million for electrification loans, or a total of \$120 million. The Budget Director has told me that if the demand is made it is virtually impossible for him to resist it, so the money may be expended.

This is a total of \$60 million plus \$60 million plus \$40 million, or \$160 million. If the \$160 million is expended, then instead of the so-called \$135 million reduction in the budget figure as reported by the committee, actually there will be

an excess expenditure over the budget figure.

This is not exactly back-door financing. This is a contingent appropriation. I become a little concerned about it, because instead of a back door it might become a trapdoor.

I did not want the legislative record to be closed on this matter without alluding to this. I am sensible of the fact that the language was incorporated in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives. The Senate did not modify the language and did not modify the amounts provided, but simply concurred in the action taken by the House.

I am pretty confident that those who are beset with budget problems and an effort to maintain a balanced budget are looking upon this with dubious eye, because they may feel the budget is in balance and suddenly discover the demand for the contingent amounts will be made. If such a demand is made and the money is expended in the fiscal year to come, then of course what now looks like a budget cut will really be an addition to the budget.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I should read into the Record the contingency language in one of these paragraphs. It is after the regular appropriation:

* * * and additional amounts, not to exceed \$60 million for each program, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the fiscal year 1961 under the then existing conditions for the expedition and orderly development of the rural electrification program and rural telephone program.

There is, therefore, no authority in the Bureau of the Budget or in the executive to stop the expenditure of the money if the head of the agency says, "We need it. We want it. We are going to spend it."

This throws a little new light on a different budgetary procedure of the Appropriations Committee, and someone should bring it to the attention of the Senate, because it may happen again upon a contingency basis. I am delighted, indeed, that the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is presently occupying the Presiding Officer's chair. This is a matter, I am sure, of great concern to him.

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON ADDRESSES ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL SALES EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, New York State recently welcomed distinguished visitors when Vice President and Mrs. Nixon appeared in several upstate cities. In a notable address before the annual convention of the National Sales Executives Association in Buffalo, the Vice President discussed the causes and aftermaths of the breakup of the summit conference.

More importantly, perhaps, he dealt with what all of this may mean for the future and with what America's role must be in leading the world to peace and security. Of particular pertinence

were his remarks on the need to extend the mutual security program without serious cuts.

Mr. President, so that this address may reach the wide readership it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

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

TEXT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON BEFORE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL SALES EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION ON MAY 18, 1960, AT BUFFALO, N.Y.

Tonight I want to talk to you about a major problem, certainly the problem that is in the mind of every person in this room and most of the people in this Nation and probably in the world. You have read and heard that the summit conference is over. Mr. Khrushchev has decided to return to Moscow and President Eisenhower, after his visit to Portugal, will return to the United States. And so people are asking questions: What does it mean? Why did it happen? Who was at fault? Mr. Khrushchev's answer is that the United States is at fault. He says President Eisenhower personally must assume responsibility because he ordered the flights which have occurred over the Soviet Union over the past 4 years for the purpose of obtaining information to guard against surprise attack against the United States and the free world. Mr. Khrushchev in effect has said that because of the U-2 incident, and because he was so shocked to learn that some of these flights had occurred and that the President had ordered them, the summit conference could not go forward. Then he went on to say he felt that no conference should be held now until the American people should have an opportunity to vote for another President and then possibly the climate might be changed.

Having said these things, of course, speculation immediately comes up as to whether Mr. Khrushchev is right and whether these are the reasons for the conference breaking up. I will give you my own opinion, and I am not alone in this opinion; it is that the U-2 incident was not a reason for the breaking up of the conference by Mr. Khrushchev, but an excuse. I talked to the President by telephone today in Paris and he indicated that was his view and the view of other allied leaders to whom he had talked when he said, in effect, that the conference was broken up by Mr. Khrushchev for apparently contrived reasons.

What were the real reasons, then? We can only guess; I can only report to you what many of those who are experts in this field have projected as possible reasons for Mr. Khrushchev's actions in torpedoing the summit conference as he did.

First, there is the possibility that he may be under pressure economically in his own country and that he needed a "foreign devil," so to speak, to blame for the distress that may have been developing, and to excuse his government from failing to provide more consumer goods for his people. Second, there are those who believe that a possible reason for his acting as he did was pressure that he was under from Stalinists or extremists within the Soviet Government, who had never liked his line of so-called "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition" and believe that a more aggressive line should be adopted. Third, there are those who believe that he may even be under some pressure from his Chinese ally, Mao Tse-tung, who publicly has indicated that he does not agree with Mr. Khrushchev in the "peaceful coexistence" line which Mr. Khrushchev had been following prior to the summit conference. There are others who believe that one of the reasons

why he broke up this conference was that he was convinced, by reason of what President Eisenhower, President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan had said in the past few weeks, that he, Mr. Khrushchev, would be unable to get his way on the Berlin question; and that believing he was not going to get his way on the Berlin question; because of our firm position, in which we would be joined by our allies, he felt it was best not to participate in the conference at all, so that he would be free to act unilaterally.

These are some of the reasons that have been suggested. But whatever the reasons are, I will again repeat what I said at the outset: That the majority opinion seems to be that the real reason does not lie in the fact that the U-2 incident was so shocking to him.

Now if I may go to a second point. I believe that Mr. Khrushchev, in making his announcement that he was going to break up the summit conference, and in attempting to convince the world that he was doing it because of the U-2 incident, made three major mistakes in judgment.

One, he misjudged the intelligence and sophistication of the leaders of the world and the people of the world. These leaders and people could certainly not be taken in to believe that Mr. Khrushchev, who to put it in understatement is a master of espionage activities, would be so shocked to find that the United States was attempting to obtain information with regard to surprise attack in any method by which that information could be obtained. Certainly, I would think that most impartial observers would say he was the last person who would show shocked surprise at espionage activities. And so he misjudged the action and the temper of the world's leaders and people. Dispatches from all over the world indicate this because, although for a few days after the U-2 incident first hit the world's headlines there was support for Mr. Khrushchev, when he used this incident as an excuse for breaking up the conference, then that support drifted away; now there seems to be almost unanimous condemnation of him as the one solely responsible for this action. This was his first mistake in judgment.

His second was in misjudging the President himself. Apparently Mr. Khrushchev thought that he, in effect, would be able to blackmail the President, to bully him, by threatening to break up the conference unless the President apologized for attempting to defend the United States through surveillance by aerial activities and also punished those who were responsible. The President would not pay this price, in my opinion properly could not pay such a price. He refused to apologize under the circumstances which Mr. Khrushchev had laid down in his conditions for his participation in the conference. And so he misjudged the President and the President's determination in this area.

In addition, Mr. Khrushchev, I believe, misjudged the character of the American people. And I speak now not as a Republican, or as a party leader, but as an official of this Government and as an American citizen. When he tried to imply, as he did, that by waiting for 6 or 7 months to pass and for the American election to occur, that the American electorate then might select as President of the United States another individual who would take a different line with regard to his threats than President Eisenhower was taking, I think he misjudged the American people and he misjudged both the great American political parties.

Because, my friends, we know that the great majority of Americans—regardless of their partisan affiliates—resents any attempt by Mr. Khrushchev, or anybody else outside this country, to interfere in an American election in such a flagrant and

arrogant way. And second, I think we would all agree that regardless of party, Americans believe in the cause of peace with justice which the President was representing at Paris; and Americans believe that the President of the United States was fully justified in adopting a course of action to protect this country from another Pearl Harbor surprise attack through aerial surveillance.

I do not suggest that the conduct of the administration in this—or any other area—has been without mistakes. I only suggest that as far as the basic policies and the basic attitudes of the American people are concerned, we stand united against attempts by outsiders to interfere with our elections and for the principles of freedom, peace with justice, and the right of self-determination for the 2,500,000 people of Berlin and others throughout the world.

And so, having analyzed the events to date, may I turn to the future. What will happen now? What will Mr. Khrushchev do—and what should we do? Again, we are in the area of conjecture. I would first say that as far as Mr. Khrushchev is concerned, no one can predict what he will do on Berlin, or with regard to the disarmament conferences that have been going on, or with regard to the conferences on atomic tests, until at least a few days have passed and he is able to assess world opinion. Because one thing I have noted about Mr. Khrushchev, and one thing other observers have noted, is that he is very sensitive to world opinion, particularly the opinion in the so-called uncommitted areas of the world. I think Mr. Khrushchev will have to have his assessment of that opinion in mind as he develops his course of action for the future. If he does not have that in mind, he could lose many of the gains and the advantages that he presently thinks he has in the ideological conflict going on in the uncommitted countries of the world—between communism on the one side and the forces of freedom on the other.

Second, does Mr. Khrushchev want war? My answer is: I do not believe so. I share the view, in this respect, which I think was very well stated, by Chancellor Adenauer who told me while visiting my house a few weeks ago, that Mr. Khrushchev without question—being a dedicated Communist—wanted communism to rule the world; that this was his objective and would continue to be his objective regardless of the means or the shifts in policy which he might adopt. But on the other hand, as Chancellor Adenauer put it very graphically, Mr. Khrushchev does not want to rule a world of ruined cities and dead bodies. And he knows, as we know, the terribly destructive force of atomic weapons; he knows, as we know, what a war would do to the countries which he may want to rule and what it might also do to his own country. And there is another argument Mr. Khrushchev might have in this respect: He firmly believes, I think, based on the conversations I've had with him—as well as other statements he has made—that he can gain his objective of domination of the world more effectively and more surely at less cost without war.

This brings us, then, to the key problem of the future. In the massive 2½-hour press conference that Mr. Khrushchev held in Paris today, I think that the most significant line in it was one that perhaps will go unnoticed in most areas of the reporting of that conference, or relatively unnoticed. It was this: Referring to this whole problem of elections in the United States, he said, well, if the next President doesn't take the right line, we'll wait for the next President and the next one after that. Then he said this significant thing: "Because we can afford to wait, we can afford to wait."

There is nothing that I think is more typical of the Communist attitude and the Communist line, and more a challenge to us,

than what Mr. Khrushchev says in this respect. The Communist has a sense of history. He thinks in terms of not 5 years, but of a century, or 2 centuries if necessary; and he is willing to wait. He believes that he and his cause have the stamina and the strength to outlast the decadent societies of the West among which we, of course, are classified. So this is the challenge to us. Do we have the stamina, do we have the strength, do we have the determination in this nonmilitary struggle, which is going on now and which will continue to go in the years ahead: One, to resist further Communist gains; and two, to win the uncommitted areas of the world, who hold the balance of the power, to the side of freedom and away from those who would win it for communism. This is the key question of the next 10 years of the sixties and even beyond my day. I'd like to direct my remarks just briefly to this question in the time that remains tonight.

Let us look at this area. A billion people live in Asia, in Africa—a billion people who are unlike in many respects, but who are alike in that most of them are desperately poor and all of them need economic progress. Prime Minister Nehru put it very graphically to me when he said that the per capita income in India is one-twentieth of what it is in the poorest State in the United States.

You have never seen poverty until you have seen it in Asia and in parts of Africa, as I have seen it and my wife has seen it. You can see why the leaders of these countries say, "We must have progress." And so the question is, How are they going to get it? Which way are they going to turn? Some say, "Well, will they take progress without freedom?" The answer is that they would prefer not, and this is one of the main cards we have in our hands. Believe me, the leaders of these countries in Asia and of the newly developing countries in Africa, despite what you may hear to the contrary, want to be on our side. They prefer to have their progress and retain their independence and retain an opportunity to develop free institutions—not like ours, because they need different institutions since they have different types of development than we have, but institutions which at least give them the right of self-determination. But make no mistake about it: If the terrible choice left to these people is progress without freedom or staying where they are, they will take progress without freedom.

The Communists tell them, "Come our way." They don't tell them, of course, that the cost is freedom, but these people know that the cost is freedom. But the Communists say, "Look at what we've done in the Soviet Union, look at what we're doing in China; come our way, for this is the way to progress for the teeming millions who do not now have an adequate standard of living." There must be an alternative in which it can be shown that there is a way to have progress without giving up freedom; unless there is that alternative, the battle for the world will be lost in this area just as surely as if a war were fought in which we were the loser as well as civilization itself.

That brings me to a very unpopular subject. There now is a bill before the Congress for appropriations for the Mutual Security Act. Part of it goes for the purpose of maintaining adequate defenses abroad. Part of it goes also for technical assistance, for loans, for other programs designed to see to it that the people in these uncommitted countries that I have mentioned, who hold the balance of power in the world, are not faced with this terrible alternative of going the Communist way or staying where they are. Yet this is a bill which has no constituents at home; this is the one that is damned always as a giveaway; this is the one where people say, "Cut it down and spend it here in the United States." Particularly at this time,

when in my opinion there is no question but that Mr. Khrushchev will step up his activities in the nonmilitary aspects of the world struggle, the United States should support adequate programs in the mutual security area and particularly in the technical and economic aid areas of the program provided by this bill.

I could say many things that would be much more palatable to you, but this needs to be said and that is why I wanted to say it at this point.

One other point I would like to develop in that connection. In the years ahead, we will have to maintain adequate military strength so that we are never in an unfavorable position or an unequal position at the bargaining table. We also must maintain our mutual security programs, as I have pointed out, and we must maintain our programs of economic assistance abroad. Now, this means that the United States must have an economy which is strong, and sound, and productive. There is another point about the economy which, I think, should be made before this audience.

Mr. Khrushchev, in selling his wares around the world, constantly says: Ours is the way to the greater progress. He says, we are moving faster than the United States; the America economy used to be a pretty good one, but it isn't as good as it once was and, therefore, ours is the way of the future. I think he put it best, perhaps, with one of his very clever analogies, when he was speaking in India a few months ago. You may have read what he said. He likened this competition between the American economy and the Soviet economy, to a horse race. And in referring to the American economy, he said: "There was a horse, but now it's old and tired and limping, whereas our Socialist steed is young and vigorous and vital and moving faster; we will soon pass it by and it will never catch up." Is he right? My answer is, he is wrong, but only provided we stay on our horse and don't try to get on his, as far as the economic system is concerned.

We hear a great deal about growth these days in this country. How are we going to have adequate growth, they say, how is our economy going to grow fast enough? There are those, some very well intentioned, who say: The way to growth in the United States is to increase the size of Government and to spend more in Government, and that spending by Government of and by itself is a way to make the economy of the United States grow at a fixed level which the Government can set.

Let's understand exactly what we're talking about here. Government has some real responsibilities for spending—in the military area, in the national security area, in the economic-assistance area to which I referred, in the area of space, and in the necessary areas at home with which we are all familiar. But let us never forget that in our system Government should spend only what it needs to spend, and that Government spending should never be an end in itself. Or if I can put it another way: If we are going to have maximum growth of the American economy, that will keep us ahead of the Soviet Union as we are ahead of it today, the way to get that maximum growth is not to increase the size of Government or to increase Government spending; rather, the way to achieve this growth is to expand the opportunity for creative action for millions of individual Americans in the private enterprise system.

If we bear that lesson in mind in these years and months ahead, I am confident that we will win this struggle. We will be betting on the right horse, a horse that has served us well, and one that can continue to serve us well if we give it a chance, the chance that it can and should have.

Now, if I can bring one final thought to you, which is perhaps as important as anything I have said, if anything has been important in your minds up to this point.

I've been speaking about our military strength, about our economic strength, about the battle for the uncommitted nations and the prospect ahead. I believe all of these are highly important parts of this struggle in which we are engaged. But they are not all of that struggle. There is another part which is even more significant and one which I can best illustrate by an example.

People have often asked, Why did the President get the magnificent reception he did in Asia and in South America? Part of the reason certainly is because he is a world-famous man and people in that part of the world—as here—like to see world-famous people. But it could not all be ascribed to that; certainly, part of it also was because of the country he represented. To prove the point, may I tell you how my wife and I had a reception which could not have been due to the fact that the people were trying to receive a world-famous man—nor his wife—but which, nevertheless, was the most moving experience of our life.

It occurred after our visit to Russia last year. We went to Poland on a Sunday afternoon from Moscow. The Polish Government, before we arrived, had tried apparently to discourage any crowds in the streets by not printing our route into the city and not indicating the time of arrival; but the word some way had gotten around. After the plane landed, we drove from the airport; as we went through the suburbs of Warsaw into the city, increasingly large groups of people came to gather on the streets, and they were singing, they were throwing bouquets of flowers onto our cars. When we got into the heart of the city—and understand, no notice by the Government, no attempt to get a crowd out—when we got into the heart of the city, a quarter of a million people were there, stopping the caravan eight times so that we had to move them out in order to move on. And when the caravan stopped, we were able to look into their faces, and they were singing and they were shouting and at least a third of them were crying.

Why? We were the Vice President of the United States and his wife. Why? We represented a powerful country, but Mr. Khrushchev had been there just a month before—he represented a powerful country, and he had not received a welcome like this. Why? Because to the people of Poland behind the Iron Curtain under totalitarian government since World War II, America stood for something more than military strength and economic strength. It stood for freedom, for the hopes of people everywhere, for the right to be free, and for moral and spiritual values which have always been the great heritage of our Nation. This is something we should never forget.

And so tonight, may I tell you that in this hour of difficulty in this Nation's and the world's history, we can and should have faith—faith in our country, faith in our principles, and faith in our future. We should have that faith because of our strength, our military strength and our economic strength; but we should have it mainly because we're on the right side, the side of freedom, the side of justice, the side of peace with honor, the side of a nation that wants not an acre of territory nor an economic concession for any other person in the world. Standing for these things, America can and will, I am sure, help lead the forces of freedom and justice and peace to victory in the years ahead.

Thank you.

MOTION PICTURE BASED ON RICHARD FREDE'S BOOK, "THE INTERNS"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a motion picture based on Richard Frede's book, "The Interns," depicting the func-

tion and duties of interns in hospitals, is being made in Hollywood by Producer Robert Cohn for Columbia Pictures. I believe this picture will create considerable discussion of the manner of operation of modern hospitals and the way in which interns are treated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief review of Mr. Frede's novel by Robert Cohn.

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

Hollywood and the motion picture industry and Producer Robert Cohn are making a motion picture out of Richard Frede's book, "The Interns." While the book, which is now in its third printing, will reach many thousands of readers, the screen as a mass medium will bring the message of the novel to many millions in this country and abroad. The story of what goes on behind scenes in a hospital will unquestionably cause many hospital boards and administrators to cast a searching look at their own domains. The beneficiaries of this will be the sick and injured of the country and everyone who requires hospitalization at any time in the future.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the entire Senate is saddened by the death on April 11, 1960, of James W. Murphy, senior member of the corps of the Official Reporters of the Senate.

As a Member of the Senate I feel deeply the loss of a dedicated, able public servant who, by his patience, his painstaking efficiency and his exceptional fund of knowledge in reporting and editing an accurate account of the proceedings of the Senate, has been of immeasurable assistance to me and to all my colleagues in our work. And as an individual I grieve the loss of a friend, a friend whose loyalty, kindness, good humor, wit, and unfailing courtesy have enriched my daily life during the nearly half century I have known him.

James Murphy came to the office of the Official Reporters on December 7, 1896, and from that day on, for close to 64 years, he gave unstintingly of his time and his very considerable talents to serve the Senate. I am convinced that no reporter ever gave better service to any parliamentary body in the world.

With Mr. Murphy's passing there ended 108 years of continuous official Senate reporting by his family. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, the Senate section of which our esteemed friend and his most capable staff so carefully prepared every day the Senate was in session, was established largely through the efforts of the first Murphy to serve as Official Reporter. Dennis F. Murphy, the uncle of James W. Murphy, was selected in 1848 by Senator John C. Calhoun to give the Senate verbatim reports instead of the summaries by which debates and proceedings of the body had been recorded up to that time; 25 years later the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as we know it today, came into being.

Dennis Murphy served as Official Reporter of the Senate until 1896, the year his 17-year-old nephew, James, joined the corps as an amanuensis. He was the fourth member of the family to enter the employ of the Official Reporters' Of-

fice; at that time his father, Edward V. Murphy, had been a reporter since 1860, and the elder Murphy served until his death in 1919. Another uncle, James J. Murphy, had been an Official Reporter from 1854 to 1874. In all, the four members of the Murphy family served the Senate as Official Reporters for a total of 191 years, a record I doubt any other family can approach in any line of government service.

In the nearly 64 years James Murphy reported the colloquies, debates, and other proceedings of the Senate he recorded a wealth of American history and gave generously of his counsel and assistance to many of our Nation's leaders.

In 1917, when I came to Washington as secretary to the late Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming, I first became acquainted with Mr. Murphy, and he was most helpful to me in my new duties. He was a good friend of Wyoming's senior Senator Francis E. Warren, and soon Senator Kendrick, as well as his secretary, also came to regard him as a valued friend. Mr. Murphy's and my friendship strengthened down through the years, with the result that the loss I feel today at his death is personal and deep. I shall miss this scholarly gentleman, this great American, during the remainder of my days.

To the members of Mr. Murphy's family I extend my most sincere sympathy. They may be comforted by the realization that he served his country well and that his memory will live long and honorably in the hearts and minds of countless men and women who considered him their friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill which is the pending business merely amends the Navy's ration statute to insert the words "margarine" or "oleomargarine." It gives the Navy permissive authority to use margarine for table use, which authority is not now explicit in the statute.

The Navy Department itself for some time has indicated it wanted this authority. In many cases it is not possible to secure butter and margarine can be used with no loss of nutrition and at less cost.

As I said at the time of the introduction of this bill:

There is no valid reason why the Navy or any other branch of the armed services should not be given simple freedom of choice to buy what foods it wants or that necessity requires it to use, within the structure of the present ration statute. The omission of margarine from the ration statute is a simple discrimination against a perfectly good pure food product made from American farm products.

The bill S. 2168 is only permissive. It does not require the Navy to buy anything.

The bill limits this permissive authority by section 2, which provides that, except where the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, margarine may not be used by the Navy for table use if surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is apparent, therefore, that this bill is in no sense a restriction of or injury to the dairy or butter industries. It goes far to protect surplus butter's disposition channel in the armed services. It puts both butterfat and vegetable oils on the same level of treatment, insofar as those commodities may be in surplus.

I am now informed that there is no uncommitted stock of surplus butter. The great majority of CCC butter goes into the school lunch program.

S. 2168 is, therefore, a bill that seeks to remove a discrimination and to put two American farm products on the same basis in respect to use in Navy messes. I urge the Senate to approve this bill.

THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN MOVEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in his statement of January 22, J. Edgar Hoover warned that Nikita Khrushchev's visit to this country had resulted in the reinvigoration of the American Communist movement and that the FBI was receiving increasing evidence of stepped-up Communist activities at many points.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover warned that non-Communist organizations dedicated to causes that command popular support could expect Communist efforts to infiltrate their ranks.

Evidence that has come into the hands of the Subcommittee on Internal Security indicates that the Communist Party has made the nuclear test ban movement the chief target of its infiltration operations. I think it important that this evidence be placed before Congress and before the public so that we may have a better understanding of the methods by which the Communists operate and of the goals they seek to achieve. I should like to detail to you some of the evidence of this infiltration, and to suggest the outline of a self-defense program for all organizations whose purposes make them particularly vulnerable to Communist infiltration.

I do not accept the thesis that if one happens to hold a position that enjoys the support of the Communist Party on any issue, one is, ipso facto, either a pro-Communist or a fellow traveler. The Communists are opposed to the poll tax: does that make all people who oppose the poll tax Communists? The Communists support the Forand bill. Does that make the many millions of Americans who have endorsed the bill Communist sympathizers? Obviously not. But on a foreign policy issue of overriding importance like the test ban, if a legitimate organization adheres to a policy

which coincides with Communist policy, then it must be prepared to expect a concerted effort at infiltration by the Communist termites. The more urgent the issue, the more respectable the organization, the more illustrious the names on its letterhead, the greater the temptation from the Communist standpoint.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is headed by a group of nationally prominent citizens about whose integrity and good faith there is no question. Among them are people like Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review, Mr. Clarence Pickett of the American Friends Service Committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, and so forth. They advocate a point of view which some of us consider unrealistic or utopian, but it is, nevertheless, a significant point of view on an issue of life and death importance. For the personal motivations of most of those associated with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy I have the most sincere respect. The point of view they represent deserves a hearing—indeed, it must be heard.

Last Thursday evening, May 19, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy held a rally at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Many eminent persons attended this rally. The speakers included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Alfred Landon, Mr. Walter Reuther, Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Dr. Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College. At this meeting, the speakers urged that another summit meeting be convened for the purpose of attempting to arrive at an agreement banning nuclear tests.

Because I esteem the sincerity of the original founders of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the sincerity of the speakers I have named, it was for me an unpleasant duty to have to notify them that the unpublicized chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden rally, Henry Abrams, was a veteran member of the Communist Party; that there was also evidence of serious Communist infiltration at chapter level throughout the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; that the Communist Party and its front organizations had done their utmost to promote the meeting; that the Communists provided much of the organizing machinery for the meeting because they planned to use it as a pressure instrument in support of Soviet nuclear diplomacy.

This information was confirmed by the Subcommittee on Internal Security only several days before the Madison Square Garden meeting was scheduled to take place. Because I wished to be fair to all the decent and prominent people who were associated with the meeting as sponsors or as speakers, I had some doubt about the advisability of rushing into print with my information only 48 hours in advance of the rally. Instead, I decided to communicate the information, or at least certain essential portions of it, to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Mr. Cousins came to Washington to see me and we had a long and frank discussion about the problem.

The directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, it turned out, had some inkling of the existence of a Communist infiltration and were extremely unhappy about it. When the Communist affiliations of the chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting were brought to Mr. Cousins' attention, he immediately suspended the organizer in question. This was 2 days before the meeting. It is my understanding that the national committee of the organization intends to take some further measures against Communist infiltrators.

If I have any criticism to make, it is that the directors of the organization have moved so slowly to confront the problem and that the measures they have taken have been inadequate. I was, for example, surprised to discover that one of the officers of the committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, had, as early as last January, expressed serious suspicion about the individual who later became organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting—but that no action had been taken on Mr. Thomas' warning.

To me it is appalling that the Communists should be able to infiltrate and manipulate a movement founded on sincere humanitarian and pacifist motivations, and headed by so many reputable citizens. Perhaps this is a situation in which remedial legislation is indicated, a situation in which private citizens must have the assistance of Government to cope effectively with a movement that operates by stealth and by secrecy.

In accordance with the subcommittee's mandate from the Senate, it was clear that our duty required that we do everything in our power to get at the facts. In presenting the information we have gleaned to the Senate, it is my hope that I will be able to do so in a manner that will avoid injury to the innocent and will point the way to a constructive course of action by Government and private organizations.

The test ban has for several years now been the chief objective of the Communist propaganda apparatus. Of this there is ample documentary evidence.

In his speech before the congress of the Soviet Communist Party on January 27, Nikita Khrushchev, in his most militant rhetoric, called for a permanent ban on nuclear tests.

The main political resolution adopted by the 17th congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in February 1960 said:

The demand that the administration end nuclear testing and ban the H-bomb has found a widening response in community meetings, peace talks, petitions, and sermons from the pulpit.

On February 16, 1960, seven Communist foreign language newspapers took a full-page advertisement in the New York Times and called on the President—

1. To proclaim the achievement of total, universal, and controlled disarmament as the goal of national U.S. policy.

2. To restore the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons and to do everything in your power to insure early agreement on the banning of all nuclear tests.

3. To oppose the sharing of nuclear war-heads with NATO allies.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has not solicited the praise of the Communist movement, and most of its leaders, I am certain, would be much happier if they received no plaudits from Communist sources. The fact, nevertheless, remains that the committee in recent years has been the recipient of consistent and generous praise from the Communist press. The Communist organ, *New World Review*, for April of this year, for example, carried these paragraphs under the caption "Peace Groups in the United States":

No amount of conspiratorial silence can wipe out the forces for disarmament and peace; but it can leave them isolated from each other and ignorant of the efforts their fellows are making.

It is our purpose to bring to our readers' attention the main groups in our country working toward these ends, beginning in this issue * * * with a description of the main nonsectarian national organization.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY

SANE offers a wide choice of channels for expression of the American people's desire for a world without war. Under the chairmanship of Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review*, and Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee, and with the sponsorship and support of many noted Americans, SANE provides an elastic organization and comprehensive program through which ordinary people can be effective.

Local committees of SANE exist in many cities, towns, counties, and small communities throughout the United States. Their membership policy is flexible and they generally welcome additions to their forces, whether for one particular campaign or on a long-term basis.

Mr. President, to anyone who is familiar with the language of communism, the paragraphs I have just quoted constitute a clear directive to members of the Communist Party to enter into the ranks of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. These paragraphs, I might point out, were not the haphazard product of a novice or intellectual dilettante. They were written by the editor of the magazine, Jessica Smith, a hardened old-time Communist.

As for the Madison Square Garden meeting, the Communist organ, the *Worker*, in a series of its own advertisements, called upon all the Communist faithful to turn out in strength. The masthead of the *Worker* for May 15 carried a banner headline "For Sanity in Foreign Policy—All Out to Madison Square Garden, Thursday, 7:45 p.m."

Given this background, it was only natural to anticipate that the Communists would attempt to find their way into the organizing mechanism of the meeting.

The name of the Communist Party member who served as chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting is Henry H. Abrams. As I have pointed out, Mr. Norman Cousins suspended Mr. Abrams several days before the meeting, when I brought the matter to his attention. Until the date of his suspension, however, Mr. Abrams devoted vir-

tually full time to the organization of the meeting for many weeks. He did so, moreover, without remuneration.

On March 16, 1960, Mr. Abrams attended a meeting of the executive committee of the Greater New York Committee of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Let me read just two sentences from the minutes of that meeting, which clearly illustrates the central role this Communist agent has played:

Dr. Lear reported that Gov. G. Mennen Williams has accepted our invitation to speak at Madison Square Garden. Henry Abrams then gave the rest of the Madison Square Garden report.

Henry Abrams' residence at 11 Riverside Drive, New York City, and his telephone number of Trafalgar 4-7769, is the address and telephone number used by the headquarters of the Upper Manhattan Sane Nuclear Policy Committee. Abrams has served as an accountant for both the Upper Manhattan Committee and the Greater New York Committee of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. From these facts it emerges that his association with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy was a long and fairly prominent one.

Now let us look at Henry Abrams' Communist record.

In 1939, he resided at 972 East 14th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. In that year he signed a Communist Party nominating petition from that address which appeared on page 4091 of the election records.

He was a member of the 11th Assembly District Club of the Communist Party which met at 2744 Broadway, New York City. On Tuesday, February 15, 1944, it was announced at a meeting of this Communist club that Henry Abrams would give a class for Communists on the preparation of income tax forms.

Henry Abrams was a member of the Young Communist League and later of the upper West Side section of the Communist Party of New York City. He has been a consistent financial contributor to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

As recently as September 28, 1958, the official Communist Party newspaper, the *Worker*, printed a letter from Henry Abrams endorsing the candidacy of Benjamin Davis for State senator in the 21st senatorial district of New York City. Benjamin Davis is national secretary of the Communist Party, and is, in fact, one of the most notorious of native Communists, a fact which is well known to most Americans. He was one of the leading members of the party convicted in the famous Foley Square Smith Act trials of a dozen years ago. He spent several years in jail for advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence.

Mr. Abrams has served as an accountant for the American Communist Party, for the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and for the late Congressman Vito Marcantonio.

Abrams has carried out Communist policies in many ostensibly non-Communist organizations which have, in fact, served as fronts for the Communist

Party. Among the organizations promoted by the Communists in which he has played an active role are the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the Hiroshima Commemorative Committee, the National Committee of the American Forum for Socialist Education, the American Labor Party, the United Independent Socialist Conference Committee.

I state all these things as facts, Mr. President. On Friday, May 13, Henry Abrams was given the opportunity to deny them in a hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. He invoked the fifth amendment in reply to all questions regarding his years' long record of service to the Communist conspiracy.

The obvious and declared purpose of the Madison Square Garden meeting was to influence American policy on the nuclear test ban. It is one thing when American citizens come together, in accordance with their rights, for the purpose of urging a specific policy on their Government. It is an altogether different thing when such a meeting is infiltrated by the Communists and when the chief organizing role falls into the hands of a member of the Communist Party, which, as we all know, is a quisling instrument of Soviet policy. Such a situation has an important bearing on American security, because it is axiomatic that all actions of the Communist Party are planned to subserve the ends of Soviet diplomacy.

Let me say here, parenthetically, that this is by no means the only occasion of Communist machinations in the field of nuclear policy. At a previous hearing, we established that Avraham G. Mezerik, a man with a long Communist record, actually managed a so-called American Nobel Anniversary Forum and Dinner, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on January 11, 1958, which concentrated on the theme of an American ban on nuclear testing. It was brought out in this hearing that this gathering while managed by a Communist, was financed by a prominent American capitalist, who was unaware of Mezerik's Communist record.

With all this interest in the subject, the Internal Security Subcommittee summoned Mr. Abrams to appear and testify. Through his attorney, Leonard Boudin, of New York, Mr. Abrams pleaded illness, and asked to be excused from coming to Washington to testify. We then arranged to hear him in New York City. He showed up with a doctor's certificate that he was suffering from heart disease, and moved a further continuance on the ground that his condition was so serious that being questioned might cause him serious harm. Since the committee was aware that Mr. Abrams had continued right up to that day to carry a heavy load as the man in active charge of arrangements for the May 19 meeting at Madison Square Garden, we were not impressed by these claims.

We had a New York City Public Health Service doctor present, and asked Mr. Abrams if he would consent to be examined then and there. He refused,

so we denied the request for a continuance, and went ahead with the hearing, which was in executive session.

As I have indicated the hearing had been called in the hope that we could learn from Mr. Abrams the full story of Communist infiltration of and participation in this movement for a nuclear test ban, as a basis for determining what, if any, legislation may be indicated in this area.

The subcommittee has received evidence, much of it still of a classified nature, that Henry Abrams is not a lone infiltrator, that there exists in fact a serious Communist infiltration in the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

What, specifically, are the Communists attempting to achieve by their infiltration of the test ban movement, including their recent all-out support of the Madison Square Garden meeting? The answer to this is, I believe, obvious.

The Communist purpose in supporting the test ban agitation and in going all out to make the Madison Square Garden meeting a success is to exert pressure on the administration to make still further concessions to the Soviet viewpoint in order to arrive at a test ban agreement; to create a climate of public opinion which will make it impossible for the administration to resume small underground tests, even though there may be every reason to believe that the Kremlin is conducting such tests; to enervate the free world so that it becomes incapable of responding with appropriate measures to challenges at Berlin and at other points.

In the test ban negotiations that are now going on there are major differences between the Soviet position and our own. These differences hinge around the question of inspection. In my own opinion, we have already conceded too much, especially by agreeing in principle to a further voluntary moratorium on undetectable underground tests. But for those tests that are subject to detection, we still take the stand that there should be an inspection system based on an adequate number of fixed stations, with at least 20 or 30 onsite inspections per annum. The Kremlin wants a minimum of inspection. It wants as few stations as possible, and its spokesmen have indicated that they would not be willing to accept more than a few onsite inspections per annum.

The Kremlin apparently attached major importance to the Madison Square Garden meeting as a pressure operation in support of its nuclear objectives. This, I believe, is conclusively demonstrated by the generous and sympathetic coverage of the meeting in the Soviet press. I think this is interesting. According to an AP dispatch of May 21, Pravda headlined its account of the meeting with the words "We Want To Live in Friendship With the Soviet Union," while the Izvestia headline read "Rebuff to Advocates of War."

I believe that the heads of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy have a serious contribution to make to the great debate on national policy. But they can only make this contribution effectively

if they purge their ranks ruthlessly of Communist infiltration and if they clearly demarcate their own position from that of the Communists, first, by stressing the need for adequate inspection, second, by reiterating at every opportunity their opposition to the tyranny of communism.

On the basis of the evidence that has come to me, I do not believe that the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has taken the necessary measures to create a climate that is inhospitable to Communist infiltration. At the Madison Square Garden rally, for example, there was much direct and inferential criticism of American policy, but, according to the press accounts and reports from private sources—persons who were present at the meeting—there was almost no criticism of Khrushchev or of his arrogant, insulting, gutter-level behavior in Paris. On the contrary, the speakers called for an immediate effort to renew the summit conference.

Let me digress briefly for a comment on this last proposal, which has, unfortunately, not been confined to the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Perhaps I am old-fashioned, but to me it seems that after the President of the United States has had to endure a barrage of the crudest insults ever leveled at a head of state, a petition to Khrushchev for another summit meeting would constitute a total abandonment of national dignity. The only conceivable political consequence of so craven an action would be to encourage Khrushchev to further arrogance and further demands.

As I have said, I have found no serious evidence that the Madison Square Garden meeting was organized and conducted in a manner which would have discouraged Communist participation. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Communists and their sympathizers turned out in force. Although no Gallup poll or breakdown was possible, I am convinced from reports that the Communists were responsible for a very substantial percentage of the overflow turnout. A number of well-known Communists, including Alexander Trachtenberg, a top party member, were observed in the audience. Outside the meeting, the Communists brazenly distributed literature in their own name.

If decent organizations like the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy wish to protect themselves against the danger of Communist infiltration, I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for an organizational climate that is openly inhospitable to Communists. This is a situation where a tepid declaration of devotion to democracy simply will not suffice, while a neutral silence is an open invitation to disaster.

I can think of other things that can and should be done by the directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and of other non-Communist organizations which must contend with the problem of Communist infiltration. At top level, control is relatively easy. One can more or less assume that the people who are elected to a board of directors or to

a national committee have enjoyed public visibility over a period of years so that their records are known. At the local level, not even the FBI with all of its resources could offer a 100 percent guarantee against infiltration. However, I think it is possible for organizations to exercise a good deal of control by carefully examining the personal records and bona fides, first, of all those who volunteer to help establish local organizations; second, of those who are elected to office in local organizations; third, of all those assigned to organizing activities.

If any effort had been made to do these things, the Madison Square Garden situation might have been avoided. But for 25 years, Henry Abrams has been a Communist. Without looking up his record, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy allowed him to become the chief organizer of the rally in New York City. That was not taking the necessary precautionary measures.

I think it is not too much to ask that all such committees, which are headed by good people and made up of thousands of good people, ought to give consideration to the question whether Communists like Abrams are taking a part in the running of their meetings. Many of these committees have been doing good work. But it is little wonder that they become infiltrated by Communists if they do not take the pains and the time to ascertain who some of their people are, before they allow them to become officers or chief organizers of mass rallies.

I believe it is not too much to ask our fellow citizens who are organizing committees for the purpose of exerting influence on Congress—as they have every right to do—to make a preliminary, cursory check of the persons who are working in their organizations, especially before they hold such meetings.

This would not be an easy task. But there is much that can be done. It will not always be possible to obtain accurate personal information, because many Communists operate underground as secret party members. But in the case of a man like Abrams, who has a public record of membership, the facts should be available without too much effort.

Perhaps this is a situation in which private organizations can in some way be assisted by Government. This is a problem that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is at present exploring.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I wish to pay my personal tribute to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, for the manner in which he has reacted to the revelations of the subcommittee. Mr. Cousins has been a neighbor and a friend of mine for many years. I have the highest regard for him. That is why I called him up and told him what I knew about Abrams. He was good enough to come to Washington to see me.

I said, "I don't want to release this material 24 hours before your meeting. You have your plans all made. But many innocent people will be present, and a number of them will be prominent

people. Why have you not checked on people like Abrams? Norman Thomas said in January that he was doubtful about the man's background. Here it is the middle of May, on the eve of your meeting, and you have not yet done anything."

Mr. Cousins was upset about the matter. He immediately suspended Abrams. Not only did he do this, but he told me he was glad we had informed him about Abrams. He offered to open the books of his organization to the subcommittee and to cooperate in every way to rid his organization of Communists.

I assured Mr. Cousins and other persons connected with his committee that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is ready to cooperate with them to help to prevent a repetition of the Madison Square Garden situation.

I think it is not too much to say that the subcommittee is desirous and willing to help any other organization to avoid infiltration by subterranean elements who are not there for any good purpose, and who are certainly not interested, as are the good people who make up the bulk of their membership, in the welfare of the United States.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 809 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1482, S. 3226. I may say that the bill has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3226) to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 4, after the word "section," it is proposed to insert:

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, in the case of mortgages referred to in this subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed,

the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama give a brief explanation of the bill and the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so.

Senate bill 3226 amends section 809 of the National Housing Act. Section 809 was added to the National Housing Act in 1956, pursuant to Public Law 574, 2d session, 84th Congress, to help solve the housing problems of essential civilian employees of the armed services at research and development installations. The establishment of this special program was necessary because in some instances homes built for such employees in towns near or adjacent to such installations would be above and beyond those needed for the normal economic growth of the community. In the opinion of the Federal Housing Administration, homes built in excess of those needed for normal growth of a community cannot meet the test of economic soundness required by statute as a prerequisite for FHA mortgage insurance. Section 809 permits the economic soundness test to be waived in such cases.

In order to qualify for insurance, section 809 provides that an individual is required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that first, the employee requires housing; second, the employee is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research and development installation of one of the armed services of the United States; and third, the employee is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary employee on such date.

In addition, the Secretary of Defense is required to certify to the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration that housing is necessary for these civilian employees and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installations. The latter certificate is conclusive evidence to the FHA Commissioner of the need for housing; but if the Commissioner determines that mortgage insurance on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss with respect to the mortgages in question.

This program has been very helpful in supplying needed housing to essential employees of the armed services in areas surrounding Cocoa and Eglin Air Force Bases, Fla.; China Lake, Calif.; and Redstone Arsenal, at Huntsville, Ala.

Administrative jurisdiction over certain research and development installations has recently been transferred from the Department of Defense to NASA. While these transfers do not alter the intent of section 809, it has been concluded by the HHFA and the NASA that the program as presently constituted is not available to essential civilian employees of NASA at installations so

transferred. The reason for this conclusion is that the Administrator of NASA has no present authority to certify eligible employees, and cannot guarantee the FHA against loss.

The amendment as proposed by Senate bill 3226 is designed to overcome these technical difficulties, so that essential civilian employees at installations transferred from the Department of Defense to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may use the section 809 program to obtain needed housing.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well, Mr. President; I am prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3226) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 809 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person employed or assigned to duty at a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, where such installation was a research or development installation of one of the military departments of the United States (on or after June 13, 1956) before its transfer to the jurisdiction of such Administration, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, in the case of mortgages referred to in this subsection. For purposes of this subsection, (1) the terms 'Armed Forces', 'one of the military departments of the United States', 'military department', 'Secretary or his designee', and 'Secretary' when used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and the term 'Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force' when used in section 805, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Administrator thereof, as may be appropriate, (2) the terms 'civilian employee', 'civilians', and 'civilian personnel' as used in this section shall be deemed to refer to employees of such Administration or a contractor thereof or to military personnel assigned to duty at an installation of such Administration, and (3) the term 'military installation' when used in section 805 shall be deemed to refer to an installation of such Administration."

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION LAWS NEED TO BE STRENGTHENED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the necessity to strengthen the program under which the United States is assisting efforts to reduce air pollution becomes more obvious with the passage of time. From many quarters, there is being provided evidence that the proportions of the problem warrant removal of legislative shackles from the U.S. Public Health Service and sister agencies, which have been charged by Congress with helping clean up the atmosphere which is essential to existence.

Earlier this session, in company with my colleague from California and both colleagues from Pennsylvania, I introduced a bill, strongly recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to allow greater latitude and flexibility in Public Health Service activities in this field.

Within the past few days, more reasons for enacting such legislation have been revealed. Among them is a report to the Air Pollution Control Association, to the effect that the extent of automobile-caused smog has increased greatly in the last 5 years. This alarming information is contained in an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit I.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, another illustration of the need to give the Public Health Service more tools for its air pollution program is the continuing and growing demand for the promulgation of standards and the establishment of criteria to govern the discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere.

My own State of California recently, by action of its legislature, has taken steps to reduce contamination of the air by automobiles. Only this week, related legislation has been reported to the Senate—specifically, a bill passed by the House last year, H.R. 8238, under which the Surgeon General would report on such discharges.

These incidents show that research must be stepped up. It is not now possible to do so under the ceiling retained by Congress last year on appropriations for air-pollution work. Furthermore, the time limitation in the present legislation handicaps the administrators of the program in planning long-term health studies with universities and other scientific institutions.

A task group of experts from outside the Federal Government has studied the national air-pollution research needs, and has approved in principle a draft report which recommends for the next 10 years an approximate threefold increase in the total effort, with a proportionate stepping up of Federal activity. This is not possible under the present \$5 million ceiling.

In a recent issue, the Journal of the American Medical Association warned that—

In numerous places on the earth the air contains hundreds of substances which were never intended to be inhaled. Some of these make us uncomfortable or ill and at times hasten the end of human beings.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from this publication also be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, growing concern about the spread of air pollution is felt and expressed by responsible public officials. Recently, I have heard from California that the Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County feel that more needs to be done. Likewise, the Public Health Director of San Diego County, Dr. J. B. Askew, has written to me a letter in which he states his feeling that Congress should "if at all possible, allow expansion of the Federal activity" in this field. I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD, following these remarks.

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

(See exhibit III.)

EXHIBIT I

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

CRACKED RUBBER AND DAMAGED CROPS CITED AS RESULT OF AUTO-CAUSED SMOG

(By Morton Mintz)

CINCINNATI, May 23.—Two hallmarks of automobile-caused smog—cracked rubber and damaged crops—have been found in urban and adjoining rural areas in 20 States, as well as the District of Columbia and the Canadian Province of Ontario.

The two scientists who reported this to the Air Pollution Control Association today gave the first documented summary of how widespread the problem of this kind of air pollution has become.

The Nation is expected to have 114 million autos by 1976, compared with about 70 million today.

"Control of motor-vehicle exhaust must be achieved if the air is to be conserved as an essential national resource," Prof. John T. Middleton and Arie J. Haagen-Smit told the association's 53d annual meeting.

Middleton is a University of California plant pathologist. Haagen-Smit is a California Institute of Technology chemist. Both are pioneer smog researchers.

Middleton, who read the report, said that even 5 years ago it was unusual, if not rare, to find East Coast vegetation damaged by smog. But today, he said, such damage is found in and around Washington, Baltimore, Wilmington, Del., Philadelphia, Trenton and New Brunswick, N.J., New York City, Hartford, Conn., and Boston.

The gravity of the problem is most sharply indicated in the Delaware Valley. Here, he said, smog generated in metropolitan Philadelphia is damaging spinach planted in an area of about 500 square miles between, roughly, Cranberry, N.J., and Wilmington.

He identified the harmful agent as ozone, the irritant in smog previously found to have damaged tobacco plants at Beltsville, near the District in Maryland's Prince Georges County.

In experiments with laboratory animals ozone has caused lung injuries, some of them fatal.

Ozone also oxidizes rubber, causing, for instance, cracks on tire sidewalls. A standard test for ozone is to measure how fast and deep it cracks bent rubber strips exposed to the air.

EXHIBIT II

[From the American Medical Association Journal, Apr. 30, 1960]

THE AIR WE BREATHE

By rights the air we breathe is a mixture of oxygen, nitrogen, and argon, with traces of helium, neon, krypton, and xenon, and presumably it has been approximately so since man began to breathe. Today, however, in numerous places on the earth, the air contains hundreds of substances which were never intended to be inhaled. Some of these make us uncomfortable or ill and at times hasten the end of human beings.

Extraneous substances such as dust have been in the air for a very long time, and, while they protect us against the sun's actinic rays, they too have taken their toll. The more serious air pollution problem began well after the industrial revolution (1870), and it has increased year by year until the number of air pollutants is now almost as great as the number of human activities which produce them.

The chief air pollutants today are the oxides of nitrogen, the oxides of sulfur, the aldehydes, carbon monoxide, smoke, condensed fumes, and organic vapors, often referred to as hydrocarbons, of which there are said to be 200 in automobile exhaust fumes alone.

Automobile engines, according to Chambers, emit an average of 200 to 400 pounds (91 to 182 kilograms) of hydrocarbons and from 25 to 75 pounds (11 to 34 kilograms) of oxides of nitrogen, estimated as NO_2 , per 1,000 gallons of gasoline used. Burning a ton of coal produces 8 pounds (3.6 kilograms) of oxides of nitrogen, estimated as NO_2 . Carbon monoxide is produced by gasoline engines in normal operation at the rate of about 3,200 pounds (1,453 kilograms) per 1,000 gallons of gasoline. Diesel engines produce about 75 pounds of oxide of nitrogen, estimated as NO_2 , per 1,000 gallons of oil burned.

One need only look at the window sills occasionally to see that the air we breathe in congested areas contains thousands of specks of soot. As for dust, for example, the Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology reported that the average fall for 30 days of January 1960, for the city of Chicago was 53.1 tons per square mile, while in the Chicago Loop it was 124.1 tons per square mile. The list could be extended for both places and things.

In this issue of the Journal, Oderr reports a study of 200 lungs of adults who died of causes other than tuberculosis or lung cancer. He observed a correlation between parenchymal soot deposit and emphysema. His findings indicate that the common form of chronic emphysema begins in highly localized areas which tended to be in the pathways trapping soot particles. Lawther, at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in London, found that certain soot particles trap acid radicals internally, and when they are collected on cascade impactor slides coated with gelatin films containing a color indicator, a strongly acid reaction is observed after a time. Other mechanisms have been suggested by which air-polluting inhalants could produce structural and functional abnormalities in the lung.

The effects on public health of unsavory gases and solids in the air is of first importance. It seems obvious, in some places, that the effects have been detrimental. However, as yet scientific proof of the specific hazards to human health is fragmentary, making it difficult to arrive at valid conclusions. Many studies have been published,

many are under way. The proceedings of the National Conference on Air Pollution, sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service, published recently, contains much of the information here being reviewed.¹

There is no doubt that during the episodes at Donora and London the death rates mounted. The evidence is clear that certain air pollutants can cause bronchitis. There is abundant evidence that the Los Angeles smog affects the eyes of its citizens, temporarily at least, to the point of distraction. Mills² said, "The present report shows a clearly significant association between Los Angeles smogs and rises in day-by-day respiratory and cardiac deaths in the exposed population." Evidence is accumulating which suggests that air pollution may be causally involved in asthma, emphysema, and lung cancer. Stocks and Campbell estimated that about 35 percent of deaths from cancer of the lung in the Liverpool area result from air pollution. Mancuso maintained that air pollution represents a highly probable and important factor in the excess of lung cancer in urban areas. Kotin said that atmospheric pollution, both epidemiologically and in the laboratory, must be regarded as one of multiple factors operating in combination to result in lung cancer.

In a symposium in San Francisco, January 16-18, 1960, sponsored by the University of California School of Medicine and Continuing Education in Medicine and the Health Sciences, University of California, northern area, David F. Eastcott, M.D., formerly assistant director, National Institute of Health of New Zealand, presented a paper entitled "Other Airborne Factors in Cancer." He said that immigrants to New Zealand from highly industrialized Britain run a risk of lung cancer 30 percent greater than persons born in New Zealand of the same stock and way of life. If they are more than 30 years of age on coming to New Zealand, their risk is 75 percent greater. This can only be explained logically, Dr. Eastcott said, in terms of atmospheric environment, and it is significant that the effects of the British environment are felt many years after the person has left Britain to live in the cleaner New Zealand environment. Work done on lung cancer and bronchitis in Britain is consonant with this interpretation and renders it difficult to uphold any other.

Public Health Service Surgeon General Burney in his welcoming address before the National Conference on Air Pollution said that "investigators are finding a definite association between community air pollution and high mortality rates due to cancer of the respiratory tract, including the lungs, cancer of the stomach and esophagus, and arteriosclerotic heart disease."

There is another part to this drab picture, that of the cost in damaged crops and livestock, damaged buildings, lowered real estate values, and excessive laundry, cleaning, and paint bills. And how about the housewives who scrub and scrub to keep the grime away? While no one knows the cost of air pollution in these areas, estimates place it at billions of dollars a year.

This enormous, complex problem will probably get worse before it gets better, since our cities and total industrial output are becoming larger each year. Dyktor,³ commissioner of the division of air pollution control of Cleveland, has said that complete elimination of air pollution is not econom-

ically attainable. The aroused public will have its say about that. Already the 84th Congress of the United States has responded by enacting a law which directs the Public Health Service to conduct research and provide technical services to State and local governments and private agencies. The goal of this program is to determine the conditions under which toxic substances in the air affect human health, and the measures which must be applied to prevent adverse effects. A national air sampling network is at work and 180 cities and 51 nonurban areas have sampling stations. Each State has at least one urban and one nonurban sampling station and seven States have their own sampling networks.

The sanitary engineering centers in Cincinnati and in the field offer training courses, and more than 900 persons took part in them during fiscal year 1958. At least 14 universities were offering graduate courses in subjects related to air pollution as of November 1959. Cities are banding together to form countrywide air-pollution control districts. Thus, a good start has been made. We may be surprised at what can be done if everybody, managers of buildings, homeowners, industries, and research workers, will do their part in keeping toxic material out of the air we breathe.

EXHIBIT III

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
San Diego, Calif., May 3, 1960.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Information has come to this office indicating that legislation which you introduced to extend Public Law 159, the Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act, is now under active consideration as Senate bill 3108 and House bill 10696.

As air pollution control officer of this county, it has been my privilege to become familiar with the vast need for more information concerning air pollution and the proper approach to control same. Likewise, I attended the National Air Pollution Conference held in Washington in November 1958, at which time it was the unanimous recommendation of the conference that the authorization for the air pollution control program as a responsibility of the U.S. Public Health Service be continued indefinitely and that the ceiling limitations on the authorized expenditures be removed.

It is noted that your bill which would have provided for these two conditions was subsequently modified by committee action. Even though California has adopted air quality standards and exhaust discharge standards, and the recent session of the California Legislature adopted further air pollution controls, it is the opinion of all that these actions will not completely correct the problem and that there will be further need for research and development for future air pollution control activity.

It is, therefore, respectfully requested that you and the other California representatives do all within your power to continue the air pollution control program at its present level and, if at all possible, allow expansion of the Federal activity in air pollution research and technical development, if such can be justified by program proposals to be reviewed by the proper appropriation committees of the Federal Congress.

This matter is being brought to the attention of the board of supervisors of this county, who act as directors of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, with the recommendation and request that they act and communicate with our California representatives to urge the continuation and extension of the air pollution work by the

¹ Proceedings of National Conference on Air Pollution, Washington, D.C., Nov. 18-20, 1958, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1959.

² Mills, C. A.: "Respiratory and Cardiac Deaths in Los Angeles Smogs," *Am. J. M. Sc.* 233, 379-386, (April) 1957.

³ Dyktor, H. G.: Community Problem, *Indust. Med.* 19: 102-106 (March) 1950.

Federal Government. You may rest assured that we are behind you 100 percent in the continuation of this vital program.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. ASKEW, M. D.,
Director of Public Health and Air Pollution Control Officer.

COUNTY OF SONOMA,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,

Santa Rosa, Calif., March 21, 1960.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is gratifying to note your renewed activity relative to smog-control at the Federal level. This business of smog is definitely something to be concerned about.

We are pleased that Senator CLAIR ENGLE and the two Senators from Pennsylvania have added their weight to your effort.

This renewed activity will be a shot-in-the-arm to the San Francisco Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

With kind personal regards, I remain,
Yours very truly,

LEIGH S. SHOEMAKER,
Supervisor, Second District, Board of
Supervisors of County of Sonoma.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1833) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colo.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LAKE MICHIGAN POLLUTION STUDY

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in a moment I intend to request unanimous consent to have a number of insertions made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

if and when those requests are granted, I intend thereafter to seek recognition by the Chair, in order to reply to a statement made yesterday, on the floor of the Senate, by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I notified the office of the Senator from Wisconsin about 30 minutes ago that I intended to make these comments, but I do not see him on the floor at this time. I therefore ask that the staff of the minority or the staff of the Senate seek out the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and again notify him of my intention. Then, after I have submitted my unanimous-consent requests, I shall proceed with the matter to which I have referred.

(At this point, Mr. DOUGLAS submitted certain matters for inclusion in the RECORD, where they appear under the appropriate headings.)

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I come now to the matter of the comments of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in the Senate yesterday, which will be found at pages 10889 and 10890 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I deeply regret that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is not on the floor. As I said, approximately 40 minutes ago, I telephoned his office that I intended to comment on his remarks and indicated the nature of my comments, and asked that he be informed. When I came to the floor I found he was not here, and, as the RECORD will show, I have asked either the staff of the minority or the staff of the Senate to seek out the senior Senator from Wisconsin and so inform him. But he is not here and I cannot delay any further. I must therefore proceed, but I do so with the consciousness that I have tried to give to the senior Senator from Wisconsin a full opportunity to answer the statements which I am going to make.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has always been an opponent of Chicago's efforts to deal with its sanitary problems, is continuing his obstructive tactics in a mutually contradictory fashion.

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate, he denounced the proposal by Representatives O'BRIEN and YATES that \$12 million be appropriated for an overall survey of the sanitary problems of all five of the Great Lakes—namely, not merely Lake Michigan, but Lakes Superior, Huron, Erie, and Ontario—and the large number of cities adjoining the lakes.

In view of the widespread pollution of lake beaches because of the unsanitary practices of all the lake cities except Chicago, and in view of the grave pollution of Milwaukee's beaches, I had expected Senator WILEY to support this proposal of Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES. But evidently Senator WILEY's well-known dislike of Chicago prevented him from doing this. Because the O'Brien-Yates proposal provided for an experimental diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second at Chicago for only 1 year, he has announced his opposition to this modest and cooperative proposal.

It is extraordinary to find the Senator from Wisconsin giving as his chief excuse for opposing this appropriation the

fact that H.R. 1, which was an attempt to deal with this problem for Chicago only, is supposedly under consideration by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he is the ranking Republican member. He therefore labels the O'Brien-Yates proposal as a "subterfuge" and a Trojan horse, and says it is an attempt to bypass consideration of H.R. 1 by the Foreign Relations Committee, and that only this body should give the matter legislative consideration.

Now, the facts are these: When H.R. 1 was referred last fall to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as the result of the filibuster in which Senator WILEY played a leading part, the chairman of that committee, the junior Senator from Arkansas, promised to give it careful consideration. I charged at the time that Senator WILEY, as ranking minority member, would never permit the committee to consider or approve the bill. I was told that I was too suspicious, that the Senator was the soul of fairness and would certainly not object to our having our day in court.

The new session opened, but the Foreign Relations Committee did not bring up the bill for consideration. On February 25, I therefore wrote the chairman and asked for a hearing upon H.R. 1. After a somewhat fruitless exchange of correspondence during which Senator WILEY helped to block action because on the 15th of March the records of the Foreign Relations Committee show that my request was considered in executive session, but not acted upon, and I am informed confidentially it was not acted upon because of a filibuster led by Senator WILEY. I again renewed my request on March 22. Finally, I was asked to appear in person, which I did on March 29, and asked that the committee give us the courtesy of a hearing.

Senator MORSE, with his customary sense of fairness, then moved that this be done and a hearing be held, but his motion did not carry, both because of a filibuster led by Senator WILEY and another Senator from a lake State and because they were able to get half of the 12 votes, and therefore were able to prevent affirmative action on my request for a hearing.

Since then Senator MORSE has brought this issue up again and has asked once more that the committee give us a hearing. Each time Senator WILEY and his Lake and New England allies have prevented our even getting a chance to be heard. It was because of these obstructionist tactics on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin—I want to say that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] had absolutely nothing to do with these unfair tactics—that Messrs. O'BRIEN and YATES sought to deal with the whole problem of lake sanitation which is so grievously afflicting Milwaukee, which wants to foist its dirty habits of returning sewage into the lake off on Chicago.

How can I characterize the behavior of the Senator from Wisconsin in terms which would not violate rule XIX? I want to characterize the action of the Senator accurately; yet I do not wish to violate rule XIX.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I will not yield. I wish to complete my statement. Then I will yield.

On the one hand, the Senator from Wisconsin prevents us from having a hearing. On the other he says constructive legislation should not be considered by another committee because we are having a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee.

As a matter of fact, yesterday, May 24, the Senator from Wisconsin, after lengthy discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee, moved to postpone any further consideration of the lake diversion bill, and mustered six votes in support of his motion. The motion lost by merely a tie vote, and the motion to hold hearings was similarly lost by a tie vote, with Senator WILEY leading the opposition.

Senator WILEY then immediately hurried to the floor of the Senate saying that since H.R. 1 was under consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee should not consider the O'Brien-Yates proposal. Language fails me in dealing with that contention.

The contradiction in this fast and ambiguous footwork is clear. The plea that the Appropriations Committee surrender the O'Brien-Yates measure to the Foreign Relations Committee for its consideration is obviously an effort not to get it considered, but to get it killed.

I notice that the very able and fair-minded senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is in the Chamber. The Senator from Oregon has been trying his best for some months now to see that we at least get a hearing and a fair deal. I appeal to the Senator as to whether my statement of facts is correct or incorrect.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield with the understanding that the Senator from Illinois will not lose his right to the floor. I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes.

The Senator from Illinois has referred to the part which I played in the controversy within the Committee on Foreign Relations. I want to make a very brief statement for the RECORD in regard to it.

The Senate has heard me for 16 years—I fear sometimes to near boredom—stress over and over again that, after all, the substantive rights of people can be no better than their procedural rights. I do not know of any better illustration of that truism than the controversy which is waging over getting a hearing on the so-called lake diversion bill of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, the Senate referred the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is my interpretation that when the Senate referred the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations the referral carried with it by clear implication, if not by express provision, a mandate to the Committee on Foreign Relations that it

proceed to consider the bill and to hold hearings in respect to the issues involved.

That is all I have asked for, Mr. President. I am perfectly willing to follow where the facts lead in regard to the bill, but I think it is only proper, fair and right that the Committee on Foreign Relations hold a hearing on the bill.

The motion which I have presented several times to the Committee on Foreign Relations would send the bill to a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations headed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is chairman of the subcommittee which deals with United States-Canadian relationships. I selected that subcommittee, Mr. President, because there has been raised a so-called international question with respect to this issue. Various allegations have been made as to the position taken by the Canadian Government in regard to the bill.

I do not intend to go into the merits of the argument. In fact, I am not a competent witness on the merits. The purpose of the hearing is to bring out the merits of the controversy.

What I have been saying in the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. President, I repeat to the Senate. The Senator from Illinois is a colleague of ours in the Senate. The Senator from Illinois is the author of a bill of vital concern to his State. I happen to think that the State of Illinois is entitled to a hearing on the matter. I am at a loss to understand why roadblocks should be put in the way, against the procedure which would assure the making of a record on the facts. That is all I have been pleading for.

I have pointed out that men serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations who are opposed to the Senator from Illinois in regard to the bill. I have said in the committee, and I am perfectly willing to say on the floor of the Senate, I think this makes it all the more important that the Committee on Foreign Relations grant a hearing on the bill, so that it can never be charged that anyone on the Committee on Foreign Relations in opposition to the bill is using the Committee on Foreign Relations to "bottle up" the bill.

I think that we in the Senate owe a good-faith relationship to each other. I think when a colleague has a bill of as much consequence as is this bill, and the bill by a vote of the Senate is referred to a committee, the bill ought to be considered automatically, and there should be a hearing on it.

I am very fond of the individuals who are opposed to me in respect to this matter in the committee, but I said yesterday in the committee, "I think you are making a great mistake, procedurally."

I am going to continue to press for my motion for a hearing on the bill, Mr. President, as many times as I have a opportunity to make the motion. We are subject to a procedural rule in the committee, and the only time I can bring up the motion is on a so-called regular meeting date, unless the committee votes to bring it up at some time other

than a regular meeting date. Our regular meeting date is usually Tuesday. Next Tuesday I shall offer my motion again.

I wish to offer the motion, Mr. President, in the hope that we can get a majority of the members of the committee, at least—and I hope the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will be among them—to recognize the plain fairness of the procedure for which I am pleading.

Mr. President, I shall always oppose any "bottling up" technique.

It is my judgment that is what is happening to the bill on the part of some of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Some Senators are trying to block a hearing. I cannot reconcile that with fairness, with equity and, I will say, with proper relationships among ourselves as Senators. If we ever start letting this unhappy procedure take root in the Senate we are going to do great injury, in my judgment, to the work of the Senate itself.

It makes no difference whether the Senator involved might be my most bitter enemy, if a Senator has a bill and wants a hearing on it in the committee, the Senator from Oregon will vote for the hearing. I think any Senator would be entitled to that. I believe in the right to petition and the right to have a hearing on the substance of matters.

Mr. President, I am glad to join with my friend from Illinois today in supporting his general premise, that a wrong is really being done by those in the Committee on Foreign Relations who refuse to vote to give the distinguished Senator from Illinois a hearing. There are many reasons why we ought to have the hearing, but one is senatorial courtesy, if Senators consider no other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his statement. I assume the Senator agrees with me that my recital of the facts has been an accurate recital.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has led the fight in the committee against a hearing on the bill, and he has been joined by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in spite of the fine work of the Senator from Oregon and the other members of the committee I have about abandoned hope of getting a fair deal for Chicago on this matter from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It pains me to say this, but I have about abandoned hope. I think, therefore, the best thing to do is to proceed with the O'Brien-Yates proposal in the Appropriations Committee, which provides for an appropriation of \$12 million to study the sanitary problems of all the lake cities—Milwaukee, Cleveland, Toledo, Erie, Buffalo, and others. If Canada wishes to come in on this, we would be glad to study the Canadian problems as well.

These cities are dumping sewage, either raw or treated, into the lakes, and polluting the lakes. If my information is correct, Chicago is now the only

city where one can enjoy lake bathing. This problem is going to increase in severity with the passage of time.

Even the city of Milwaukee, which has had a good record until recently, found its beaches so badly polluted last year that it was necessary to close the beaches. I am informed that the new sewage disposal plant in Milwaukee is merely a sedimentation plant, and therefore only about 40 percent of its sewage will be eliminated. This residue will shortly be dumped into Lake Michigan, and that will have a bad effect not only upon Milwaukee, but, also since the lake current moves from north to south, will endanger beaches in Kenosha and Racine and possibly across the line in Zion, Waukegan, North Shore, and other places in Illinois.

I appreciate the fine work of the Senator from Oregon. I understand the present distinguished Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has also assisted. I think the Senator from Arkansas has been fair in the matter. Nevertheless, I do not have much hope. I raise this question simply to indicate the type of treatment we have been getting.

Most of all I am indignant, I will say, that a Senator should work to prevent consideration of a bill and then say that a general proposal should not be considered by another committee because the Committee on Foreign Relations is considering the bill.

It was this performance which really taxed my patience and strained my language and forced me to impose restraints upon myself lest I violate rule XIX. Frankly, if I said what I thought of this performance, rule XIX would be smashed to smithereens and I would be forced to take my seat. But being a law-abiding man, conforming to the rules of the Senate, I have restrained my language and will not violate rule XIX. Every Senator knows what my sentiments are, and if Senators will examine the RECORD, they will see I feel the same now as I have always felt about this matter.

Now I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] who will present the defense of his colleague. I have tried to get the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the floor so that he could also hear what I said and make such answer as he thought it possible for him to make. Unfortunately, he is not present. Now I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I wish to say that my senior colleague [Mr. WILEY] needs no defense from me. He has already handled this situation in such an effective way that he has infuriated the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] goes down in my esteem. I think that is a terrible statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my friend from Illinois that when I rose about 10 minutes ago, I rose not to invoke rule XIX, although in my judgment the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]

violated rule XIX, not by referring to my senior colleague, but because of his reference to the so-called "dirty habits" of the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are dirty habits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That statement was a violation of the rule. It offends a State and offends the greatest city in my State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Wisconsin deny that the city of Milwaukee dumps its treated sewage back into the lake?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is proud of the excellent handling of sewage by the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator deny that the city of Milwaukee dumps its treated sewage back into the lake?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course we do, but we treat it first.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the new plant in Milwaukee is merely a sedimentation plant and does not use the method of activated sludge that Chicago and the first plant built in Milwaukee used? Is it true that the new plant is merely a sedimentation plant?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin tells the Senator from Illinois that the water which is taken from Lake Michigan by the city of Milwaukee for drinking purposes is pure and that no illnesses have been caused through its use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I repeat my question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois speaks of an entirely different subject. I am talking about the fact that the water of Lake Michigan taken for drinking purposes is clean. Competent medical authority has never indicated to the contrary at any time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The city of Milwaukee withdraws water north of the point at which sewage is dumped. The lake current is north to south. So of course the water which is taken for drinking purposes is all right. But the beaches are contaminated.

The Senator from Wisconsin does not deny the fact that the new plant is a sedimentation plant which will remove only about 40 percent of the sewage, leaving 60 percent of the sewage to be dumped into the lake by the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The city of Milwaukee has followed sanitary practices which have not endangered anyone's health. The Senator from Illinois has argued in favor of the proposed legislation for years and has yet to bring to the attention of the Senate an instance of a single person who has ever become ill as a result of the practices of the city of Milwaukee. Indeed I have repeatedly brought to the attention of the Senate testimony by the most authoritative medical and health experts in the country supporting the Wisconsin position against Illinois. I am still waiting for the Senator from Illinois to present a scintilla of competent medical or health testimony supporting his position.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is therefore tacitly admitting what I have said by his refusal to reply to my question.

I propose that we get together and study all these problems. I propose that we try to improve the situation in Milwaukee, Cleveland, Toledo, Buffalo, Erie, Superior, Duluth, and all the other cities on the Great Lakes. I hope the junior Senator from Wisconsin, who is a very fine gentleman, will cooperate in such a study, displaying therefore an attitude unlike that of his senior colleague.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be delighted to cooperate in any study which does not provide additional diversion of water from the Great Lakes for 1 year, as the Senator from Illinois so well knows is the proposal which he has supported. I ask the Senator from Illinois if his proposal provides for diversion of Great Lakes water to any other city except Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Chicago is the only city on the Great Lakes where the water runs from the Great Lakes toward the south. All other cities are located where the rivers flow into the lakes, and that was once true of Chicago. But in 1899 we reversed the flow of the Chicago River, so that instead of the waters of the river flowing into Lake Michigan, they go now into the Illinois River, then into the Mississippi and thence into the gulf.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is a master at diversion, and of diversionary tactics, too. The Senator from Illinois knows that if there is to be equitable treatment among all the cities, they must be treated the same. If Chicago is singled out for diversion, which is really what the Senator from Illinois has been asking, the diversion of a thousand cubic feet of water per second per year—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just as a trial.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Regardless of the justification for it, if Chicago is singled out and is getting special consideration and treatment, such a course would not be proper. We are saying that if a study is to be made, it should be made on the same basis for all cities, and all cities should be treated the same.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the junior Senator say about the behavior of his senior colleague?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will say this about the behavior of my senior colleague: My senior colleague succeeded in what I think was a magnificent struggle last year to have the bill committed to the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator from Illinois knows perfectly well there has probably been no bill in the history of the Senate of the moderate consequences of this bill which has been so thoroughly heard. We had hearings before the Public Works Committee last year during three or four separate periods. They were extensive hearings. There were volumes put in the record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And on every occasion the judgments were favorable to the claims of the city of Chicago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Last year after an extensive debate which lasted many days the Senate acted. A substantial majority of the Senate decided that the bill

should not be passed, but that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly aware of the circumstances under which that vote was taken. If we could have brought the measure to a vote, we could have passed it, but the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and, I am sorry to say, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]—and I now will have to let the cat out of the bag—carried on such a filibuster as to wear out the Senate, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations rather than have the discussion continue indefinitely. The junior Senator from Wisconsin, who has joined me in trying to check the institution of filibustering, was one of the worst practitioners of filibustering that I had ever seen at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations by a substantial majority of the Senate. There are 17 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority of the members of the committee are outstanding, seasoned, mature, and thoughtful Senators. A majority has not seen fit to report this bill. The senior Senator from Wisconsin had every right to oppose the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he the right to oppose hearings on the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course he has, if he believes hearings are not necessary. He is 1 Senator among 17 Senators who constitute the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he the right to rise on the floor of the Senate and say, "Since we are considering the bill, no other committee should deal with the matter of appropriations"? The Senator from Wisconsin would not do so. I am sure he would not. The junior Senator from Wisconsin is an honorable man. He would not take such action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The junior Senator from Wisconsin will do all he can legally, morally, and properly to oppose this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say that the junior Senator from Wisconsin disappoints me. I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I inquire whether the pollution in the Chicago River has been aggravated to any extent by the use of oleomargarine?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the question is not germane.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a chronological statement of the legislative history of H.R. 1.

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

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF H.R. 1

H.R. 1: Congressman O'BRIEN of Illinois introduced bill January 7, 1959.

February 17, 18, and March 3, 1959: Public hearings on H.R. 1 by House Public Works Committee.

March 9, 1959: Reported to House with amendments—House Report 191.

March 13, 1959: Amended and passed House.

March 16, 1959: Ordered to lie on table in Senate.

March 18, 1959: Referred to Senate Public Works Committee.

August 25, 1959: Reported with amendments—Senate Report 808.

September 2, 1959: Referred to Foreign Relations Committee.

September 3, 1959: Referred by committee to State.

February 15, 1960: Report received by committee from State.

March 15, 1960: Considered in executive session.

March 29, 1960: Considered in executive session.

March 30, 1960: Motion to table motion to hold hearings defeated 6 to 6.

May 24, 1960: Wiley motion to postpone further consideration defeated 6 to 6. Morse motion to hold hearings defeated 6 to 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill (S. 2168).

Mr. PROUTY. 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. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY BRAZILIAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we are particularly honored today by having as our guests some Members of the Congress of Brazil.

Brazil is one of our great and good neighbors. It is a country about which many Americans know too little. It is a country larger than the United States, if we exclude the northmost part, Alaska. It is a country so great that it does not yet know the vast extent of its own natural resources, since they are so enormous.

Brazil has recently established a great new capital, which has been a tremendous venture. This new capital is almost 600 miles from the old capital.

Brazil is a growing country, growing extremely fast, and has nearly 65 million people now. The population will certainly reach 100 million within the next few years.

Brazil is a great, free country. It is a country the government of which is probably nearer to our own than that of any of the other countries of the world. It is truly a very great neighbor of ours.

Mr. President, this afternoon it gives me great pleasure to introduce to this body six Members of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies.

First I introduce the Honorable Angelo Mendes, a Member of the Chamber of Deputies from the former Federal District, a representative of the Social Progressive Party. It is the District of Guanabara.

The next guest I introduce is the Honorable Francisco Leite, a Member of the Chamber of Deputies from Sergipe, and the President of the Social Democratic Party of Sergipe.

Next I introduce the Honorable Manoel de Novaes. Senor de Novaes is a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Bahia, and is president of the Republican Party of Bahia. It is appropriate that we have Senor Novaes sitting on the right side of the aisle, since he is a member of the Republican Party of Brazil.

Next, Mr. President, I introduce the Honorable Estacio Souto Maior, a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Pernambuco, a member of the Brazilian Labor Party.

The Honorable Ernani Ayres Satyro Souza, who is a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Paraiaba; and a member of the National Democratic Union.

Finally, the Honorable Lourival Baptista, who is a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Sergipe; and the National Democratic Union.

It has been a great privilege to have the honor of introducing these guests from the Congress of our great and good neighbor to the south.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in welcoming our colleagues from the United States of Brazil. We are very proud of the relationship which has existed between our two great countries based on a policy of equality and mutual respect over so many decades.

We know, of course, that you are a venturesome people and that you are willing to take chances, because you recognize you have a great future in the affairs of this hemisphere, and I dare say in the affairs of the world as well.

The fact that you have moved bag and baggage, so to speak, from your old capital at Rio de Janeiro to your new capital, Brasilia, indicates to me a determination to open up your great country, to populate it, to exploit it, and to do so for the benefit of the people which you so ably represent.

I believe also that the Republic of Brazil is to be congratulated for the leadership it has assumed in recent years in trying to bring about a better economic development of the Americans, especially in the creation of a common market to which seven Latin American nations belong at the present time. It is my hope that from this initial impetus the common market will expand so that in time it will include not only all Latin America, but the United States and Canada as well. We look upon you as brothers, we respect you as colleagues, and you honor us by visiting this Chamber today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall ask our guests to go to the rear of the Senate Chamber for a few moments, and I hope that Members of the Senate will join them there and greet them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes so that we may pay additional honor to our guests.

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

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW—UNANIMOUS - CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to inform Senators that the Senate will very likely be in session late this afternoon and evening in discussion of the pending business.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I vigorously oppose the pending bill, for many reasons; first, for the perfectly obvious reason that I stand here as the junior Senator from Wisconsin, which is known throughout the country as the No. 1 dairy State. We are very proud of the fact that we export more milk and milk products than the next five States combined.

Wisconsin produces some 17 percent of all the milk which is produced in the Nation. At the same time, I think I should make it clear that dairying is an extremely important part of the Nation's farm economy. The dairy farmer produces the number one cash crop in America. The dairy farmers in my State and in the State of Minnesota, and also in many other States, are in very serious trouble. The fact is that prices have gone steadily down as costs have risen.

Recently, the Department of Agriculture made a study of the hourly farm income in Wisconsin. That study, I think, shocked many persons, because it showed that if we allowed the dairy farmer in Wisconsin—and we are very proud of the efficiency of our dairy farmers—a meager 4 percent return on his invested capital, he would have a labor income for the amount of labor he expended on his farm of 56 cents an hour, or only a little more than half of the present minimum wage, and, of course, far less than half the minimum wage which may become law in this country within a month or so. The dairy farmer is in serious trouble. He has been consistently in trouble for a long time.

The bill would amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the purchase of oleomargarine or margarine on the basis of the experience in the Army and the Air Force. It is perfectly obvious what will happen. That will mean that the Navy will do what the Army and the Air Force have done. The Navy will reduce its purchase of butter and will step

up its purchase of margarine, and for a perfectly logical reason, a reason which, in most circumstances, would be perfectly defensible. By and large, margarine is cheaper.

The Navy officials can show a better record of economy if they buy margarine.

However, so far as the Government is concerned, that is very foolish economy, because the Government has had, in the past, very substantial surpluses of butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation. The newspapers in the last few days have reported that there is almost certain to be a substantial increase in butter purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation. There will be increased stocks of butter. That will mean that the Federal Government will have surplus butter which can be used for the armed services. Instead, in order to have a better bookkeeping record, the Navy procurement officer, if the bill shall be passed, will, of course, step in and do what any good procurement officer would do. He will buy the commodity he can purchase at the lowest price, instead of getting it from the Commodity Credit Corporation at virtually no real cost to the Government, but at a bookkeeping cost to the Navy which will be somewhat higher than the cost of oleomargarine.

I particularly object to section 2 of the bill. I shall read several lines of section 2 to indicate why. I think the debate will focus around the problem I have already attempted to spell out; that is, whether there would be any real saving to the Government, overall, if the Navy should ignore the holdings of butter by the Commodity Credit Corporation and should buy margarine, regardless of the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings.

The authors of the bill have been conscientious. They have attempted to cope with the problem in section 2. They have attempted to cope with it, however, in a way which does not accomplish what most of us believe is necessary. I read from section 2:

During any period when surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation no oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof.

The difficulty with that provision can be best understood by recognizing the situation which exists today. The fact is that right now—at this moment—to my knowledge, no surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In about 10 days, there probably will be. How foolish it will be if the Navy buys oleomargarine now, and perhaps stocks up for a long period, but by the end of the month they can get the butter at no real cost to the Government, because it has already procured butter, and the Navy could get it simply by negotiating with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So I think this section of the bill can be improved, and I have an amendment, which is pending at the desk, and which I shall call up later. I think my amendment will greatly improve the bill and will make it at least more workable, although I think the heart of the bill, the

primary purpose of the bill, is wrong. This is why:

The fact is that dairy producers and the Government have cooperated in many ways to expand the consumption of fluid milk and dairy products. They have done this for many reasons. Milk is not only an important dairy product; it is a perfect food. It is perfect for children and is wonderful food for the young men and women in the armed services. One of the best customers for butter—in fact, the best customer, among all the services—has been the Navy.

The results of industry and government cooperation, plus the effect of a firm beef market, have contributed substantially toward bringing milk production and demand into as close a balance as they have been in for several years.

We who watch the dairy economy closely are gratified that, at long last, the dairy industry is getting into a situation where there is something of a balance between supply and demand, and where the cost to the Government of the dairy program has been exceedingly small—much smaller in recent weeks than it has been for a long time.

However, we should not be overconfident to the point where we feel that the dairy problem is solved. It certainly is not. The Wall Street Journal reported on Monday that the Commodity Credit Corporation expected in a very short time to begin purchasing butter again.

It is quite evident that a softening of the beef market will be reflected in higher milk production. Here, again, any proposal which would in effect curtail the outlets for dairy products would aggravate the situation, and make it more likely that the Government would have to get into this program again and purchase more milk, and that would make the management of the program more difficult.

In the second place, the lowering of the Navy ration by replacing butter with a vegetable substitute is certainly inconsistent with the efforts of the Department of Defense to attract capable young men and women to the military service, and to make such service desirable to such a point that they will make the service a career.

I shall not maintain that there is anything wrong with oleomargarine as a food. However, I think all Americans recognize that while oleomargarine may be acceptable under some circumstances, butter is a superlative, superior product. Oleomargarine is a good product, but we are very proud of butter because of the health it provides for those who consume it.

At a time when, because of the nature of the farm program, we can provide butter at no real cost to the Federal Government, and provide it for the people in the Navy, it seems very foolish for Congress to change the law and to put the Navy procurement official in a position where he will buy oleomargarine so that he will have a better procurement record. In doing that he will discourage people—admittedly, in a relatively minor way—from continuing in the armed services.

It has not been necessary in the past for the Navy to use a substitute for butter, any more than it has been necessary for the Navy to replace the meat requirement in its ration with calories from cheaper vegetable sources. The argument is made that the Navy ration should continue to be extended. I am certain a ration could be devised which would be far cheaper and would result in a diet which would be most unattractive and inedible. It is perfectly possible that the Navy people might be kept alive, but the Navy personnel are not cattle or animals which are fed certain ingredients in order to get production out of them. They are human beings. I think they should be treated as human beings. One way we can do it, and in a very modest way, at virtually no cost, is to provide the prospect that they can get wholesome milk and butter.

In the fifth place, it is abundantly clear that so long as milk and dairy products are in surplus supply, any action which would aggravate the situation would be costly and unwise.

The fact is that milk and dairy products are not, as I have said, in very great supply in the Commodity Credit Corporation at the moment. But dairy production is increasing, and the consumption of dairy products is not increasing to keep pace with the production. This is one way in which Congress can wisely and thoughtfully exercise its particular advantage as a Congress in looking at our Government overall, and not simply looking at one segment, by providing that the Navy will continue on its ration of butter, and not include oleomargarine, because to do so it is perfectly clear that damage will be done to the dairy farmer.

Mr. President, I expect to speak later on this subject, but at this time I yield the floor.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). 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.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, this bill, S. 2168, would amend the Navy ration law, to permit the serving of oleomargarine or margarine to naval personnel. I believe many Members of the Senate know something about the history of this legislation.

The components of the ration to be served naval personnel are prescribed by law. Oleomargarine or margarine is not now listed as a component of this ration. Unlike the Navy, the Departments of the Army and the Air Force do not have a basic ration law. The elements of the Army and Air Force ration are prescribed by the President. The serving of margarine or oleomargarine by the Army and the Air Force is now permissive.

The Navy desires authority to serve margarine. Such authority would increase the adaptability of menus to existing operating conditions, and would

place the Navy on an equal footing with the other military departments in being permitted the discretionary use of margarine, in lieu of butter.

House bill 912, of the 85th Congress, would have authorized the serving of margarine or oleomargarine by the Navy, except when surplus butter stocks were available through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate passed an amended version of this bill late in the 85th Congress; but the Senate amendment was not agreed to, and thus the bill did not become law.

The existence of surplus butter stocks has complicated favorable action on legislation of this type. If the existence of surplus agricultural commodities is to be considered in prescribing ration components of the Navy, this bill would afford equal recognition to the possible existence of a surplus in either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, from which oleomargarine or margarine is processed.

In brief, the Navy would be permitted to serve margarine if both butter and either soybean oil or cottonseed oil were in surplus supply. If only butter were in surplus supply, the Navy would not be authorized to serve margarine.

The Navy must acquire margarine for use in emergency operations, when refrigeration facilities are limited or not available. Since stocks of margarine acquired for use in these circumstances must be rotated periodically, to keep the stocks fresh, the bill also provides express authority to permit the use of such rotated stocks for any purposes other than as a component of the Navy ration. In practical effect, this means that the rotated stocks are used for cooking purposes.

The enactment of this authority would result in no increased cost to the Government. It could result in savings. It is impractical to estimate the amount of such savings, because of many variable factors, such as personnel strength, the price differential between butter and margarine, and the extent to which margarine would be used as a substitute for butter.

Mr. President, it hardly is sensible for the Army and the Air Force to have permissive authority to serve margarine, but to deny such authority to the Navy. I do not believe that enactment of this bill would have a disastrous effect on producers of butter. If special recognition is to be afforded butter producers, it seems logical that equal recognition should be extended to producers of soy bean or cottonseed oil. The pending bill adopts such an approach and I urge that it be approved.

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

Mr. **THURMOND**. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina why there were no public hearings held on the bill, in view of the very, very great interest which the entire dairy industry has in the bill, and the fact that the bill would affect literally hundreds of thousands of farmers, as well as a tremendous number of persons in the Armed Forces.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the distinguished Senator I would say, in the first place, that no request for a hearing was received. In the second place, this is a very simple bill. The bill would merely give to the Navy the right to serve margarine, which authority the Army and the Air Force now have. It was felt there was really no need for any hearings on the matter.

Mr. President I will say further that the Senate Armed Services Committee reported the bill in the 83d Congress and again in the 85th Congress. This is the third time the Armed Services Committee has acted favorably upon the bill.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Is it not true that although there was no request for a hearing, the Senator knew there would be very strong, vigorous, determined opposition to the bill? Therefore, since it is a controversial bill, it is a simple matter of equity that both sides ought to be heard.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, I would not reach any such conclusion, because ordinarily if a Senator is especially interested in a matter and wishes to bitterly oppose a bill it seems he has a very fine avenue in requesting the committee considering a piece of proposed legislation to give him a chance to be heard.

Furthermore, I do not think there is that much interest in the bill at all, because it is a very simple bill; it would simply permit the Navy to do what the Army and the Air Force now can do. The bill would give permission. The bill would not require the Navy to serve margarine, but would merely give the Navy the right and the authority to serve margarine if the Navy wished to do so. That authority the Army and the Air Force now have.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. So far as the permissiveness aspect is concerned, the Army and the Air Force have indicated by shifting overwhelmingly to oleo how the permissiveness is likely to work out. I said in my short speech that the permissiveness is going to result in a very, very sharp diminution of the use of dairy products, with no real saving to the Government, but only a bookkeeping saving to the Navy procurement officer, who will rely upon that so that it can be said to Congress, "Look. We have saved \$1 million," or "some very substantial amount of money." In fact, it will simply mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to buy more butter.

So far as the bill being a simple bill is concerned, the bill is divided into two sections. The second section is divided into three exceedingly complex parts. There is an initial sentence of four lines, which is followed by three provisos, each one of which complicates the one ahead of it.

As the Senator from South Carolina said in his presentation, this is a bill which would have at least a double effect. The bill would have an effect not only upon the dairy industry, but also upon the soybean industry and upon the cotton farmers. It is a bill which is complex in many ways, it seems to me.

The Senator from South Carolina made the point that there have been hearings on the bill before. I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether there were hearings on an identical bill, a bill with all of the provisos which are in the bill presently before us.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this bill is somewhat different from the previous bills of this nature.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Indeed it is. There have been no hearings on a bill of this kind at all. The fact is that the other bills were substantially different from this bill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, for this reason the Senate should very seriously consider recommitment of the bill, if such a motion is made later, because there have been no hearings on the bill, substantially, as it is drafted.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in answer to the last question of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] with respect to the difference between the pending bill and previous bills concerning cottonseed oil and soybean oil, the bill presently under consideration limits the permissive authority so that if butter is available to the Navy from CCC stocks, permission to purchase margarine is withdrawn, unless cottonseed and soybean oil are certified by the Department of Agriculture to be in surplus. That is the main distinction between the present bill and previous bills.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The particular provision to which I referred is the one which most deeply concerns those of us who are extremely interested in the dairy industry. We feel that there will be a situation during many periods when there will be not only a surplus of butter but also a surplus of cottonseed oil, and that therefore this will be used as a pretext for the procurement officers to buy margarine.

Under the circumstances there will be no real saving whatsoever to the Government since there will be a surplus of butter, and the benefit to the cotton industry and the benefit to the soybean industry will be relatively very minor because, as I said in my statement, there are many other uses for cottonseed oil and for soybeans than this particular use, but there is no other use for butter or no other very common use except in cooking and as a spread, and so the damage which is done the dairy industry is far greater than any minor or modest benefit which is given to the soybean and cotton industries.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I would only say that in reporting the House bill in the 85th Congress—and I now read from the report—the committee states:

The Department of the Navy indicated that on the personnel strength and price differentials existing at that time, an estimated saving of more than \$1 million could have been realized by serving a ration component consisting of two-thirds butter and one-third margarine.

The factors vary so much, it is difficult to say what would be the saving. However, that was the situation at that time. The figures could change period-

ically; it could be more, and it could be less.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to emphasize that in the preceding sentence of the report, the committee itself states that it is impractical to make a realistic estimate of the savings; and I may say that the committee is somewhat favorable to margarine. That indicates that the committee felt that the previous estimate which had been made in the House was not realistic, and that it is not possible to make a realistic estimate of what the saving would be. It depends on what is likely to happen. If it were possible to do so, we would be able to solve our farm problem very easily indeed.

Mr. THURMOND. We can only judge by what was estimated in the 85th Congress. As I said, it could be more or could be less. Of course, we are interested in all segments of the economy of our country. We are interested in cottonseed, we are interested in soybeans, and we are interested in dairy products. The pending bill is a fair bill. It does not discriminate. It puts other crops on the same basis with butter. The purpose of it is not only to recognize cottonseed oil and soybean oil—and I am sure the State the Senator represents does produce some soybeans also—but the bill is also in the public interest. After all, the public interest should be the primary concern of the Government. If there is a saving of something like a million dollars a year, it is certainly worth passing this legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not want to be facetious, but I am quite astonished and shocked to hear the Senator say that. I never thought that the day would come when the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina would stand on the floor of the Senate and urge the integration of butter and oleomargarine, considering the purity of butter. I never thought he would be an integrationist, particularly on something like this, where the ingredients of butter are nature's own and those of margarine are so synthetic.

Mr. THURMOND. I would remind the Senator that this integration is confined purely to butter and oleomargarine.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Contrary to what my friend from Wisconsin has suggested, I believe that the Senator from South Carolina is using extremely good judgment in suggesting the inclusion of some butter in oleo. Certainly the butter would improve it.

Mr. THURMOND. It is to be left entirely to the Navy. I am not going to suggest to the Navy whether they use all margarine or all butter or no margarine or no butter. We feel that the Navy should have the authority to make that judgment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Before I conclude these remarks and suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish to hammer home and emphasize again the fact that the real problem that is likely to develop in this debate, and the real reason why the bill ought to be recommitted, is that

no public hearings were held on the bill. Only executive session hearings were held. Is there any military secrecy involved in the bill? Do the Russians care or do the Chinese Communists care whether our servicemen are fed butter or oleomargarine? Of course, not. The hearings were held in secret. No open hearings were held. No Senator had an opportunity to study the issue. We are presented with a report which gives a short description of the bill, a letter from the Department of the Navy—and the Navy, of course, has an interest in this particular bill—and a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, which is also a short letter, but a letter which, it seems to me, provokes more questions than it answers. Under those circumstances, and in view of the fact that the great dairy industry, which has many eloquent and deeply interested representatives, who were anxious to be heard on the proposed legislation, the bill ought to be recommitted.

The Senator from South Carolina has stated that no one raised any point about hearings. Well, of course, Senators cannot, with their tremendous obligations and duties and responsibilities, keep their eyes upon every single bill that is introduced and demand hearings on it. We must assume that when a controversial bill is introduced—and attempts were made to pass the bill in three sessions of Congress and it failed of passage three times—the Senate will be given the benefit of full-scale public hearings, so that at least one or two Senators who oppose the bill can be heard, as well as other people.

No one in opposition to the bill was heard by the committee, although the Senators from Vermont are vigorously opposed to it and the senior and junior Senators from Wisconsin are opposed to it. I am sure that there are a number of other Senators who are opposed to it.

In view of those circumstances, and also in view of the inadequacy of the report, although it was drawn by a very competent man, and certainly was adequate from the standpoint of ability, but inadequate when we consider the importance of this subject, and because no public hearings were held on the bill, I say the bill should be recommitted.

Mr. THURMOND. I again remind my good friend from Wisconsin that he did not request a hearing, and that no other Member of the Senate requested a hearing; no one requested a hearing.

It is a simple bill. The committee had considered it before. This is the third time the committee has acted favorably on this subject.

The bill attempts to bring about uniformity. The Army and Air Force now can use oleomargarine if they choose to do so. The bill merely gives the Navy the same right. It does not impose on the Navy the obligation to use margarine. It gives them the authority to use it. Therefore we in the Armed Services Committee feel that it is well to make the rules uniform, when it is possible to do so, with respect to all the armed services.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would say that we favor uniformity, too, and that it would

be a great improvement if the Army and the Air Force and the Navy would serve butter, not margarine.

Mr. THURMOND. I am confident that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all will use butter to some extent where practical. I am certain that the Defense Department and the services will give due consideration to using butter along with margarine, and will not discriminate in favor of one or the other. It is the duty of the services to save public money, and if they can get the same ration with the same nutrient and get it cheaper, the services naturally will consider that angle, and it is their responsibility to do so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to say once again that this would be a bookkeeping saving, and because of it pressure would be brought upon a naval procurement officer—just as it has been in the Air Force and the Army—to make purchases of margarine, because in that way the procurement officer could show a bookkeeping saving. It will be a saving to the Navy Department, just as it has been a saving to the Army and Air Force. However, it is not a real saving whenever there is a surplus of butter. Under the bill there would be the situation, first, where butter would not be used even though there were a surplus, provided there was also a surplus of cottonseed; secondly, butter would not be used if a situation existed in which there was a temporary absence of butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation but a pending surplus. That is exactly the situation at the moment.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that the Bureau of the Budget favors the bill. The Bureau of the Budget generally does not favor a bill, certainly of this nature, unless it feels that the passage of the bill would be advantageous insofar as fiscal matters are concerned. The Bureau of the Budget concurs with the Navy's position on the pending bill.

I should like to read one sentence from the letter of Acting Secretary of Agriculture E. L. Peterson, on page 5 of the report:

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report. The Bureau further advises that it "favors proposed legislation such as H.R. 1948, which would simply add margarine or oleomargarine to the Navy ration list, thereby giving that service the same flexibility in this regard as is possessed by the other Armed Forces."

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. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IN DEFENSE OF THE SAILOR'S RIGHT TO EAT BUTTER

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I oppose the passage of S. 2168 because the very best in Navy rations is traditional

and a minimum serving of butter has been prescribed by statute for many years. It has not been necessary to use substitutes in the past, and no compelling reason appears for changing this rule now.

It has been argued in support of S. 2168 that a change should be made to permit the Navy to use its discretion as to what foods it may serve. The same arguments are considered to be applicable to the entire statutory ration and if a change is to be made for that purpose then the entire ration should be repealed and the Navy should be permitted to prescribe its own ration.

It has also been argued that by serving part butter and part oleomargarine the Navy could save substantial sums of money. This, I believe, is false economy.

I can see the wisdom of saving money, but I cannot see the wisdom of serving cheaper foods to fighting personnel, particularly in time of emergency when our whole defense system is in a state of more or less constant alert. It is imperative that these men be kept at the very peak of their physical and mental ability. Furthermore, at a time when it is important to attract more men to the service and to hold those with experience, the providing of cheaper food would appear to be a step in the wrong direction.

Oleomargarine is cheaper than butter because the former is a vegetable product and the latter is an animal product, just as a vegetable plate in a restaurant costs less than a good steak.

Without depreciating at all the value of oleomargarine and a vegetable plate per se, I doubt that anyone would seriously consider putting our fighting men on a vegetable diet, even though tremendous savings in cost could be made by doing so. If it is necessary to save money by replacing a part of an animal diet with a vegetable product, then consideration should also be given to saving more money by replacing some of the meat ration with vegetables.

There is another most important reason why the pending proposal would result in false economy: If a pound of butter were displaced in Navy rations, the Government would be buying an additional pound of butter through the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program; thus, for each dollar the Government saved on one hand it would lose probably more than \$1 because of the storage and disposal costs on the other hand.

I am aware that cotton also is under support, but cottonseed oil is less perishable and can readily be put to more uses than can butter.

However, Mr. President, I may point out that as of February 29 of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported that there was no cottonseed oil in inventory and no soybean oil in inventory. So today we have no problem in that respect.

Vegetable oils have many outlets and many uses. These oils are marketed for human consumption and for industrial use. They have a wide and varied market here at home, and there is also a growing market overseas. Butter is extremely difficult to store, while on the

other hand, vegetable oils may be safely and cheaply stored over long periods of time. Butter must be refrigerated in storage and transit, while the oils may be stored and moved in bulk, with no special handling required.

Furthermore, the cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market, should that become necessary—although it certainly is not necessary at the present time—but should it become necessary, the cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market is 11 or 12 cents a pound, whereas the cost of removing butter is approximately 58 cents a pound. The removal of butter is necessary, in order to maintain even the current meager rates for the labor of dairy farm operators, which are shown by the Department of Agriculture to be less than \$1 an hour in all three of its test areas.

Enactment of Senate bill 2168 would be a reversal of the important steps that have been made to utilize in the armed services our abundant supplies of dairy products.

This utilization of butter has contributed greatly to the improvement that has been made in the dairy price-support program. Surely it would be a mistake to overturn the cart now, just when we are beginning to emerge from the woods. The small amount of good that this bill might do for the producers of cottonseed oil, if in fact it would do any, would be seriously disproportionate to the harm that would be done to the dairy industry and the dairy price-support program.

The theory back of our increased use of dairy products in the armed services has been that since we have these fine dairy products in abundant supply, and are hard put to find a means of disposing of them, why not give our fighting forces as much of them as they want to use?

As a result, this program of increased use has correspondingly reduced costs to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the support program.

Similarly, it does not make sense to send our fighting forces oleomargarine and give our butter to peoples overseas or convert it to byproduct uses.

The benefit from this bill would go to relatively few in number, but large in size, oleomargarine manufacturing companies. I doubt that even the remotest benefit from it would trickle back to the American farmer.

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. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which is labeled "5-23-60—A," and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be read by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, beginning with line 7, to strike out all down through line 9 on page 2, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. No oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof during any fiscal year unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify (1) that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been or are intended to be made by any department or agency of the Federal Government in such fiscal year for the purpose of stabilizing or supporting the prices received by farmers for milk or butterfat, and (2) that acquisition of oleomargarine or margarine in the amounts and at the times specified will not cause or contribute to a surplus of milk or dairy products: *Provided*, That limited supplies of oleomargarine or margarine may be acquired for use in special operations where the use of butter would be impractical: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed as prohibiting the disposition of any unused stocks of oleomargarine or margarine acquired under the foregoing proviso by any means other than by serving as a component of the Navy ration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Congress has frequently been confronted with the question of the type of spread that is to be used in the Navy ration as a part of the general provisions for the U.S. Navy. The amendment which has just been read and which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is, in my mind, the most constructive proposal on this controversial subject that we have ever had; and I compliment and commend the Senator for this wise and judicious proposal because, on the one hand, while it recognizes the very relevant facts of the price support program relating to dairy products, it also recognizes that there may be instances where there may be a need for the use of a substitute spread such as oleomargarine.

In other words, the amendment, if carefully analyzed, should reveal and, I think, recommend, an answer to the question of the Navy ration, as to whether it should be butter, a dairy product, or a substitute, a vegetable oil or oleomargarine.

Let us analyze the amendment very carefully. On line 4 of page 1 of the amendment, it provides, first, that "no oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof during any fiscal year unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify."

Then it provides:

(1) that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been or are intended to be made by any department or agency of the Federal Government in such fiscal year for the purpose of stabilizing or supporting the prices received by farmers for milk or butterfat.

That particular language relates directly to the price support provisions of the agricultural acts relating to the proper and orderly marketing of agricultural commodities. We have on the statute books a price support provision for dairy products, providing 75 to 90

percent of parity price supports for dairy products, including butter and milk, and depending upon the supply, the price support varies. Sometimes it has been as high as 90 percent. It has been as low as 75 percent. It has been at 80 percent.

There are those of us who believe that the price support program for dairy products should be higher than it is presently. The amendment presented by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to the particular bill now pending takes into consideration the established law of the land, namely, that there will be a price support program and that there is a price support program for dairy products.

How does that price support program work? It works essentially through Government purchases. It works upon the basis of the Government buying up the surplus over the consumer demand, and storing that surplus, whether it be in the form of cheese, dried milk, or butter. Then the Government has ways of disposing of the surplus.

Fortunately, the surpluses are rather low at the moment. There is very little dried milk and practically no butter, and I believe the cheese supplies are at a low, at least have been for the last several years.

Mr. President, what the Proxmire amendment proposes is simply stated. If the Government of the United States has available supplies of dairy products under the price support program then the Navy, which is a department of this Government which uses substantial quantities of foodstuffs, shall not purchase a substitute spread, since the Government has already purchased butter under its price support operations. What could be more sensible and more reasonable? The Government is in possession of a substantial amount of good, wholesome, nourishing, clean, delicious butter. The Government, through the Department of Agriculture, simply says, "We have this butter available." It says to the Department of the Navy, "Here is the butter. It has already been paid for. Why not use it?" In other words, the amendment says to the Department of the Navy, "So long as there are supplies of butter which have been acquired under the price support program, the Department of the Navy shall not spend some extra dollars of the taxpayers for another product."

The amendment, conversely, would state that if there is no butter available, if there is not an adequate supply, then the oleomargarine may be utilized as a foodstuff or as a spread for the Navy ration.

Point No. 1 made by the Proxmire amendment is in the public interest. It is in the taxpayers' interest. It is in the farmers' interest. I add, it is in the interest of the Navy, because good, wholesome, fresh, delicious butter is a good food, in or out of the Navy. The Government of the United States ought to have the interests of its servicemen enough at heart so that it will provide the best food it can find. Surely butter qualifies under that label, as being the best of nourishing food.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very eloquent and persuasive exposition. It is very clear, and I think it is very convincing to anyone who reads or listens to the argument.

I should like to say, to underline the importance of what the Senator from Minnesota has said, that the Army and the Air Force may purchase margarine or may purchase butter. The procurement officers have the kind of incentive one would expect. Those officers want to have a bookkeeping saving, so even though there is a surplus supply of butter available in the Commodity Credit Corporation, those procurement officers turn around and purchase margarine. They purchase margarine because they can purchase it at a lower price. It is a lower price for the Navy. Then they can say, "Look, we made a savings of \$1 million or \$2 million."

Actually, those purchases have added a substantial amount to the costs of the Government. Why? That is so because the Commodity Credit Corporation has surplus butter available.

The reason why the Proxmire amendment is essential is that if we do not provide this safeguard we are going to have exactly the same situation in the Navy that we have in the Army and in the Air Force. That is why Congress is in such an excellent position, looking at the matter from an overall standpoint, to provide that so long as the Government has the butter available, the Navy should be able to use it.

The Senator from South Carolina earlier was calling for uniformity. The main argument made was for uniformity. If we call for uniformity, we ought to have the Army and the Air Force get in line with the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator surely makes a point with which any reasonable person would agree.

The Commodity Credit Corporation operates under an act of Congress, under public policy, and is required under the law, through its price-support operations, to sustain or to maintain a price which is agreed upon under a formula of the flexible price-support program. A substantial quantity of butter is purchased on occasion, or cheese or powdered milk. We have gone through this process for several years.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, a public agency, owns butter. Frequently that butter has been sold back into the market at lower prices, not to the benefit of the taxpayers but instead to the benefit of a private entrepreneur, or else it has been given away in relief feeding, which is a desirable development, in a program I have consistently supported.

What the Proxmire amendment provides is that, so long as we have a price-support operation of the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and so long as the Commodity Credit Corporation continues to purchase supplies of butter or dairy products, then the Navy will be required to utilize the product which the Government has

already purchased, rather than to have the Government continue to pay storage charges upon the butter which is already owned by the Government.

The Proxmire amendment simply says: "We will use in the Navy Department the butter which is owned by the Department of Agriculture."

The problem is that each department head looks upon his department as if it were a separate principality, a separate government. Each department head has his own budget, for his own department. So the Department of the Navy says: "Oh, we will save a few cents a pound on a spread. We will buy oleo, which is a little cheaper than butter, and it will make the Department of the Navy budget look a whole lot better."

In the meantime, the taxpayers, who pay for the Navy plus the Department of Agriculture plus everything else, own millions of dollars' worth of butter held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the taxpayers are paying thousands of dollars for storage of that butter. In the past some of that butter has gone rancid because of lack of use.

From the point of view of the taxpayers, instead of from the point of view of the Department of the Navy, it is important that the butter be used. The Congress is not about ready to repeal the price-support program for butter. This is an established program of the Government, and has been for years. It is necessary for the well-being of the dairy producers. It is necessary so that we may have an adequate supply of butter, milk, and cheese for the American consumers.

The argument in this debate runs as follows: If we consider the bill as reported by the committee, we are simply saying, "Look, the Navy can save a few dimes and a few nickels upon oleo, even though the Department of Agriculture is spending millions of dollars on butter." What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is as follows: "Let us look at the Government as one Government instead of a series of departments. Let us look at the total Federal budget instead of the Navy budget alone, and then let us look at the taxpayer and see what we can do for him."

The taxpayer would be benefited by the Proxmire amendment. The taxpayer would be injured by the committee bill, because the Proxmire amendment is based upon the availability of supplies in the hands of the Government. The Proxmire amendment takes into consideration the price support laws which are on the statute books and places in relationship to those price support laws the needs of other departments of the Government. I say the Senator from Wisconsin has for the first time put this debate in proper focus by his amendment. He has pointed out that we cannot have two diametrically opposed policies operating without great cost and waste. The Senator has said that so long as we have a price support program for dairy products in which the Government of the United States becomes a holder, an investor, an owner of the dairy products, it makes good sense for the Departments of the Government to use

what the Government already owns rather than stepping out and buying another product. I believe the Senator has done a real service in this respect.

The Senator points out further that his amendment provides:

Provided, That limited supplies of oleomargarine may be acquired for use in special operations where the use of butter would be impractical.

Of course, that part of the amendment refers, for example, to areas where there may be problems of refrigeration or where there may not be supplies readily available, or to some areas of the world where the Navy may have a base in which supplies of butter are not readily accessible. In other words, oleo is not excluded. What is more, oleo is not excluded if there is no surplus butter, if the butter program is in balance between the supply and demand, and in a situation in which the purchase of oleo does not contribute to the surplus of butter products or milk products. In that event the Navy, in coordination with the other agencies of the Government, can purchase on a free and equal basis with any other Department of the Government.

I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin ought to be adopted, and I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the two provisos. I hope when the Senator from Wisconsin speaks in his own right, since he is the author of the amendment, he will elaborate in some detail on the amendment because it is important that the Record be made very clear.

I say most respectfully that there will be Senators who will say that the Senators from Wisconsin and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] stood here in the Senate and tried to force upon the Navy the use of butter, which is a higher cost spread than oleo. That is not what we are attempting to do at all. What we are saying is that the Government of the United States ought to be considered as one Government instead of a series of separate departments. What we are saying is that when we have one policy of the Government which provides for price support operations which necessarily bring within the hands of the Government the ownership of certain butter supplies that they use, and which have been paid for once by the taxpayer, there is no reason why there cannot be a transfer of that commodity from one department to another at no extra cost to the American taxpayer.

The final proviso of this particular measure is:

Provided further, That this section shall not be construed as prohibiting the disposition of any unused stocks of oleomargarine or margarine acquired under the foregoing proviso by any means other than by serving as a component of the Navy ration.

I think there is some merit in that provision. The oleo can be used in the overseas program, and can be used in the relief feeding programs. I may add that I believe the vegetable oil stocks that the Commodity Credit Corporation owns ought to be used more generously in our overseas and charitable relief feeding program. I happen to know that the

great voluntary agencies—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and the nonsectarian agencies—send vegetable oils for relief feeding in many parts of the world. I believe this is a good way to use those products. I come from a State which produces vast quantities of soybeans. I believe we are the second largest producer of soybeans.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to emphasize the fact that the Senator from Minnesota, who is speaking, comes from a State which produces more soybeans than any other State of the Union with one exception, and that means he speaks with authority. He speaks, not from a one-interest standpoint, but from a standpoint in which he takes neither side, neither the side of soybeans nor the side of the dairy farmer, but the side of the total public interest, the taxpayer, the consumer, and both the dairy farmer and the soybean producer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I add that soybean production in the State of Minnesota in terms of income and number of producers approximates its dairy production.

Therefore, as I speak on the subject of oleomargarine I am mindful of the economic interests of the respective groups in my State, but I wish to say again that it is in the public interest to see that vegetable oils are properly used. Vegetable oils can be used in relief feeding and in the school-lunch programs. They can be used in a great number of ways.

Had the Department of Agriculture been willing this year to purchase some vegetable oil in the market when the market was filled with soybeans, the farm producers of my State would have been getting approximately 80 cents a hundredweight more for their soybeans. A modest purchase of vegetable oil, soybean oil, could have increased the income of the farmer for his soybeans substantially. In other words, an expenditure of a few million dollars on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the oil—not the beans but the oil—could have increased the income of the soybean producers \$200 million or \$300 million.

I had a table presented to me this past week, which I do not have with me at the moment, but which I shall make available during this debate, which pointed out that with a reasonable purchase of approximately \$25 million of oil, which could well have been disposed of, and which was requested by the great overseas relief organizations, we could have increased the income to the producers of soybeans in Minnesota to over \$150 million, and that would have been \$150 million which would have gone into the community life of every one of our communities, towns, villages, and cities.

Such expenditure would have been good business, and it would not have run into conflict with the butter and dairy program.

Returning to my original point, I simply wish to add that the Senator from Wisconsin is asking Congress to quit storing butter and start using it. What

the Senator from Wisconsin is asking the Congress to do is that in the event there is a surplus of butter, the department—in this instance, the Navy—shall utilize butter which has already been bought and paid for by the taxpayers. What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is that if there are circumstances in which none of these supplies are on hand and where the purchase of order will not in any way contribute to the surplus of the dairy products which are already protected under a price support program, that the Navy may go ahead and buy oleo.

What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is that he does not wish to see the Navy's policies contribute to the problems of the Department of Agriculture. What he is saying is that he does not want to see the Navy purchases contribute to the surpluses that we have. What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is, "Let us use the dollars we have frugally. Let us use them well. We have a price support program on dairy products. It is a program which was requested by the President, supported by the Department of Agriculture, and enacted by Congress."

The Senator from Wisconsin is merely saying that as long as the program is on the books, which he supports, which I support, which his senior colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] supports, and which the majority in Congress supports, that there is no sense in trying to throw a monkey wrench, so to speak, into the gears of the price-support program with respect to dairy products by enacting a special act which requires the Navy to buy oleo.

The Senator from Wisconsin has performed a real service. I know that some processors of oleo will be unhappy with my comments today. I should like to say a word to them. They have plenty of markets for their product. We are talking about Government business. We are talking about a department of the Government purchasing supplies for Government purposes.

The Senator from Minnesota is saying that if the Government already owns supplies, it should use them, and not go out looking for something else. In other words, if it already owns what it needs for edible food, if it has high nutritional value and high caloric value, and is good and delicious food, why go around shopping for something else, on the theory that the Government will save some money for the Navy, when, in fact, it will only add the cost to the Department of Agriculture?

I wish to thank the Senator for permitting me to make these observations. Of course I will support his amendment. I am much pleased that he has taken the leadership in this matter. I am confident that the people of the State of Wisconsin will feel, as I do, that he has done a great service not only to the dairy industry, but also to the taxpayers. I might add also that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is also a cosponsor of the amendment and that he is to be commended for his fight in this matter. I would surely like to be associated

with the purpose of the amendment, and with the objective it seeks to fulfill.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I had not expected to speak at this time. I had expected the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to address the Senate. However, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish again to thank the Senator from Minnesota. Ordinarily the author of an amendment, when he calls it up, immediately talks about the amendment and explains it. However, I could not resist the great opportunity, with the eloquent Senator from Minnesota on the floor, to take advantage of having him kick off the discussion. My judgment has been vindicated, because his justification and explanation of the amendment have been extremely convincing.

I should like to pinpoint a few details of the amendment, because they are very important. The bill as introduced does provide—and I must say this in all fairness to the authors of the bill—

During any period when surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation no oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for the use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof.

That is what the bill provides.

My amendment plugs loopholes in that language. The Senator from Minnesota has indicated quite eloquently the need for plugging those loopholes. This is what my amendment provides:

No oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof during any fiscal year unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify (1) that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been or are intended to be made by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

The difference, of course, between my amendment and the bill can be seen by analyzing the situation which exists at the present time. As far as I know, at least within the last few days, there has been no butter held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We all know that within a couple of weeks there will be surplus butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Under the circumstances, there would be nothing to prevent the Navy, if the bill is passed, from buying surplus oleo, which would last for as long as it would last without perishing. It would last for several months. At the same time, within a few days a surplus supply of butter would be available. I know the intention of the authors of the bill was a good intention, because they would not have included section 2 of the bill if they had not intended to protect the Government from the kind of loss I have described. However, I believe the argument that the amendment does protect it much more is an argument that cannot be dismissed.

Under the Proxmire amendment if during a fiscal year butter is in surplus in the Commodity Credit Corporation, or there is any intention to buy butter, then at the same time and under those circumstances the Navy would not procure oleomargarine. That makes a great deal of sense, I think.

There is one other phase to the amendment which I should like to explain, because it is a little technical, but it is exceedingly important. I am sure that the authors of the bill will be concerned about the difference I have in mind. I should like to justify the difference. The bill provides in the last proviso—I am now referring to the bill, not to my amendment—that the Navy shall in fact purchase margarine when there is butter in surplus as follows: It provides that even though butter is in surplus, the Navy can buy margarine provided that during any period of time the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean or cottonseed oil.

My amendment eliminates that proviso.

I feel sure that the authors of the bill had the best of intentions when they provided that butter and cottonseed oil should be placed on the same basis, and that if there is a surplus of butter, the Navy should be permitted to use margarine. That argument certainly has surface plausibility, and it would seem to be fair. The difficulty is that there is all the difference in the world from the standpoint of the cotton producers and the soybean producers on the one hand and the dairy producers on the other.

For example, it is true that cotton is under the support program.

First, cottonseed oil is less perishable and much more easily diverted to non-food uses than butter. Even more important, the cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market, should that become necessary, is 11 or 12 cents a pound, which is much less than the cost of removing butter from the market, because the cost of removing butter from the market is 58 cents a pound. If there is a surplus of a commodity which costs the Government 58 cents a pound to remove it from the market, and there is a surplus in another commodity that costs only 11 cents to remove it from the market, from the standpoint of the Government it would be far better for the armed services to use the more valuable spread first. It would mean that then the Government would not have to step in and buy additional quantities of butter at 58 cents a pound. It would be more economical from the standpoint of the taxpayer to pay 11 cents a pound for the other commodity.

That is why it seems to me that the taxpayer is far better served by the amendment, which would provide that the Navy would continue to use butter as long as there is a surplus of butter, although at the same time that there is a surplus of butter, there is a surplus of cottonseed oil or soybean oil.

I expect to discuss the amendment later and in a little more detail.

Before I yield the floor, 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 DESCENT OF THE BATHYSCAPHE "TRIESTE" TO THE UTTERMOST DEPTH OF THE SEA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in our preoccupation with missiles, sputniks, and outerspace, we have given far too little attention and credit to an event which is a milestone in mankind's exploration and conquest of the unknown—an event which, for cool audacity, has few equals in history.

I am referring to the descent, in January, of the Navy's deep-diving craft, the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, to the uttermost depth of the sea.

It is regrettable indeed that this descent of more than 7 miles into the Pacific has not received more attention. It has pointed the way for scientific exploration into the depth as well as the breadth of the 70 percent of the earth's surface which is covered by water.

The *Trieste* itself is essentially a two-unit vessel composed of a large cigar-shaped float 58 feet long and 11 feet in diameter, and a gondola 6 feet in diameter slung underneath. The craft is called bathyscaphe from the Greek words for deep and boat.

The main structure of the *Trieste*—the cigar-shaped float—is divided into 13 chambers, each separated by thin steel bulkheads. In these chambers the *Trieste* carries 30,000 gallons of aviation gasoline which, because it is lighter than water, provides buoyancy.

Seventeen tons of small iron pellets about the size of BB shot are carried as ballast in two containers or tubs, one forward of and one abaft the gondola.

The recordbreaking descent took place on January 23 in the central Pacific Ocean in the Marianas Trench known as the Challenger Deep. There the *Trieste*, with Lt. Don Walsh, U.S. Navy, and Swiss Scientist Jacques Piccard aboard, began its dive.

Descending at more than 200 feet a minute, at a thousand feet the deep-diving craft passed below the level of visible light. For tens of thousands of feet from that point downward, the small experimental craft made its descent in total darkness, completely beyond help of any sort in case of emergency.

As it dropped deeper and deeper into the Pacific, tremendous pressures were building up on the hull and gondola. At 24,000 feet, they passed the previous depth record set by the *Trieste* itself.

At 30,000 feet, Walsh and Piccard heard and felt a powerful crack in the bathyscaphe. "The sphere rocked as though we were on land and going through a mild earthquake," said Lieutenant Walsh later, as reported in *Life* magazine. "We waited anxiously for what might happen next. Nothing did. We flipped off the instruments and the underwater telephone, so that we could hear better. Still nothing happened."

If the float part of the bathyscaphe had been rendered ineffective, the two bathyscaphists would have been plunged downward to the ocean floor, without

any hope of return to the surface. They would have been imprisoned in their small steel sphere for life—and life for them would have been very short, indeed, as their oxygen supply gave out in the cold darkness at the bottom of the sea.

If the gondola itself, or its Plexiglas portholes, had imploded—that is, exploded inward—the two young adventurers would have been instantly smashed shapeless by the force of untold thousands of tons of water.

Under these circumstances, not knowing for sure what damage had occurred to the bathyscaphe as it ventured into pressures never before experienced, to have turned back would have been no discredit.

Nevertheless, Walsh and Piccard elected to continue their epic journey downward.

After 4 hours and 48 minutes of descent, the *Trieste* reached the bottom. There Walsh and Piccard found that the balance of the vessel was so fine that the thin wire suspended beneath the vessel was sufficient to cushion the final few yards of descent, as the wire itself slacked off on the sea floor.

Then, through the clear plastic portholes 8 inches thick, in the sides of the gondola, and by means of floodlights beneath the hull of the float, Walsh and Piccard looked for the first time on a sight never before seen by the eyes of man—the ultimate depth of the sea. They also learned the source of the loud report they heard: one of the plastic portholes was badly cracked.

By marvelous chance, one of the foremost questions entertained by scientists about these great depths was answered on this first descent of the *Trieste* to the bottom of the Marianas Trench. A sole-like fish swam slowly through the area illuminated by the light shining from the *Trieste*, thus proving that higher forms of life can exist even at this depth, where the pressure on the hull of the bathyscaphe and on the fish itself was more than 8 tons per square inch.

The pioneer visit of man to the depth of the sea lasted only 20 minutes. The return to the surface was made by Walsh and Piccard in a little more than 3 hours.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, sent congratulations to the two men. He said their feat would "mark the opening of a new age in exploration of the depths of the ocean which can well be as important as exploration in space has been in the past."

Mr. President, I may say that today we know less about what is at the bottom of the ocean and in the depths of the seas than we know about outer space itself. That is why the great achievement made by these brave men is so outstanding, as they extend their explorations beyond known areas, into depths of the ocean heretofore wholly unknown to man.

Lt. Don Walsh, the Navy officer in charge of the *Trieste*, is a typical young Navy submarine officer. A native of Berkeley, Calif., he now makes his home in San Diego, while he is assigned as officer in charge of the *Trieste*. He is an

Annapolis graduate, and has served aboard both surface ships and submarines. He is 28 years of age.

Mr. Piccard who, together with his famous father, Auguste Piccard, designed and built the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, and sold it to the Office of Naval Research in 1957, is 37 years of age. His permanent home is Lauzanne, Switzerland.

Mr. President, at this point I may say that it seems to me that the fact that we had to go overseas to obtain the underwater vessel necessary in order to accomplish this remarkable feat, is a reflection on the scientific progress of our Nation in this field. A vessel of that character is not now built in this country; neither do we have under way at the present time experimentation leading to the construction of such a vessel. I hope the proposed legislation introduced by the chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which calls for further exploration in the field of oceanography, will be enacted into law this year, in order that our country may lead in this field of exploration, as it has led in others.

After their feat, Walsh and Piccard were flown to Washington, where the President presented Walsh with the Legion of Merit and Piccard with the Distinguished Public Service Award.

Walsh's citation read, in part:

During deep-diving operations in the Marianas Trench, he successfully completed a series of recordbreaking dives, culminated by a dive to the unprecedented depth of 37,800 feet on January 23, 1960, this being the deepest spot on the ocean floor known to man. By his leadership, courage, and devotion to duty, he contributed greatly to the success of this project and upheld the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service.

Piccard was cited for his "outstanding services to the Department of the Navy in the field of oceanographic research." He was commended for dives "made at the risk of his own life" while "collecting scientific data for the U.S. Navy in this previously unexplored area of the earth."

Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker, U.S. Navy, was also cited for his performance of duty as assistant officer in charge of the *Trieste*. Dr. Andreas Rechnitzer, a native Californian, who was Navy scientist in charge of the bathyscaphe program, was awarded the Navy's distinguished Civilian Service Award.

It is difficult to forecast the full scope and importance of the pioneering exploit of the *Trieste*. It is, however, readily apparent that the seas of the world are of enormously increasing importance. The surface of the sea has traditionally been the highway of world commerce; 99 percent of international trade moves on the surface of the sea. Now a vast new dimension of the sea has been opened to mankind.

What does this dimension promise to us? It is of tremendous military importance. The expanse of sea, with its almost unlimited opportunities for mobility and dispersal, has, at one stroke, been vastly increased to us.

Moreover, the *Trieste* itself is useful to the Navy, in planning new submarines which, by combining the ability to de-

scend to tremendous depths with the ability to cruise almost indefinitely by means of nuclear propulsion, will extend tremendously the military strength of the Nation.

The Navy expects the *Trieste* to be useful in planning a whole new order of vessels designed to advance the frontiers of learning in the increasingly important study known as oceanography.

Undoubtedly, many more descents will be made by the *Trieste*, in our efforts to learn more of this relatively little known medium on which we are so dependent.

When the *Trieste* has ended its days of pioneering exploration of the depths, and is supplanted by newer undersea craft, I propose, Mr. President, that it be placed in the Smithsonian Institution, with the Wright Brothers first airplane, with Charles Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis*, and with other craft which, in this century have carried Americans on great pioneering adventures. The *Trieste* will be a fitting addition to that group.

Mr. President, in closing let me say that these heroic, great adventurers risked their lives in order to advance the cause of science; and they truly stand in the same position with reference to exploration as do the other great men who could be mentioned—those who have gone into the Arctic, those who have gone into the Antarctic, those who have gone into the upper atmosphere, those who first broke the sound barrier, and those who today are preparing to make the first visit by man beyond the atmosphere of the earth, into outer space.

If this adventure had "misfired" and if these men had been lost, they would have been counted authentic heroes of this country. I am glad no misfortune occurred; but I regret that more attention was not paid throughout the nation and in the press to their courageous and most important contribution to the exploration of an unknown part of the world and development of science in the United States.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to offer comparative figures on the rate of water resource development in the United States in the past decade.

The administration last year, in justifying its now discredited no new-starts policy, attempted to show that public works expenditures approved by this Congress were threatening to skyrocket out of sight. The Bureau of the Budget presented to the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources a tabulation of fiscal data on Federal expenditures for the construction of water and power projects by all agencies—Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Agriculture, TVA, St. Lawrence Seaway, Public Health Service, and International Boundary Commission. Projecting estimates beyond the budget table, Assistant Director Elmer B. Staats said that expenditures in fiscal 1962, assuming no new starts, would reach \$1,200,000,000; and that with a number of new starts each

year as provided in the bill, expenditures would reach \$1,600,000,000.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I questioned the Budget conclusion, considering the true value of the dollar as related to 1950. Accordingly using the Budget Bureau's figures on dollar expenditures, I have worked up a study of the effective level of water resource investment in each of the last 10 years, in relation to the changing value of the dollar and the increase in population. I shall offer the table for the RECORD.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that while our population has increased in the last decade by 19 percent, our real expenditures for water resource development have increased only three-tenths of 1 percent.

There is another point of special significance revealed in this table. Look

what happened, Mr. President, when the present administration presented its first budget, which was for fiscal 1954. Equivalent expenditures, at 1950 prices, dropped off \$79 million, or 9 percent. The decline continued, despite steady population increases, at a rate of 21 percent in fiscal 1955 and 47 percent in fiscal 1956. In fact, not until fiscal 1960 did real expenditures for water resource development regain the level of 1950—and then, as I have said, the total went up only three-tenths of 1 percent for the decade. I offer these figures as a significant study of our investment in America's future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table I have referred to made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

Federal expenditures for water-resource development

Fiscal year	Actual expenditures ¹	Value of 1950 dollar ²	Equivalent expenditures at 1950 prices	Real change from 1950		U.S. population ³	Increase in population		Fiscal year
				Dollars	Percent		People	Percent	
	Millions	Cents	Millions	Millions					
1950.....	\$901	100.0	\$901	-----	-----	151,683,000	-----	-----	1950
1951.....	944	92.6	874	-27	-3	154,360,000	2,677,000	1.8	1951
1952.....	983	90.5	890	-11	-1	157,028,000	2,668,000	1.7	1952
1953.....	1,037	89.8	931	+30	+3	159,636,000	2,608,000	1.7	1953
1954.....	918	89.5	822	-79	-9	162,417,000	2,781,000	1.7	1954
1955.....	792	89.7	710	-191	-21	165,270,000	2,853,000	1.8	1955
1956.....	650	88.4	575	-426	-47	168,176,000	2,906,000	1.8	1956
1957.....	769	85.5	657	-244	-27	171,196,000	3,020,000	1.8	1957
1958.....	971	83.1	807	-93	-10	174,064,000	2,868,000	1.7	1958
1959.....	1,031	82.9	855	-46	-5	176,890,000	2,826,000	1.6	1959
1960.....	1,089	83.0	904	+31	(*)	180,126,000	3,236,000	1.8	1960
Decade, 1951-60.....							28,443,000	19.0	

¹ Source: Bureau of the Budget, for construction of water and power projects by Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Agriculture, TVA, St. Lawrence Seaway, Public Health Service, and International Boundary Commission.

² Source: Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

³ Source: Census Bureau.

⁴ +3/10 of 1 percent.

⁵ Estimate.

CHINA AND THE BOMB

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I recently received a communication from Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who is presently with Harvard University, in which he referred to an article written by Mr. Mervyn Jones, entitled "China and the Bomb," which appeared in the Observer of Sunday, April 24, 1960.

In the letter Dr. Schlesinger wrote to me as follows:

Knowing your efforts to persuade our Government to take a more sensible look at policy toward Red China, I thought you might be interested in reading—and perhaps inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the attached piece from the London Observer.

The value of the piece, it seems to me, lies in the emphasis he places on the crucial issue—that is, the relationship of Red China to nuclear weapons and to future disarmament programs.

I would say he has put his finger on the crux of the question, because, no matter what kind of agreements we finally make with the Soviet Union and its satellites, if we ever make such agreements, if China is not part and parcel of those agreements and arrangements, tests can go forward in that area without any supervision whatever.

Dr. Schlesinger goes on to say:

While a policy of protracted nonrecognition is obviously sterile, it seems to me equally foolish to suppose that recognition would make much impression on the revolutionary fanatics of Peiping.

I may observe here I have not favored, and I do not now favor, the present recognition of Red China; and I have not favored, and I do not now favor, the admission of Red China to the United Nations. On the other hand, it seems to me we have to find realistic ways of dealing with these people if we ever expect to get together and work for a practical disarmament program. No disarmament program is going to be realistic unless it includes the area controlled by the Red Chinese.

Dr. Schlesinger goes on to say:

The British experience has been sufficiently discouraging about the significance of recognition per se. However, if we are serious about international disarmament and if we are concerned (as we well ought to be) with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons to Red China, then we must do something as soon as possible to implicate Peiping in the general arrangements and ordinances of the international community.

Mr. President, recent occurrences at the summit lend additional emphasis to the importance of what Dr. Schlesinger

has said in his letter. If anything, since the collapse of the summit conference, it is perfectly obvious that the Red Chinese will be more independent of Soviet Russia, if any dependence ever existed, and they will be without control both by the international community and by Soviet Russia itself, should they wish to be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the article referred to made a part of the RECORD.

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

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 12, 1960.

Senator CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ENGLE: Knowing your efforts to persuade our Government to take a more sensible look at policy toward Red China, I thought you might be interested in reading—and perhaps in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the attached piece from the London Observer.

The value of the piece, it seems to me, lies in the emphasis it places on the crucial issue—that is, the relationship of Red China to nuclear weapons and to future disarmament programs. While a policy of protracted nonrecognition is obviously sterile, it seems to me equally foolish to suppose that recognition would make much impression on the revolutionary fanatics of Peiping. The British experience has been sufficiently discouraging about the significance of recognition per se. However, if we are serious about international disarmament and if we are concerned (as we well ought to be) with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons to Red China, then we must do something as soon as possible to implicate Peiping in the general arrangements and ordinances of the international community.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.

[From the Observer, Apr. 24, 1960]

CHINA AND THE BOMB

(By Mervyn Jones)

The study of politics, in our century, is to a large extent the calculation of the chances of disaster. It is foreseen, at first, as the problematical end result of still latent trends. Later, actual events make it, not indeed inevitable, but positively more likely than not. Everyone who is old enough remembers the point at which he admitted that the Second World War had become a probability.

The event that will make the third world war—in other words, the end of civilized and perhaps of all human life—a probability can now be foreseen. This event is the acquisition by China of nuclear weapons.

There is not much doubt that it is going to happen, unless it is prevented, quite soon. Even without the aid of men who have studied in Western countries, and more recently in Russia, Chinese science is on the necessary level of attainment. To underestimate it would be merely to repeat the error of those who supposed Russia to be incapable of the same achievement.

TWO YEARS, SAY SOME SCIENTISTS

Moreover, we must assume the Chinese effort to have the same urgent stimulus from authority, the same lavish use of resources at the expense of other projects, as had the Russian sputniks. The scientific report on which the Labor Party relied in framing its "nonnuclear club" proposals listed China among the nations which could make nuclear weapons within 5 years; and that was in 1959. Some British scientists believe the time is as short as 2 years.

For anyone who has not accepted with cynical resignation the human capacity to ignore unpleasant realities, the lack of public discussion of this prospect must seem extraordinary. True, many voices, from the Observer to the campaign for nuclear disarmament, warn us of the spreading of nuclear ambitions. But as a rule the danger is presented in terms of the sheer number of possible nuclear powers: "What—will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?"

There is no denying that each and every increase in this number makes the world more unsafe. The chance of war through accident or recklessness grows; the hope of agreed and controlled disarmament weakens. Both these effects, however, would be felt with special sharpness if the newcomer to the nuclear club were China: the former because the world has little practice in judging the seriousness of Chinese actions, the latter because China is wholly outside the circle of international negotiation. And there are other reasons to think that the danger of China armed with the nuclear bomb is of a unique kind.

A DISSATISFIED GREAT POWER

By reason of her size, her population, her developing industry, and the determined character of her rulers, China is about to become—with or without the bomb—a great power. In this context, a great power is a nation able to threaten or initiate a major war, not in the hope of dragging a stronger ally with her, but in command of weaker allies or independently.

The two existing great powers who are nuclearly armed, America and Russia, are satisfied powers. They are content with the present division of the world, or—at the least—disinclined to risk war over such minor aspects of this division as are not to their liking. China is a dissatisfied power, opposed to the consolidation of the status quo, which the others favor. To what extent China's claims are justified, and in what measure they ought to be conceded, is not the point in this argument; the point is the danger of the bomb in the armory of a dissatisfied great power.

There is another important difference. The rulers of China, if we assume them to mean what they repeatedly say, do not believe in the possibility of a peace securely based on negotiation and agreement, and are actively preparing for the hard necessity of war.

CONSEQUENCES OF WRONG GUESS

This does not mean that they are preparing for aggression. It does mean that in a time of crisis, or when faced with what they take to be an intolerable trespass on their own interests, they would reconcile themselves to entering into hostilities.

They would say to themselves: "Well, the moment we expected has come, and fortunately we are ready for it." To some extent, this was true of both America and Russia in the worst years of the cold war. It is not true now of either; but it is true of China.

If these are the characteristics of China as an incipient great power, it would be very rash to assume that such a power, when full-grown to greatness and equipped with the bomb, would be deterred by the threat of nuclear bombardment by her enemies. The ability to precipitate a worldwide massacre might make China more cautious, as apparently it has made America and Russia; or it might have the opposite effect.

It does not seem that China is likely to take Russia's current behavior as a model. In the Lebanon crisis of 1958, when Khrushchev refrained from going anywhere near the brink, the Chinese view was that he had made the wrong decision. The safe deduction seems to be that in any future crisis, if China's influence with Russia has grown,

and more emphatically if China were directly involved, the choice might be otherwise.

What will happen if China has the bomb, admittedly, is guesswork. But the consequences of guessing wrong are so appalling as to entitle us to say that the only safety lies in preventing China from getting the bomb. To my mind, this aim of policy—being, at one short remove, the aim of saving the human race—must take precedence over any other objective.

The problem of dealing with China has the same overriding importance as had, a generation ago, the problem of dealing with Germany: not because Communist China can be accurately compared with Nazi Germany, nor because the solution can be what it should have been then, but simply because of the penalty that attaches to turning aside from the obligation to thought and action.

NATION THAT DOES NOT EXIST

This is what Britain and America are doing now, to a degree that makes one recall Stanley Baldwin as a paragon of foresight and resolution. Officially for America, and virtually for Britain, China does not exist. The Americans may thus be the first people in history to be annihilated by an enemy whose existence they did not admit.

China is the one nation on earth completely free from the obligations, and immune to the dictates or requests, entailed by membership of the United Nations. America and Russia move toward agreement, now tacit and perhaps soon formal, to limit their armed forces to 2,500,000 men; China is at liberty to keep 6 million under arms, or is it 8? The others laboriously evolve a system of inspection; China need be inspected by nobody.

All this happens not because of Chinese defiance, but because America wills it so. In Britain, not only does the Government not press its ally for an end to this absurdity, but the opposition does not press the Government. There seems to be nobody for whom China is real.

There is no way of preventing China from getting the bomb without first admitting to ourselves, and to China, that China exists. This is all the more true because China cannot be forbidden to have the bomb; she can only be dissuaded. She must be convinced, as Russia has slowly been convinced, that war is not inevitable nor preparation for it a task of prudence. In the time available, even if the channels of communication were open, this would be a task of the utmost difficulty. So long as they are closed, it is hopeless.

IN RUSSIA'S INTEREST

Yet, just as the West has ignored the elements of danger in this situation, it has equally ignored one enormously valuable element of hope. This can be simply stated. That China should not get the bomb is the common interest of the rest of the world. No demonstration is needed that it is the interest, both of the United States and her allies, and of India and other uncommitted nations. What has lately become clear is that it is also the interest—to the measure that peace is the interest—of Russia.

If China does become armed with nuclear weapons, it will be by making them herself. Russia, though allied to China, and though debarred by no undertaking to others, makes no move to supply them. It is relevant that Moscow has ignored a confident request by East Germany for nuclear missiles, breaking for the first time with the policy of copying step by step the rearmament of West Germany. Russia was evidently unwilling to give these weapons to a government which is now an ally of China as much as of her own; unwilling, above all, to provide a precedent which would have obliged her to give them to China.

If we face the fact that China exists and matters; if we consider every possible expedient that may serve the vital aim of preventing her from getting the bomb; if we avail ourselves in this of the cooperation of Russia, realizing that we are lucky to have it—then we shall have, instead of evasion, the makings of a policy.

Mr. ENGLE. 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. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I rise in favor of the pending amendment. Before I address myself specifically to the amendment I should like, by way of prefatory remarks, to point out what is the law now and how the committee bill would change the law.

Under the Navy ration statute the members of the U.S. Navy are guaranteed a daily ration of butter for table use. The committee bill would take away that guarantee and would permit the Navy to serve to sailors either oleomargarine or margarine instead of butter. When we take a careful look at the text of the committee bill we note that although the bill states that when surplus butter stocks are available through the Commodity Credit Corporation oleomargarine cannot be purchased for table use by the Navy, such provision is rendered almost meaningless by another little proviso at the end of the bill which says, in effect, that if butter and soybean or cottonseed oil are in surplus then the Navy can use either butter or oleo.

Let us take a look at what the reported bill would do to the taxpayers' pocketbook, to say nothing of what it would do to dairy farmers. Suppose that both butter and cottonseed oil are in surplus. The committee bill would then permit the Navy to use either oleo or butter. This would mean that the Federal Government would be putting in warehouses butter it purchases at a price of from 58 to 62 cents per pound so that it will not have to store cottonseed oil which costs only around 11 or 12 cents per pound.

This is playing fast and loose with the taxpayers' pocketbook. When we note that between the years 1954 and 1959, almost 129 million pounds of butter were transferred from surplus stocks to the Defense Department, we can really see how much harm the bill could do.

Had the committee proposal been in effect during those years, 1954 through

1959, we would have been allowing the Navy to purchase oleo while butter piled up in the warehouses.

I am happy to say I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] in supporting that amendment.

We who support the pending amendment do not believe that Congress ought to force upon American sailors oleomargarine for table use when butter, a much preferred product, is available. But we realize that the Senate may wish to settle on a compromise of the whole issue, and that is what we have proposed in our amendment.

The amendment would allow the Navy to use oleomargarine or margarine if the Secretary of Agriculture certifies—

First, that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been made or are intended to be made by any agency of the Federal Government for the purpose of stabilizing or supporting the prices received by farmers for milk or butterfat; and

Second, the purchase of oleomargarine or margarine in the amounts and at the time specified will not cause or contribute to a surplus of milk or dairy products.

Does not that provision in the amendment make sense? How can anyone argue that Congress should encourage the Navy to use oleo when another department of the Government is purchasing milk or dairy products to stabilize the support prices? Contrast this with the provision in the committee bill which would encourage the Navy to use oleo so that it could reduce a surplus of 12-cent cottonseed oil, while at the same time 58- or 60-cent butter stacks up in warehouses.

As of March 1, 1960, or February 29, 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported that there was no inventory of cottonseed oil; there was no inventory of soybean oil; and those who purchase those commodities, certainly at the present time at least, and, insofar as we can ascertain, in the future, are not likely to experience any economic hardship whatsoever.

We also recognize the fact that the Navy may have on hand oleo which it has been using for cooking purposes. It could use up this oleo for cooking purposes so long as it was not served as a component of the Navy ration when dairy products are being supported or are in surplus.

Looking ahead to the not too distant future we can see that on the basis of reports from the Department of Agriculture or elsewhere, the supplies of milk in the marketing year 1960-61 could increase over the 1959-60 level because of such factors as a low beef market. Should this increased production become a fact and we take away one of the dairy producers best customers, the Navy, the taxpayer may find himself in a position where he is helping the Government to buy butter to put in the warehouses, at the same time that the Navy is using oleomargarine.

Mr. President, without this amendment, S. 2168 would be a knife thrust deep in the economic vitals of the dairy farmers of America.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished senior colleague from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that the prospects are that the Federal Government is likely to purchase more dairy products from now on, the reason being that the import quota on foreign cheeses has recently been doubled. Such increase would mean a probable loss of market for the manufacturers of European type cheeses in America. The American manufacturers undoubtedly cannot compete with the foreign cheeses, which are produced under vastly different and cheaper conditions than is the case for example, with either the blue cheese or the Romano cheese produced in the United States.

As foreign cheeses are permitted to take over more of the American market, the American manufacturer will have to put the milk which he is receiving into other products—possibly butter, powdered milk, and Cheddar cheeses. Those products will then come into surplus and will likely have to be purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So I think in voting on the amendment we must realize that the Government is likely to own more dairy products in the not distant future than it does today. I wish to make clear that I do not approve doubling the import quota for foreign cheeses at this time, when the supply and demand situation for dairy products in the United States is barely in balance, if it is in balance at this time. I believe it has been a mistake to authorize the importation of millions and millions of pounds of dairy products into the United States at this time, and certainly this is no time to substitute other fats for butter, except where it may be absolutely necessary.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me, because the point I mention ought to be taken into consideration by the Senate in taking action on the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sincerely grateful to my colleague from Vermont. He always makes an invaluable contribution whenever he speaks on the Senate floor or off. Certainly I know that the dairy farmers in the United States, as well as farmers generally, have no greater champion than my senior colleague, who has devoted years and years of study in the interest of the agriculture welfare of this Nation.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to say how grateful I am to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a man who has been the champion of all the farmers of America, not only the dairy farmers. He speaks with authority as well as from great experience. It would be foolish for us, indeed, to pass the bill at this time in view of the Government's increase in the quota of imported foreign cheeses—Edam, Gouda, and the Italian type cheeses. The fact is that this was a body blow to Wisconsin. It was a body blow not only to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, but also to the small cheese factories, of which we

had hundreds in Wisconsin. Many of them were knocked out of business, after going through many years of plowing back their earnings into their factories. The Government, by one stroke of the pen, virtually wiped out a large number of them.

The point the senior Senator from Vermont has made is especially pertinent here because the bill provides no protection which will require the Navy to purchase butter when there is surplus butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation, although section 2 of the bill seems to give that protection. The reason is that if at any time during the year there happens to be no surplus in the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Navy can step in and buy enough oleo to last it for a long, long time. That is the kind of situation that prevails now. We know that in a few weeks there is every likelihood that there will be a surplus of butter. That is why the amendment I have offered is so essential, because it provides, among other things, protection against that kind of development.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont for the excellent defense he is making of the dairy industry of the United States. I believe he has made some very pertinent points. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the proposed legislation would provide an inferior product to naval personnel. Certainly butter has been long recognized as a better product than oleomargarine, both by the price it commands in the open cash market and by the fact that oleomargarine for years tried to copy butter by color and name and everything else. Is that not true?

Mr. PROUTY. I agree with my distinguished friend from North Dakota. He is absolutely correct. The manufacturers of oleo in their advertising programs have always suggested that their product tastes just like the higher priced spread. They have been trying to copy butter. Of course, certainly, we know it is impossible to do that, because butter is a much superior product, and I believe the American people basically recognize that fact.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not also true that the enactment of the proposed legislation which is before the Senate would further aggravate the farm surplus problem in this respect: The pasture crops produced on an acre of land if used to feed dairy cattle, whose end product is butter, will produce far fewer pounds of end products like butter, than if the land were planted to soybeans and the soybeans then converted into oleomargarine? What I am trying to say is that an acre of land will produce far more pounds of oleomargarine as an end product of soybean and cottonseed than would be produced if it were a dairy farm operation.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely right in that respect. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If we wish to preserve a rural America as we knew it in the past, we shall have to do something to help the small farmer. I do not know of a better way to insure the keeping of the small type farm operations of America than through dairy farm operations. The production of any grain always lends itself to bigger operations, because of the tremendously high cost of the farm machinery that must be used. Although some oleomargarine legislation may have been necessary in the past, all of this has made it tougher for the small farmer to stay in business.

Mr. PROUTY. That is true. We must recognize the fact that the average dairy farmer operates a so-called family-sized farm, a small farm, which in many instances has been operated for several generations in the same family. Unless we give the small farmer some help, and unless we consider his interests, he cannot operate any longer. Once that happens, the whole economy is going to be drastically affected.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator very much for his helpful contribution.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIER. I interrupted the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont to commend the senior Senator from Vermont simply because the senior Senator from Vermont had just made his statement at the time I entered the Chamber. There is no question in my mind that the remarks which the junior Senator from Vermont is making show his devotion to the cause is very deep, and that he has a very deep understanding and knowledge of the issues. I am sure that before the bill is disposed of one way or another, the dairy farmers of Wisconsin will certainly rise up and call him blessed. He is making a great contribution by his deep understanding and interest. I am grateful to him.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am proud to act as a cosponsor of his amendment, which we are considering at the present time. I commend the junior Senator from Wisconsin most highly for his support of the dairy farmers, not only in his own State, but also throughout the United States.

As I suggested earlier in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the dairy farmer is a small farmer. These farmers love the soil. They are a bulwark of American democracy. They keep the small communities of the country economically viable and they want to stay on the land even if it means a lower standard of living than that enjoyed by many Americans.

Since 1952, the average wholesale price received by farmers for all milk dropped more than 18 percent. The average price received for butterfat has dropped about 22 percent. During this same 7-year period, the retail price paid by consumers for milk has increased nearly 10 percent.

While the retail price of milk has been increasing, the farmer's share of the retail price has been decreasing. In 1952 the farmer's share of the retail price was 51 percent. In 1959 it was only 43 percent, a decrease of 8 percent during the 7-year period.

This widening spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays for dairy products is highlighted further by other statistics published by the Department of Agriculture. In 1959 an urban worker's family of three paid \$195 for the same quantity of dairy products, milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream, that it bought in 1952 for \$191. But farmers in 1952 received \$100 for these dairy products as compared with only \$88 in 1959. Processors and distributors, however, increased their "take" for their services from \$90 in 1952 to \$107 in 1959.

Even though the retail prices of dairy products have been increasing, dollar for dollar, dairy products are the best buy on the housewife's shopping list. In the past 30 years, the real cost of milk to a factory worker in terms of work time required to purchase a quart of milk has dropped more than one-half. In 1929, it required the earnings of 15 minutes of factory work to purchase a quart of milk at retail. In 1947, the cost of a quart of milk had dropped to 10 minutes of factory labor. In 1959, it took the earnings of less than 7 minutes of factory labor to buy a quart of milk at retail. This is indeed an impressive record. However, consumers today are able to purchase milk at such relatively low prices largely because the farmer's share of the retail price has been constantly shrinking over the past 7 years.

Another important point which should be noted is that farm production costs, including interest, taxes, and farm wage rates, as of April of this year, are the highest on record. As a result of falling farm prices for milk, and the increasing production costs, the returns per hour to farm operators for their labor and managerial ability have been unreasonably low in recent years. A recent Department of Agriculture study, allowing a 5-percent return on invested capital, indicates that the average dairy farmer in one important dairy State receives about 57 cents an hour for his labor and managerial effort, including the value of food produced and consumed on the farm. What other workers today accept such a low return for services rendered or work performed?

Mr. President, another factor which should not be overlooked is the effect on the morale of Navy personnel if they are, at least figuratively, required to pour a so-called table spread out of an oilcan.

Strangely enough, many folks in the Navy originated in inland States, in small rural communities which are the backbone, the muscle, and sinew of America.

To force these people to eat a substitute for the rich, pure dairy products to which they are accustomed could very well prove highly disconcerting and upsetting to them.

Mr. President, no discriminating hostess would serve oil to her dinner guests. Certainly if that is true, it would be add-

ing insult to injury to force the fighting men of the U.S. Navy to consume a most inferior substitute.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] and me is eminently fair and realistic. If the amendment is adopted, I feel certain that S. 2168 can be acted on with dispatch. If, unfortunately, such is not the case, then I am afraid that some of us will find it necessary to proceed at some length to try to persuade Senators that the bill as reported will have a tragic effect not only upon the welfare of the average dairy farmer, but upon the general economy as well.

I hope the Senate will appreciate the serious consequences which will follow the passage of S. 2168 as reported, and will approve the pending amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. 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. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION DECISION LEGALIZING BOOSTERS OWNED BY AND REPEATING UHF TELEVISION STATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, an announcement of great significance was made this afternoon by the Federal Communications Commission. I refer to its decision legalizing boosters which are owned by, and which repeat only, UHF television stations. Moreover, the FCC announcement provides for a maximum power of 5 kilowatts for these boosters or repeaters, as they sometimes are called.

This decision bears directly upon the viewing public, Mr. President, and more specifically upon viewers in the West, where booster-supported television is so widespread. The decision is significant because no UHF boosters are currently in operation to serve the mere handful of UHF stations in the country, 75 in number. Yet the people in those many isolated communities who depend upon VHF boosters, using one or more of the 450 VHF television stations, still await definitive action such as that embodied in Senate bill 1886, passed by the Senate last year. This measure, the so-called booster bill, lies in a House committee virtually untouched, still unscheduled even for hearings.

Mr. President, I commend the FCC for the foresight it has today demonstrated in taking action in an area where action will soon be demanded. I also commend it for showing the need for decision where decision is needed.

However, in my own State of Colorado, thousands of viewers in booster-supplied areas still must hold their breath,

in the hope that the FCC, still unguided by a lack of decision on Senate bill 1886, will make semiannual extensions on a decision to hold up destruction of existing VHF boosters.

Mr. President, the rules outlined by the FCC for UHF boosters are sound and reasonable. They take a professional view of power needs, and establish sound engineering standards. In short, these rules permit boosters, without permitting ungoverned broadcasting. In withholding comment on the ownership aspect of the announcement, I would say this decision will be greeted with enthusiasm by broadcasters and viewers alike.

I would also point out, Mr. President, that these rules, aside from the ownership provision, largely parallel those contained in the booster bill which this body passed last year.

The FCC has explained that its decision is confined to UHF boosters owned, and operated according to sound engineering principles, by the original station. Their use, according to the statement, is confined to filling in so-called shadow areas in the prime signal area of the UHF station in question. This is reasonable.

The FCC has explained that no decision was made regarding VHF boosters, because so many are presently operating, that guidance from Congress is needed. This, too, is reasonable.

Mr. President, I hope our colleagues in the other body will view in the same light today's decision by the FCC and will act speedily to assure uninterrupted television for rural families who depend upon boosters, and who look to us for help and assurance.

I should like to add just another word or two to my prepared statement, Mr. President. It seems to me that Mr. Ford, Chairman of the FCC, and the other members of the Commission have shown a great deal of foresight and "get-up" and "do it" in their attitude toward this particular matter. We are often prone to criticize, sometimes justly, I am sure, Federal agencies, particularly the administrative and regulatory agencies such as the FCC, the FCC, the FAA, the CAB, and all the rest of the regulatory agencies, without stopping to consider the job they have.

I should like to refer back particularly to the FCC. In 1926, I believe it was, there were six or seven hundred unregulated radio stations around the country. The situation was one of sheer, unorganized havoc. As a result, the Federal Communications Commission was established for the purpose of regulating them.

Then, in 1958, the Federal Communications Commission saw that the booster situation, the taking of television frequencies or signals out of the air and boosting them, or repeating them, to more remotely located communities, was very quickly getting in the same situation in which the radio stations had been back in 1926 and 1927.

So, in December of 1958, if my memory serves me correctly, the FCC issued an order suspending the operation of all booster stations. I disagreed with that order, and I disagreed particularly with

some of the reasons on which it was based. Because of the widespread disagreement, the FCC has continually from time to time, continued the operation of that order of suspension, as it now has, and as it probably will continue to do until the House acts on this particular bill.

One of the first things the senior Senator from Colorado did when he returned to Washington in January of 1958 was to present a bill to the Senate to take care of the booster situation.

Some of our colleagues in the House and in the Senate seem to have very great difficulty in understanding that there are in existence areas which do not have a television station on about every other square mile. Out in the West we have no such abundance of television stations. We have TV stations in Colorado at Denver, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, and Grand Junction. Those are the only areas in Colorado where the population is concentrated enough to justify original television stations.

In addition, just west of the Denver-Colorado Springs-Pueblo axis, there runs a string of mountains which are a part of what is commonly known as the Continental Divide. Colorado has some 60-odd peaks over 14,000 feet high. Since television stations broadcast on a line-of-sight basis, it is very obvious that the signals cannot be lifted over those 14,000-foot peaks and over those 12,000 to 13,000 foot ranges without some kind of boosters or microwave signals.

In order to get around that difficulty, the Senate committee last year held very extended hearings upon the booster bill. I again wish to pay my tribute to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who held those hearings, and who showed great fairness and understanding of the subject, and who reported a bill which the Senate passed and which I thought was wholly reasonable. That bill has now reposed in the House of Representatives for just about a period of 1 year. If that bill is not passed and the FCC proceeds with its order of suspension toward boosters, a great portion of my State of Colorado is going to be darkened so far as receiving television broadcasts is concerned.

On the CATV matter, about which I spoke the other day in the Senate, I said that if one station, the Grand Junction TV station, were closed down, it would mean 36 boosters serving much of the western portion of Colorado and the eastern portion of Utah would be blacked out, and those people would be denied the right to the use of television.

I think, if the Federal Communications is willing to face up to its problems and face up to its challenges, there is no reason why the Congress of the United States should not act upon the booster bill and face up to its problem in acting legislatively upon the measure.

Mr. President, it is very rarely that I comment on action on legislation which has been determined in the Halls of Congress, and determined adversely to the position which I have taken, but I intend to do it at this time with respect to the CATV bill, which did not pass. Because of the failure of the Senate to face up

to its responsibilities on the CATV bill last week, it is going to have ultimately the same effect and reverberation on the people in the West—not merely the people of the State of Colorado but the people of all the western areas where boosters are necessary in order to get TV signals—as the effect the House has had by not acting on the booster bill which the Senate sent to it.

In conclusion, it seems to me we have a situation here in which, even though I disagreed with the reasons assigned by the Federal Communications Commission in its original suspension order, at least the FCC has lived up to its responsibilities. I believe it is about time the Congress started providing some legislative guidance in this respect.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to vote tomorrow at 12:30 p.m. on the Proxmire amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, the proponents' time being in charge of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], or some Senator designated by him in his absence, and the time of the opponents being in charge of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] or some Senator whom he may designate.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour tomorrow be concluded at 10:30 a.m.

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

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each side will then have an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow (Thursday, May 26, 1960),

it proceed to the consideration of routine morning business; that at 10:30 o'clock a.m. the Senate resume consideration of the Proxmire-Prouty amendment (lettered "A"—5-23-60) to the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; that at 12:30 o'clock p.m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate on said amendment; that the intervening time between 10:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. PROXMIER and Mr. THURMOND. Ordered further, That upon the disposition of the said amendment it be in order for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of and vote en bloc on the treaties now pending on the Executive Calendar. (May 25, 1960.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that under the order previously agreed to, the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is further agreed, consonant with the order requested by the distinguished acting majority leader, that the morning hour will end at 10:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is agreed that the Senate will then resume consideration of the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that the time from then on will be equally divided, 1 hour on each side, the time of Senators speaking in behalf of the amendment to be controlled by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], and the time in opposition to the amendment to be controlled by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At 12:30 the Senate will vote on the Proxmire amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In order to further clarify and make certain this matter, I ask unanimous consent—and I dislike to do it, but in view of the circumstances I think it should be done—that the yeas and nays be ordered at 12:30.

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

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not delay the adjournment for any great length of time. I understand that after the discussion today the bill will go over until 10 o'clock tomorrow. I wish to speak in favor, first, of the Proxmire amendment, which I believe rationalizes the bill in question. It makes it workable.

In analyzing any measure, it is found that there are three interested parties. There is the public, first of all. I am sure the discussion of this bill, particularly the amendment, has clearly shown

that to pass the bill itself would be detrimental to the public. I am not going into detail, however. The other day I had lunch with a young sailor. He is from my State. He said, as the butter was placed on the table, "Is that oleomargarine?"

I said, "No, sir."

He said, "You mean to say that you are going to have us Navy boys eat oleomargarine while you Senators won't eat it?"

I said, "That is not the idea."

So far as I am personally concerned, I think it is all important that we see to it that the Navy boys are given that most nourishing of all foods that come from the dairy cow—milk, cheese, and butter.

Mr. President, the cow has been called the mother of the race. The enactment of S. 2168 is against the best interest of the public. However, it is also against the best interest of the dairy industry. The dairy industry is facing serious economic conditions.

As has been so well suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] today, we cannot muddy up the stream by compelling a sale, as it were, of oleomargarine, when the Navy has been eating butter all this time. Let me put it another way. When we talk about the Navy, we talk about ships and about ports where there is refrigeration, and where it is right and proper to have butter. Let us remember that these boys have been accustomed to butter. Therefore, in my opinion, the proposal before us is against the interest of the dairy industry, as I shall show.

Oleomargarine started out a few years ago holding a very small percentage of the spread market. Now it has over 51 percent of the spread market. The pending measure would add oleomargarine or margarine to the Navy ration, although the provision is qualified by the status of surplus of butter and soybean or cottonseed oil. However, the general effect would be to open the door for oleo to replace butter in the Navy rations.

I said there were three interested parties, or three interests that were involved. There is the Navy, or the boys in the Navy who have to eat the spread. They certainly do not want oleomargarine. That is what this young man in the Navy told me the other day. I am sure that when it is known that Senators insist on butter on their table there will be some people who will see a little red when they know that we are handing them another commodity.

Over the years there has been a concerted effort by the oleo interest to usurp the market, which has been created and expanded by the dairy industry, in providing high quality food for the American people. The effort has not been unsuccessful.

According to figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture, the increase in oleo utilization has been as follows: In 1938 the per capita consumption of butter was 16.6 pounds per person. By contrast, the consumption of oleo was 3 pounds. That is 16.6 as against 3 in 1938.

By comparison, the consumption of butter in 1958, 20 years later, was 8.4 pounds, which is half of what it was in 1938. However, the utilization of oleo had increased to 9 pounds per person. It had increased from 3 to 9 pounds. Butter had decreased from 16.6 to 8.4.

It does not take a very wise man or even a Solomon to see what effect that has had upon the dairy industry. This young sailor said to me, "You mean now we must eat oleo, that we cannot have buttermilk? You are importing cheese to such an extent that we cannot have our domestic cheese. What do you really think you are doing to the farmers, to say nothing about the factories that produce the butter and the cheese?" That point was stressed very well by the junior Senator from my State. He did a great job, as he always does when he undertakes to discuss an issue. I think no one can particularly blame us if they say, "You are fighting for the kinfolk. That is why you are interested."

Yes, that is true. My kinfolk are the people of the dairy industry, not only in Wisconsin but also in the other great dairy States in this country.

I am thinking, as was outlined by the Senator from Minnesota, how much less income this is going to mean to the farmers. The people in other States, in the Southland, for example, should be interested in this bill. They have been raising cows and producing milk and milk products. I have given the comparison between 1938 and 1958, which shows a reduction in the individual consumption of butter. In 20 years the oleo interests have increased their portion of the market from 15 percent in 1938 to 51 percent in 1958. The pending bill is one more effort by the oleo interests to take over this butter outlet, which is, after all, our own boys in the Navy, who want butter. I have not heard any of them say they want oleo served to them.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin may yield to me briefly, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, in order that I may make an announcement of the plans of the leadership concerning the calendar for the rest of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Democratic policy committee has met and has cleared the following bills for the consideration of the Senate, the bills will not necessarily be taken up in the order in which I shall read them. I shall read them for the RECORD, so that all Senators who are interested may be prepared to debate these bills when they are brought before the Senate.

I desire all Senators to be on notice that any of the bills listed today may be called up in the Senate this week or the following week:

Calendar No. 290, Senate Joint Resolution 69, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Calendar No. 361, Senate Resolution 131, referring S. 882, a bill for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White, to the Court of Claims.

Calendar No. 397, S. 1617, to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 447, S. 1789, to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 924, H.R. 8315, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri. On this bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I believe, has an amendment. I should like to give the Senator from Oregon notice that the bill may be called up at any time. I desire this statement to constitute notice to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who reported the bill; and to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is the chairman of the committee.

Calendar No. 1040, S. 609, for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich.

Calendar No. 1163, Senate Joint Resolution 170, a joint resolution to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such conventions, and for other purposes.

There is some controversy about this joint resolution. It was reported by a vote of 8 to 7 by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I desire all Senators to be on notice that there will very likely be a yea-and-nay vote on this joint resolution.

Calendar No. 1178, H.R. 4251, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with respect to the limitation on the deduction of exploration expenditures.

Calendar No. 1196, S. 2850, providing for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not on the floor now, but I give notice that I plan to ask that this bill be recommitted. I shall withhold that request until the minority leader is present.

Calendar No. 1267, S. 2131, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

Calendar No. 1277, S. 511, for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster.

Calendar No. 1339, S. 2759, to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price-support program.

Calendar No. 1369, 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.

Calendar No. 1371, S. 3070, to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Morton County, N. Dak., conveyed to the State of North Dakota on July 20, 1955.

Calendar No. 1408, S. 2375, to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce, by towing.

Calendar No. 1409, S. 1545, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408.

Calendar No. 1411, S. 2929, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

Calendar No. 1412, S. 2867, to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Havana, Aug. 15, 1958.

Calendar No. 1413, S. 1235, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

Calendar No. 1414, S. 3074, to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association.

Calendar No. 1415, S. 2581, to amend the act of June 1, 1948—(62 Stat. 281)—to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen.

Calendar No. 1416, H.R. 9983, to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

Calendar No. 1417, H.R. 7681, to enact provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 with certain amendments.

Calendar No. 1418, S. 3366, to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service.

Calendar No. 1419, S. 2744, to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053 for a badge granted to George Brown Goode and assigned to the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution.

Calendar No. 1420, S. 700, for the relief of Mladen Carrara, Tonina Carrara, Ante Carrara and Zvonko Carrara.

Calendar No. 1421, S. 993, for the relief of Christos G. Diavatinos.

Calendar No. 1422, S. 2277, for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.

Calendar No. 1423, S. 2740, for the relief of Julia Sukkar.

Calendar No. 1424, S. 2942, for the relief of Eugene Storine.

Calendar No. 1425, S. 3049, for the relief of Oh Chun Soon.

Calendar No. 1426, S. 3032, for the relief of Samuel B. Pisar.

Calendar No. 1427, S. 3130, for the relief of Anne Marie Sletlin.

Calendar No. 1428, H.R. 1402, for the relief of Leandro Pastor, Jr., and Pedro Pastor.

Calendar No. 1429, H.R. 1463, for the relief of Johan Karel Christoph Schlichter.

Calendar No. 1430, H.R. 1516, for the relief of Juan D. Quintos, Jaime Hernandez, Delfin Buencamino, Soledad Gomez, Nieves G. Argonza, Feledidad G. Sarayba, Carmen Vda de Gomez, Perfecta B. Quintos, and Bienvenida San Augustin.

Calendar No. 1431, H.R. 1519, for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Peter Callas, a minor.

Calendar No. 1432, H.R. 3253, for the relief of Ida Magyar.

Calendar No. 1433, H.R. 3827, for the relief of Jan P. Wilczynski.

Calendar No. 1434, H.R. 4763, for the relief of Josette A. M. Stanton.

Calendar No. 1435, H.R. 8798, for the relief of Romeo Gasparini.

Calendar No. 1436, H.R. 11190 for the relief of Cora V. March.

Calendar No. 1437, H.R. 1542, for the relief of Biagio D'Agata.

Calendar No. 1438, S. 2583, to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1439, S. 1454, for the relief of Keitha L. Baker.

Calendar No. 1440, S. 2113, for the relief of George K. Caldwell.

Calendar No. 1441, H.R. 1600, for the relief of Francis M. Haischer.

Calendar No. 1442, H.R. 3107, for the relief of Richard L. Nuth.

Calendar No. 1443, H.R. 7036, for the relief of William J. Barbiero.

Calendar No. 1444, H.R. 8217, for the relief of Orville J. Henke.

Calendar No. 1445, H.R. 8806, for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital.

Calendar No. 1446, H.R. 9470, for the relief of E. W. Cornett, Sr., and E. W. Cornett, Jr.

Calendar No. 1447, H.R. 9752, for the relief of K. J. McIver.

Calendar No. 1448, H.R. 10947, for the relief of Aladar Szoboszlay.

Calendar No. 1449, H.R. 6081, for the relief of M. Sgt. Emery C. Jones.

Calendar No. 1450, S. 817, for the relief of Freda Filler.

Calendar No. 1451, S. 3560, to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communication facilities.

Calendar No. 1452, S. 2770, for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.

Calendar No. 1453, S. 3018, to authorize the Maritime Administration to

make advances on Government insured ship mortgages.

Calendar No. 1454, S. 3429, to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy.

Calendar No. 1455, S. 3140, to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties.

Calendar No. 1456, H.R. 10087, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit.

Calendar No. 1457, H.R. 113, to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except under certain limited conditions.

Calendar No. 1458, H.R. 276, to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents.

Calendar No. 1459, H.R. 641, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits.

Calendar No. 1460, H.R. 7502, to revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration.

Calendar No. 1461, H.R. 9785, to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces.

Calendar No. 1462, H.R. 9788, to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line.

Calendar No. 1463, H.R. 10703, to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who become totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance.

Calendar No. 1464, H.R. 10898, to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children.

Calendar No. 1465, H.R. 9322, to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool.

Calendar No. 1466, H.R. 9881, to extend for 2 years the existing provision of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

Calendar No. 1468, S. 1787, to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products.

Calendar No. 1469, S. 2998, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to extend the life of certain vessels under the provisions of such act from 20 to 25 years.

Calendar No. 1470, S. 3044, to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1471, S. 3179, to increase the authorization for appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

Calendar No. 1472, H.R. 8238, to authorize and direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make a study and report to Congress, from the standpoint of the public health, of the discharge of substances into the atmosphere from the exhausts of motor vehicles.

Calendar No. 1473, S. 3025, to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1956, relating to practical nurse training and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1474, S. 2830, to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1475, S. 3420, to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1476, Senate Joint Resolution 127, to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

Calendar No. 1477, S. 2584, to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title.

Calendar No. 1478, H.R. 11405, to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before Jan. 1, 1960, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1479, S. 1889, to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project.

Calendar No. 1480, H.R. 8295, to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1481, S. 2634, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests.

Calendar No. 1482, S. 3226, to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act.

Mr. President, I give notice also that Calendar No. 1414, S. 3074, to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association, may be brought up at a very early date, if it is convenient to the authors of the bill and other interested Senators, and members of the committee. It will probably follow the action on the bill now under consideration.

I give notice also that it is expected to have the Senate convene early and stay late, until the pending business has been disposed of. Then we will follow with a calendar call, and very likely follow the calendar call with Calendar No. 1414, S. 3074, to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association.

I expect the Committee on Appropriations to report some bills soon. Of course, all appropriation bills will always have the highest priority.

I desire all Senators to be on notice that several treaties are on the Executive Calendar, and that there will be yeas-and-nays votes on the treaties. They may be considered en bloc.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Montana if there is controversy about any of the treaties?

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I know, none of them is controversial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can they be considered en bloc?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I shall ask that the order be vitiated if it is not agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—that following the morning hour tomorrow there be a yeas-and-nays vote on the treaties en bloc.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. An agreement has been entered that the morning hour tomorrow will be concluded at 10:30 o'clock, and that the next 2 hours will be allocated to the debate on the amendment now pending to S. 2168.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is satisfactory, I should like to have a yeas-and-nays vote on the treaties after 10:30 o'clock. If that would be unsatisfactory, I shall ask that the vote on the treaties take place at 12:30 o'clock, after the vote on the Proxmire amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to vote on the treaties, en bloc, immediately following the vote on the Proxmire amendment tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there should be objection to that arrangement, I shall adjust it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request which I made previously, and which was agreed to, that there be a yeas-and-nays vote tomorrow at 12:30 o'clock on the Proxmire amendment be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do so because I understand there has been an agreement that requests of this kind are not to be made. There is no doubt that we shall have a yeas-and-nays vote at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that when more Senators are present in the Chamber tomorrow, a request will be made that the yeas and nays on the Proxmire amendment be ordered by a show of hands.

I ask the Parliamentarians to take notice that it is not desired to have unanimous-consent agreements entered into for yeas-and-nays votes, but that the regular procedure will be followed.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Texas is always welcome, if I have anything to say.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have already mentioned that the oleo interests have increased their portion of the market from 15 percent in 1938 to more than 51 percent in 1958. Since 1958, the oleo interests have been taking over more of the market. The bill before the Senate is, I believe, one more effort by the oleo interests simply to take more and more of the spread market, as it is called.

What is the significance of S. 2168 to the American people? I have stressed a part of the argument. The country has, I firmly believe, a deep interest in providing the personnel of the U.S. Navy with the best diet available so as to keep our servicemen strong, healthy, and in fighting trim.

I believe that all medical sources and other sources indicate that the best food in the world is comprised of dairy products—butter, milk, and cheese.

Now I turn to the committee report. The Department of Navy informed the committee that the enactment of the bill would result "in no increased cost to the Government and that it could result in some savings." That argument was hit squarely today by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I shall not go into it further, except to say that if we are to regard our country in segments, and not realize that we are one people; that we are fixing on dairy products a ceiling; and if we are to proceed with this kind of reasoning, it means, probably, that someone has some interest in the oleo business.

How much saving would be made, no one states. It is not even estimated. In the Department's report to the committee, the Navy also indicated that it would "favor the enactment of S. 2168, provided section 2 is deleted."

In effect, the Navy would not even want to be guided by the permissive authority of the act, which would provide—and I quote from the committee report—

Except when the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, oleomargarine or margarine may not be used by

the Navy, if surplus butter stocks are available through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In other words, the Navy would like a free hand in utilizing oleo, perhaps in some cases for budgetary reasons alone, instead of following the traditional course of using the health-giving products of the farms, in the interest of those who serve in the Navy and in the public interest.

Mr. President, in summation, let me state that I firmly believe that in the interest of the health of the Navy personnel, the economic health of the dairy industry, and the general economy of the Nation, the pending bill should not be enacted. However, if there is any thought of enacting the bill, I definitely believe that the amendment which has been submitted should be adopted. I take that position in the interest of the welfare of all three parties concerned—namely, the consumers, the producers, and the general public itself, from the standpoint of the economy and the economics involved.

Mr. President, I have spoken rather hastily this evening; but I have made these remarks at this time because I understand that tomorrow only 1 hour will be allotted to our side, and that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] will consume a great deal of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS CONCERNING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS IN INDIANA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1119, Senate Resolution 258, authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings concerning unemployment problems in Indiana, be recommitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 25, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 6: 13: Therefore take the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

God of all grace, in these beshadowed days, when we are groping our way in the darkness of conflict and confusion, may we have the wisdom to commit and trust ourselves completely and unreservedly to Thy divine leading.

Grant that we may be alive and alert to the eternal truth that the God of righteousness is our refuge and fortress and that Thy love will never let us go.

Show us how we may strengthen the bond of unity among all the citizens of our beloved country and may it be strong enough to enable us to stand fast against the forces of evil which are seeking to destroy the foundations of our Republic.

May our minds and hearts be aglow with the enthusiasm and courage of lofty ideals and principles and inspire us with a faith that fulfills itself in faithfulness and a love that manifests itself in helpfulness.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12117. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1605. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9862) entitled "An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last

finishing," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 722) entitled "An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

MESSAGE OF DISAPPROVAL ON H.R. 7947—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

MAY 23, 1960.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: An error appears in my message of disapproval on H.R. 7947, a bill relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.

In the last sentence of the second paragraph of my message the word "purchases" should be inserted in lieu of the word "sells."

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE THE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND THE VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, 86th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee To Make the Necessary Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect and the Vice-President-Elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. HALLECK.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When standing in the well of the House I repeat the remarks of a Member previously published in the RECORD, am I entitled to reprint them if I pay for them?

The SPEAKER. Well, I think that would be a matter to take up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I had the Printer's ruling about it, and I just wondered where I should go to a court of appeals.

The SPEAKER. I think the Chair has answered that question.

HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BENT'S OLD FORT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill which would make Bent's Old Fort in Colorado a national historic site. This is not alone a question of the cost of some 160 acres of land to be purchased by the Federal Government and added to the site. The reason I am so strongly opposed is the fact that for all time the taxpayers of the Nation will be called upon to maintain and manage this site.

If, as contended by the proponents, this site should be maintained why should not the expense be borne by the State of Colorado? Why unload it upon all the taxpayers at a time when Congress is preparing to again boost the Federal debt which now stands at some \$290 billion?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add that I am surprised that the Department of the Interior, which is part of an administration that professes to be interested in economy and "belt tightening," supports this bill and many others of a similar nature which call for the spending of funds for projects which could be delayed until the finances of this Nation are put in order.

The situation demands more than lip-service on the part of all agencies and branches of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 1833, an identical bill to the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such lands, interests therein and improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national historic site at the site of Bent's Old Fort on the Old Santa Fe Trail, located in Otero County, Colorado, approximately seven miles east of La Junta, north of the Arkansas River.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate the historic role played by such fort in the opening of the West. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 6851, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODELL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment: On page 4, line 16, strike out "\$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "\$658,092,300"; and on page 5, line 8, insert "Provided further, That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 20, noes 71.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 294, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—110

Adair	Pino	Miller, Clem
Alger	Pord	Miller, N.Y.
Anfuso	Goodell	Minshall
Ayres	Griffin	O'Brien, N.Y.
Baldwin	Gross	Osmer
Barr	Gubser	Ostertag
Barry	Haley	Pillion
Bass, N.H.	Halpern	Pirnie
Bates	Harmon	Poff
Becker	Hays	Quile
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Ray
Berry	Hiestand	Reuss
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Holt	Riehlman
Bosch	Horan	Robison
Bow	Hosmer	St. George
Bray	Jackson	Santangelo
Brown, Ohio	Johansen	Saylor
Broyhill	Johnson, Colo.	Schenck
Budge	Jonas	Scherer
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Schwengel
Chamberlain	Kastenmeier	Short
Church	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Cohelan	Keogh	Springer
Collier	Laird	Stratton
Conte	Langen	Taber
Cramer	Latta	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Lindsay	Thomson, Wyo.
Curtis, Mass.	Lipscomb	Udall
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Utt
Derounian	McDonough	Wainwright
Derwinski	Mailliard	Weis
Devine	Meador	Westland
Dixon	Metcalf	Wharton
Dorn, N.Y.	Meyer	Wilson
Dulski	Michel	Younger
Feighan		

NAYS—294

Abbitt	Burke, Mass.	Fallon
Abernethy	Burleson	Farbstein
Addonizio	Byrne, Pa.	Fascell
Albert	Cahill	Fenton
Allen	Cannon	Fisher
Andersen, Minn.	Carnahan	Flood
Anderson, Mont.	Casey	Flynn
Andrews	Celler	Flynt
Arends	Chelf	Fogarty
Ashley	Chenoweth	Foley
Ashmore	Chipfield	Forand
Aspinall	Clark	Forrester
Auchincloss	Coad	Fountain
Avery	Coffin	Frazier
Balley	Colmer	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Cook	Friedel
Barden	Cooley	Fulton
Baring	Corbett	Gallagher
Barrett	Curtin	Garmatz
Bass, Tenn.	Daddario	Gary
Baumhart	Dague	Gathings
Beckworth	Daniels	Gavin
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	George
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Tenn.	Gialmo
Blitch	Dawson	Gilbert
Boggs	Delaney	Glenn
Bolling	Dent	Granahan
Bowles	Denton	Grant
Brademas	Diggs	Gray
Breeding	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Brook	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Dorn, S.C.	Griffiths
Brooks, Tex.	Dowdy	Hagen
Broomfield	Downing	Halleck
Brown, Ga.	Dwyer	Hardy
Brown, Mo.	Edmondson	Hargis
Burdick	Elliot, Ala.	Harris
Burke, Ky.	Elliot, Pa.	Harrison
	Everett	Healey
	Evins	Hechler

Hemphill	Martin	Roberts
Henderson	Mason	Rodino
Hoever	Matthews	Rogers, Colo.
Hoffman, Mich.	May	Rogers, Fla.
Hogan	Marrow	Rogers, Mass.
Holifield	Miller,	Rogers, Tex.
Holland	George P.	Rooney
Holtzman	Milliken	Roosevelt
Huddleston	Mills	Rostenkowski
Hull	Mitchell	Roush
Ikard	Moeller	Rutherford
Irwin	Monagan	Saund
Jarman	Montoya	Schneebell
Jennings	Moore	Selden
Jensen	Moorhead	Shelley
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Shipley
Johnson, Md.	Morris, N. Mex.	Sikes
Johnson, Wis.	Morris, Okla.	Simpson
Jones, Ala.	Morrison	Sisk
Jones, Mo.	Moss	Slack
Karsten	Moulder	Smith, Iowa
Karth	Multer	Smith, Kans.
Kasem	Mumma	Smith, Miss.
Kearns	Murphy	Smith, Va.
Kee	Murray	Staggers
Kelly	Natcher	Stubblefield
Kilday	Nelsen	Sullivan
Kilgore	Nix	Teague, Tex.
King, Calif.	Norblad	Teller
King, Utah	Norrell	Thomas
Kirwan	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Kitchin	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Kluczynski	O'Hara, Mich.	Thornberry
Knox	O'Konski	Toll
Kowalski	O'Neill	Tollefson
Kyl	Oliver	Trimble
Lafore	Passman	Tuck
Landrum	Patman	Ullman
Lane	Pelly	Vanik
Lankford	Perkins	Van Pelt
Lennon	Philbin	Van Zandt
Lesinski	Pilcher	Vinson
Levering	Poage	Wallhauser
Libonati	Porter	Walter
Loser	Powell	Wampler
McCormack	Preston	Watts
McDowell	Price	Weaver
McFall	Prokop	Whitener
McGinley	Pucinski	Whitten
McGovern	Quigley	Whitnall
McIntire	Rabaut	Wier
McMillan	Rains	Williams
McSweeney	Randall	Withrow
Macdonald	Reece, Tenn.	Wolf
Mack	Rees, Kans.	Wright
Madden	Rhodes, Pa.	Yates
Magnuson	Riley	Young
Mahon	Rivers, Alaska	Zablocki
Marshall	Rivers, S.C.	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander	Cederberg	Sheppard
Alford	Dooley	Siler
Bentley	Doyle	Spence
Blatnik	Durham	Steed
Boland	Hébert	Taylor
Bonner	Inouye	Thompson, La.
Boykin	Kilburn	Willis
Brewster	Machrowicz	Winstead
Buckley	Pfost	
Canfield	Scott	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Spence against.
Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Willis against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Steed against.
Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bentley with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Siler with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. CLEM MILLER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 18, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—388

Abbott	Dingell	Kelly
Abernethy	Dixon	Keogh
Adair	Donohue	Kilday
Addonizio	Dorn, N.Y.	Kilgore
Albert	Dorn, S.C.	King, Calif.
Alford	Dowdy	King, Utah
Allen	Downing	Kirwan
Andersen,	Dulski	Kitchin
Minn.	Dwyer	Kluczynski
Anderson,	Edmondson	Knox
Mont.	Elliott, Ala.	Kowalski
Andrews	Elliott, Pa.	Kyl
Anfuso	Everett	Lafare
Arends	Evins	Laird
Ashley	Fallon	Landrum
Ashmore	Farbstein	Lane
Aspinall	Fascell	Langen
Auchincloss	Feighan	Lankford
Avery	Fenton	Lennon
Ayres	Fino	Lesinski
Bailey	Fisher	Levering
Baker	Flood	Libonati
Baldwin	Flynn	Lindsay
Barden	Flynt	Lipscomb
Baring	Foley	Loser
Barr	Forand	McCormack
Barrett	Ford	McDonough
Barry	Forrester	McDowell
Bass, N.H.	Fountain	McFall
Bass, Tenn.	Frazier	McGinley
Bates	Frelinghuysen	McGovern
Baumhart	Friedel	McIntire
Becker	Fulton	McMillan
Beckworth	Gallagher	McSweeney
Belcher	Garmatz	Macdonald
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	Mack
Berry	Gathings	Madden
Betts	Gavin	Magnuson
Blitch	George	Mahon
Boggs	Gialmo	Mallard
Bolling	Gilbert	Marshall
Bolton	Glenn	Martin
Bosch	Granahan	Matthews
Bow	Grant	May
Bowles	Gray	Meador
Boykin	Green, Oreg.	Merron
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Metcalf
Bray	Griffin	Meyer
Breeding	Griffiths	Miller, Clem
Brock	Gubser	Miller,
Brooks, La.	Hagen	George, P.
Brooks, Tex.	Haley	Miller, N.Y.
Broomfield	Halleck	Milliken
Brown, Ga.	Halpern	Mills
Brown, Mo.	Hardy	Minshall
Brown, Ohio	Hargis	Mitchell
Broyhill	Harris	Moeller
Budge	Harrison	Monagan
Burdick	Hays	Montoya
Burke, Ky.	Healey	Moore
Burke, Mass.	Hechler	Moorhead
Burleson	Hemphill	Morgan
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Morris, N. Mex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Herlong	Morris, Okla.
Cahill	Hestand	Morrison
Cannon	Hoeven	Moss
Carnahan	Hogan	Moulder
Casey	Hollifield	Multer
Celler	Holland	Mumma
Chamberlain	Holt	Murphy
Chelf	Holtzman	Murray
Chenoweth	Horan	Natcher
Chiperfield	Hosmer	Nelsen
Church	Huddleston	Nix
Clark	Hull	Norblad
Coad	Ikard	Norrell
Coffin	Inouye	O'Brien, Ill.
Cohelan	Irwin	O'Brien, N.Y.
Colmer	Jackson	O'Hara, Ill.
Conter	Jarman	O'Hara, Mich.
Cook	Jennings	O'Konski
Cooley	Jensen	O'Neill
Corbett	Johansen	Oliver
Cramer	Johnson, Calif.	Osmers
Cunningham	Johnson, Colo.	Ostertag
Curtin	Johnson, Md.	Passman
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Wis.	Patman
Curtis, Mo.	Jonas	Pelly
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Dague	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Daniels	Judd	Pillcher
Davis, Ga.	Karsten	Pillion
Davis, Tenn.	Karh	Poage
Dawson	Kasem	Poff
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Porter
Dent	Kearns	Powell
Denton	Kee	Preston
Derounian	Keith	Price
Diggs		Prokop

Pucinski
Quile
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Randall
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
St. George
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer

Schneebell
Schwengel
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Simpson
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck

Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wainwright
Wailhauser
Walter
Wampler
Watts
Weaver
Wels
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wier
Williams
Wilson
Withrow
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—18

Alger
Bennett, Fla.
Collier
Derwinski
Devine
Goodell

Gross
Harmon
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Latta
McCulloch

Mason
Michel
Pirnie
Ray
Smith, Calif.
Taber

NOT VOTING—26

Alexander
Bentley
Blatnik
Boland
Bonner
Brewster
Buckley
Canfield
Cederberg
Dooley
Doyle
Durham
Fogarty
Hebert
Kilburn
Machrowicz
Pfost
Roosevelt

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bentley with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Dooley with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Siler with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Steed.

Mr. KEITH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight next Tuesday, May 31, to file a report on the bill H.R. 12381.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 536) providing for the consideration of H.R. 10128, a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and also yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 536 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10128, to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, to be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The educational finance problem in our Nation has been a concern since the end of World War II.

The interest and concern on the part of Congress was reflected by the enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874 in the 81st Congress. These laws were designed to assist local school districts to meet their education financing problem insofar as that problem was aggravated by the loss of State and local tax revenue as a result of Federal programs and activities in or near the local school districts. From time to time these two laws have been amended and their duration has been extended. During the second session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor, in reporting legislation to extend their duration, recognized the continuing and permanent responsibility of the Federal Government to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

Therefore, Public Laws 815 and 874, of the 81st Congress, were made permanent

legislation by the 85th Congress during its 2d session, insofar as they relate to so-called on-base children.

Subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor have conducted extensive investigations into the shortage of classrooms during the past decade. In three instances Federal participation in the financing of locally controlled education was recommended.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 86th Congress there were introduced a number of bills authorizing Federal assistance to the States for educational purposes. These were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Many bills followed the same school construction pattern adopted in legislation approved during the 84th and 85th Congresses. Others charted new paths, which provided for both school construction and teachers' salaries.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a draft bill (H.R. 4268) to authorize a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting the debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary and secondary public school facilities. This bill would cost the Federal Government about \$2.2 billion.

Beginning on February 5, 1959, hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on General Education. The subcommittee sat in open session 14 days.

State and school districts are making great sacrifices in order to construct adequate school facilities. In spite of this tremendous effort at State and local levels, according to data supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Nation's school systems had been short 140,500 classrooms at the beginning of the 1958 fall term.

Projections indicated further substantial increases in school enrollment, as well as an apparent leveling off in the rate of construction of new school facilities.

On June 8, 1959, H.R. 22 was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor. This was a bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by authorizing the appropriation of funds to the States to be used for the construction of school facilities and for teachers' salaries. H.R. 22, providing a 4-year program, would cost the Federal Government approximately \$4.5 billion.

When the 2d session of the 86th Congress convened, the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor began drafting legislation which would be confined strictly to providing assistance for school construction, which would authorize appropriations considerably more modest than those authorized by H.R. 22, and which would recognize the procedures recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The subcommittee had, as background for its deliberations, data from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicating that the shortage of classrooms at the beginning of the 1959 fall term amounted to 132,400. This represented a decrease in the shortage from the previous year of 9,500 rooms, or a reduction in the backlog of 6.7 percent.

Assuming that the decrease in the shortage each year continues at the 1959-60 rate, between 14 and 15 years would be required before the last school system eliminated the swing shift.

The data, however, indicate that school construction, which had been in an upward trend until 1957-58, fell off somewhat in 1958-59, and is expected to decline more sharply in 1959-60. Approximately 62,700 instruction rooms are scheduled for completion during the 1959-60 school year, a decrease of 7,300, or 10.4 percent, from the 70,000 completed in 1958 and 1959. Although 62,700 rooms are scheduled for completion in 1959-60, States estimate 41,000 rooms will be needed by the fall of 1960 just to provide for the annual enrollment increase of 1.2 million pupils, and another 17,000 rooms will be required to replace those which have been abandoned for various reasons, leaving but 3,700 classrooms to be applied against the backlog.

From the fall of 1956 to the fall of 1959, the unprecedented number of 210,730 classrooms have been constructed in the 50 States and the District of Columbia; yet during that same period of time the backlog has decreased by only 27,400 classrooms. Furthermore, at the beginning of the 1959-60 term, the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity in public elementary and secondary schools was 1,883,000, which was 1.8 percent more than the 1,850,000 pupils reported a year earlier.

The bill H.R. 10128, as amended, authorizes a maximum Federal appropriation of \$975 million over a 3-year period. It is estimated that the appropriation will finance the construction of about 25,000 classrooms. Through the matching provision, the bill is designed to stimulate and encourage the States to finance the cost of another 15,000 to 16,000 classrooms. These would be classrooms that would not otherwise be built.

It authorizes appropriations of \$325 million for each of fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963, amounts appropriated to remain available for 3 years.

Allotments to States are based on school-age population; once funds reach the State level they are deemed to be State funds. The State's allotment, if unpaid, remains available to it for 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 536.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of a bill that authorizes Federal financial assistance for school construction in the amount of \$975 million covering a period of 3 years.

Thomas Jefferson, a great American said:

The best government is the one which governs the least.

I fully subscribe to that philosophy and sincerely trust there are a sufficient number here who also believe in his philosophy.

I believe that the education of our children is the duty and responsibility

of the various States and subdivisions thereof, that the Federal Government should be removed as far as possible in the field of education. I predict now that if the bill presently before us is enacted into law that the next move will be for Federal financial assistance for school equipment, then Federal financial assistance for the payment of teachers' salaries. In fact, there is such a movement on now. Then we can also expect a movement for Federal financial assistance for the purpose of purchasing textbooks, and that could eventually mean what books are to be used. It has been my experience that when the Federal Government finances a program they have some control over it. That is true of everything in which the Government has a stake.

Within the past few years 17 new private and public schools have been built in my congressional district. Let me tell you how they were built. The new parochial schools were built because the people who were interested in having them went to work. Millions of dollars were raised by popular subscription. It is safe to say that many gave until it hurt. They were not looking to Washington for handouts.

The new public schools in my congressional district were built because the Parent-Teachers Association, the teachers themselves, the Lion Clubs, the Rotary Clubs, the public-spirited citizens rolled up their sleeves and put over a bond issue to finance the program. The people did this knowing their taxes would be raised and they were willing that they be raised. They were not looking to Washington for help. They knew the education of their children was a local responsibility.

Now, I ask you why these people who are paying higher taxes because they had the pride to build their own schools, should be obliged not only to pay for their own but be compelled to pay taxes for schools in other localities where the people did not have sufficient pride to build their own schools.

Some will say that many communities have reached the limit of their taxing powers. It is probably true that in some instances they have bonded themselves to the limit by building parks, swimming pools, boulevard lights, and so forth, when they should have been building classrooms.

Let me remind you that \$975 million is a lot of money especially when we do not have the money but must borrow it for future generations to pay back. I am certain that all are aware that our national debt is nearing \$285 billion, and that the annual interest on our national debt is approximately \$9 billion. These figures should make us stop and listen. It should make us think about tightening our belts. In the event we do not—there is only one course—and that is to raise the national debt again.

I do not believe that anyone present will deny that all the States are in a better financial condition than the Federal Government. Each day the newspapers carry stories that some particular State has a balanced budget. For

instance, the other day the Associated Press carried this story:

Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, said: "Today the 1960-61 budget will be balanced without increasing taxes."

Governor Nelson said in a prepared statement before both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature:

Unprecedented growth and prosperity in Wisconsin means a \$23 million deficit has been removed without increasing taxes.

Governor Nelson and the State Legislature of Wisconsin should be complimented.

I say that I am opposed to this bill, first, because the Federal Government does not have the money and would be obliged to borrow it for future generations to pay back; second, because all the States are better off financially than the Federal Government; third, because the education of our children should be considered a local responsibility; fourth, because it is the beginning of Federal financial assistance which will ultimately end in Federal financial assistance for teachers' salaries, school equipment, and textbooks; and fifth, because above all our schools should be free of Federal controls and domination.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that just yesterday the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, notified the Committee on Appropriations of the House that he would request legislation this session to increase the national debt limit to \$293 billion.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that request was acted upon today in the Ways and Means Committee and we have applied for a rule to bring it before the House.

Mr. ALLEN. I also thank the gentleman from Illinois for his observation. The fact is, and I do not think there is anyone who can dispute it or deny it, that every State in this Nation is better off financially than the Federal Government. We read many statements in the papers to this effect. I have an Associated Press dispatch before me now which states under the heading "Balanced Budget Predicted," that Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, said today that—

The 1960-61 State budget can be balanced without increasing taxes.

Unprecedented economic growth and prosperity in Wisconsin in 1959 means a \$23 million deficit has been removed, the chief executive said in a prepared talk to both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature.

That is true of nearly all the States, but still they come down here asking for Federal aid.

I have here a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am going to read it because it states my position exactly. It is from the American Farm Bureau Federation and is signed by the legislative director:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALLEN: The Farm Bureau is opposed to the passage of H.R. 10128

or any legislation to establish an expanded program of Federal aid to general education.

As farmers and ranchers we have a vital interest in our public school system. We recognize the importance of constantly improving public education; however, we are strongly opposed to expanded Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

The financing of general education is quite properly a State and local responsibility. An expanded Federal aid to education program would be a foot in the door toward a centrally controlled system of education. It is unrealistic to contend that the mere insertion in a bill of a pious clause disavowing any intention to authorize Federal control will prevent Federal encroachment. The greatest control available to the Federal Government is in its power to allocate funds. Federal aid means Federal control.

More than 680,000 new public elementary and secondary classrooms have been constructed since World War II. This represents almost 50 percent of such classrooms in use today. The so-called classroom shortage reported to be approximately 600,000 a few years ago has been reduced to 132,400. The national average teacher's salary is almost twice what it was 10 years ago in spite of a 43-percent increase in the total number of teachers. This phenomenal record of meeting school needs proves that State and local governments recognize the importance of and are financially able to meet school needs. Federal aid would result in slowing down the present rapid expansion of our educational facilities while local school districts waited for additional Federal aid.

Farm Bureau, with a membership of over 1,600,000 in 49 States and Puerto Rico, will continue to work at the State and local level for the improvement of our school facilities and for adequate pay for schoolteachers.

Federal intervention in this field would stymie local initiative in improving our schools, increase construction cost, and could very well result in fewer schools being built.

To transfer general education costs to the Federal Government would result in an increase in Federal taxes or a boost in the current national debt, thus feeding the fires of inflation. Either of these consequences would undermine our educational system and all other aspects of our economy.

We urge you to vote against all legislation to provide expanded Federal aid to general education.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the gentleman in favor of Federal aid to farmers? The gentleman mentioned them.

Mr. ALLEN. I have generally followed the Farm Bureau and the National Grange on farm questions.

Mr. BAILEY. And you are for appropriations to take care of agriculture?

Mr. ALLEN. As I say, I generally follow the Farm Bureau and the National Grange recommendations.

Mr. BAILEY. But not for boys and girls?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the rule makes in order an amendment which would provide for Federal assistance for parochial schools?

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman had better direct that inquiry to the Parliamentarian of the House. I am sure he knows more about that than I do.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I was intrigued by a question that was addressed to the gentleman a moment ago by the gentleman from West Virginia. I have no doubt but what this type of question will be heard several times today, and the implication will be that those of us who are opposed to this legislation are against the boys and girls. I think that is very unfair. There is not a man or woman in this House who does not have a real concern for all the problems of our boys and girls.

I would like to ask the gentleman or any Member of the House, for that matter, if the boys and girls are not a lot better off under the American system than they are in places all over this world where education is controlled by a central headquarters somewhere?

Mr. ALLEN. I would say that the gentleman has made a very accurate statement of fact on that matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe the gentleman from Illinois, who has made a very good statement to his views with reference to this bill did state, if I understood him correctly, that in his own home community of Galena his people had bonded themselves to build a rather expensive educational plant. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the provisions of this bill the people of Galena, who bonded themselves, and who have furnished their own money to build their own school facilities, will not only have to pay the taxes to meet those bonds as they fall due, as well as the interest thereon, but will be required to pay Federal taxes to furnish school construction for neighboring communities in which the people have failed or refused to bond themselves to take care of educating their own children? Is that a correct understanding of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. ALLEN. That is an excellent and a true statement.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, second to the problem of international peace, the most serious question this Nation must solve is the educational crisis facing millions of our American youth.

This Congress has been guilty of gross neglect and wanton disregard for the Nation's future security by sweeping this school legislation "under the rug" during the last several sessions.

Both political parties in their national platform in 1952 and 1956 advocated Federal aid for construction and expansion of school facilities throughout the country. President Eisenhower in two campaign speeches in 1952 said the Na-

tion needed 345,000 schoolrooms. The White House, after 7½ years, has refused to work for legislation to inaugurate this program. In fact, in the last session the Eisenhower leadership in the House, with the aid of some Democrats, defeated the so-called administration school bill by six votes.

On August 26 of last year, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming stated:

The number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees by classroom shortage is about 10 million.

How large is the present classroom shortage? For the past 4 years the U.S. Office of Education has compiled estimates of the shortages made by the Chief State School Officer in the various States. For these 4 years the estimating done by the State officers appear to be fairly consistent. The following are classroom shortage figures that have been reported to the USOE by the State school officers of 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Fall 1956.....	159,000
Fall 1957.....	142,300
Fall 1958.....	140,520
Fall 1959.....	131,600

This series of figures shows an average decline of only 9,130 classrooms annually over the past 3 years. At this rate it would take over 14 years to eliminate the present shortage of classrooms. To put it another way, many first-grade pupils who will next fall be crowded into inadequate classrooms will have either graduated from high school or dropped out of school before the first-grade room to which they are rightfully entitled is built. The education of a generation of children is being adversely affected by both the shortage of classrooms and the shortage of competent classroom teachers.

In April of 1960, the U.S. Department of Education in the so-called goals paper stated:

During the 5 school years from 1959 to 1964, construction of 416,600 classrooms are needed to take care of normal needs and to eliminate the backlog.

CLASSROOM TEACHERS

The NEA Research Division publication, in close cooperation with the departments of education in various States, have estimated the shortage of teachers on an annual basis. The latest of these reports estimates that the Nation's public and secondary school classrooms will be short approximately 135,000 classroom teachers in September 1960. Every major survey taken by the Department of Education and also the President's Special Commission of Education which has been made in recent years has pointed to the shortage of well qualified teachers as great deterrent to quality education for American children.

The Rockefeller Brothers' Fund Report on Education stated:

No educational system is better than its teachers. Yet we face severe problems both in supply of teachers at all levels and also as to their quality.

The report also said that this condition has existed and expanded since the start of World War II and recommended that Congress take prompt action to eliminate the shortage.

In a press release on May 24, 1959, accompanying the statement of the Presi-

dent's Science Advisory Committee Report, President Eisenhower said:

One subject discussed in this report warrants special emphasis—the importance of raising the standards of our teachers in their communities. Higher salaries is the first requirement. We need also to recognize the great importance of what teachers do and to accord them with encouragement, understanding, and recognition which will help to make the teaching profession attractive to increasing numbers of first-rate people.

SOVIETS

All tourist and officials who visit Russia agree that regardless of their backward economy in some fields the program of top education has been given priority. They have been graduating more scientists, technicians, and engineers than the United States for a number of years. The ratio is now about 3 to 1 in this branch of education. We are living in the scientific age of missiles, space, and modern production.

This next generation will condemn the leaders of today if we do not keep pace with this new age of science and economic expansion.

The remarks of Governor Hodges following the delegation of Governors touring Russia was:

We need to pay more attention to our professors and scientists and schoolteachers—seeing that they get the job done while at the same time seeing that they are adequately compensated, both in terms of money and respect, for their efforts. American education is important to national security.

Another important fact confronting school boards today is that they must spend \$148 in 1960 to buy what \$100 bought in 1950. This inflation factor requires an increase in school expenditures of \$2.92 billion in 1960 over 1950.

The financial plight in school construction in a great number of urban and industrial areas throughout the Nation has been brought on greatly by the Federal Government and not by the local citizens. Since the beginning of World War II, the Calumet region of Indiana has almost doubled in population. The city of Gary in my congressional district is an example of population expansion caused by thousands of defense and industrial workers coming from all sections of the country to work in steel mills and other factories. The city of Gary has expanded in population from 110,000 to almost 180,000 in 20 years. Its citizens have been struggling to build schools under a financial burden and increased school tax rate which has now reached the financial limit for the local taxpayers to meet the demand for additional classrooms. For a 6-year period during World War II, the cities and towns of this area were prevented from carrying on the necessary school construction by reason of the Federal Government's limitations on critical building materials. All permits for school construction had to receive a permit from the War Production Board in Washington, in control of materials for the war purposes.

This morning I received a telegram from Walter E. Wiley, director of research, Gary public schools, Gary, Ind. I hold in my hand this telegram which in a very brief statement, outlines the

critical school situation in but one of the numerous areas throughout the United States that are struggling with this educational problem.

Mr. Speaker, I under unanimous consent include Mr. Wiley's telegram with my remarks:

HON. CONGRESSMAN RAY MADDEN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The school city of Gary is in dire need of Federal assistance. There are many other communities in our Nation whose problems are as acute as ours. Therefore, we beseech you to use all the influence at your command in urging your fellow Congressmen to pass the present Federal education bill which is before Congress.

The following examples illustrate the seriousness of the financial plight of the school city of Gary:

1. The present total tax rate is \$9.62 per \$100 assessed valuation of property.

2. The present school tax rate for operation and capital outlay is \$5.05.

3. The sale of \$1,500,000 worth of bonds at tonight's meeting of our board of education will raise our bonded indebtedness to \$5,510,000 or within \$31,321 of the debt ceiling—by Indiana law—of \$5,451,321.

4. New bond payments and interest will necessitate an addition of 7½ cents to the present tax rate.

5. The tax rate will be increased, still, with the increase in enrollment, in September 1960, by 2,939 pupils, thereby necessitating additional teachers, supplies, equipment, nonlicensed personnel, and services. Number of schools built since 1956—15.

Number of classrooms and service rooms within these 15 schools, 381.

Number of classroom additions under construction, 37.

Number of buildings under construction, 2.

Number of classrooms and service areas within these two schools, 75.

Plans have been completed for 2 schools plus a 12-room addition to another school, 69.

Plans have been laid for the construction of 2 junior high schools to accommodate and enroll 2,700.

A total of 100 classrooms plus service areas will be needed for the two junior high schools.

Anticipated enrollment increase in all grades between the periods September 1959 to September 1965, 14,614.

At present we have approximately 9,000 pupils improperly housed, due to over capacity.

We are compelled to use 76 portable classrooms.

In addition to the portables, we are using 341 outmoded classroom facilities built between the years 1890 and 1930.

Respectfully submitted,

W. E. WILEY,
Director of Research.

In other cities and towns in my congressional district, such as Hammond, East Chicago, East Gary, Hobart, Griffith, Munster, Highland, Dyer, Crown Point, Schererville, Merrillville, Black Oak, and other areas, are suffering from this over population explosion.

The Committee on Education and Labor, both in the House and in the Senate, have held hearings and made investigations throughout the country in cities like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other population centers, and have found the same lack of educational facilities for millions of American school children.

I fully realize there are some congressional districts where this school crisis does not exist and I do hope that the Members representing these districts, in voting on this legislation, will use the same consideration that Members from other districts cooperate when their areas are stricken by drought, flood or other critical situations which need Federal cooperation and aid.

In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which sets out the critical school situation in Alabama as it pertains to financial problems. All Members should read this editorial.

Citizens in sparsely populated areas should remember that education is the greatest barrier we have against juvenile delinquency. Lack of school facilities is one of the greatest contributors to juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover, in a recent speech, stated that juvenile delinquency is increasing in the metropolitan areas throughout the Nation at an alarming rate. Juvenile delinquency and the crime which follows its expansion costs the American taxpayers upward from \$3 billion per year. This affects the taxpayers in every congressional district in the United States, whether a school crisis exists in that locality or otherwise.

I have in my hand, statistics released by the Selective Service of the U.S. Government, setting out an alarming percentage of disqualified Selective Service registrants because of being educationally deficient. These statistics were taken during World War II between November 1940 and December 1944. In 7 States of this Nation, the educational deficiencies ran as follows: 29.2 percent, 29.7 percent, 22.9 percent, 24.8 percent, 29.4 percent, 25.5 percent, and 28.9 percent. These were seven of the States that most neglected their State educational facilities. The seven States in the better brackets had an amazing low percentage of rejectees under the Selective Service with the following figures: 1.8 percent, 1.9 percent, 1.4 percent, 1.7 percent, 2.7 percent, 2.5 percent, and 2.3 percent. There must be some reason why millions of our youth in certain localities have such subnormal educational I.Q. that they cannot serve their Nation in any capacity in our military forces.

We are now launching into the scientific age, not only in preserving liberty and independence of our Government, but also in the economic competition with the communist world. For over a quarter of a century, the Soviets have stressed education as their number one program to succeed for world conquest. Our Nation has remained dormant and allowed our educational competition to lag. That is why Secretary Flemming stated that 10 million American boys and girls are today attending school under subnormal conditions. Now is the time for Congress to awaken the public of America that we must build an educational system second to none if the future generations of America meet modern scientific and education competition.

I hope this Federal aid legislation for improving the education of all American

children is enacted into law and signed by the President before this session adjourns.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. I think maybe the gentleman should consider this, that while, as the gentleman says, this town is deteriorating so much, still they are paying and willing to pay for their education.

Mr. MADDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. ALLEN. While, on the other hand, the gentleman's community, where they have moved in by the tens and hundreds of thousands with fine jobs, wants this Federal handout.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from Indiana would not yield. He raised the point that the city of Gary, Ind., I guess, had reached or come close to its debt limit. The question I wanted to ask, which was quite pertinent, was—when the debt limit had last been raised in that particular city. That is the same problem that might exist for other communities throughout the country. The Federal debt limit has been raised many times and there is going to come before the House next week or so a request that the debt ceiling at the Federal level be raised again. The issue here is—how best do we educate our children and not whether we do educate them. Anyone who attempts to put it on the basis of one side favoring educating the children and the other is not is just misrepresenting the facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the money in the bill that is before us would be used for school construction in the areas where a genuine school crisis exists, I could go along with it. But the hard fact is that under this bill, most of the money would go to areas where there is no such crisis as the gentleman from Indiana has described. I hope he will support amendments that will allocate the money only to those States or areas with demonstrated need and inadequate financial ability—that is, where a crisis exists that requires outside help. I cannot find justification for taxing all our people to send more money to those States that are taking good care of their children than will go to those States which, although they are trying their best, do not have enough resources, as is certainly the case in certain States, to be able to meet the need or reach the national average.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The method set forth in the bill to determine the need question is to let each State decide its needs and

its priorities. Is such local self-determination not a pretty good approach to the problem?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Arizona knows very well that if money is going to be handed out by the Federal Government, practically every State, whether it has a school crisis or not, is going to be here trying to get back the money, and more, that it sent to Washington. I have been in a dilemma on this problem ever since I first came to the Congress. I would like to give help where help is actually needed. But every time, in order supposedly to meet the genuine problems in certain areas, a bill is brought before the Congress that gives aid to all States whether they are in need or not. I do not think that is the way to meet the problem. Obviously, the more of our funds that we send to the areas without a crisis, the less there will be for the areas with a crisis. How can that do the job?

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily we do not cast negative votes against mere consideration of legislation, because to do so may prevent the passage of some good law that might be arrived at by amendment of the bill that is up for consideration. In the legislation before us today, however, the form of the bill that may come out of any legislative debate cannot be the basic issue that is to be decided. The basic issue is whether the Federal Government is to assume ultimately the responsibility of education in this country. We have approached this issue before, but never have we cast a final conclusive vote. Under the circumstances before us now, we are justified in voting to reject the unamended bill to show disapproval of the Federal Government assuming this new basic obligation of government. The existence of such legislation would be more important than its precise content.

I urge that we reject the idea of the Federal Government assuming this responsibility. I do this for a number of sound reasons.

The Constitution, of course, puts this responsibility in local hands; and, in all good faith with the people of the United States, we should not without democratically enacted constitutional amendment turn this power over to our Federal Government.

But aside from the constitutional reason, there is the danger that adding this substantial burden to the Central Government may be the straw that breaks the camel's back insofar as our national security and defense obligations are concerned. In my opinion, there is much left undone today in the field of adequate defense, and this is primarily because we are unwilling to spend and tax adequately even for this primary function of government. We have never really had an all-out program in intercontinental ballistics, space defense, and other tools of future warfare. We are not building enough Polaris submarines. Even our ground forces are using weapons which are outmoded and they are inadequate in numbers when their

counterparts across the Iron Curtain are realistically considered. We are not adequately handling many aspects of our defense. To assume a new multi-billion-dollar program of Federal Government in the face of inadequate handling of defense measures seems to me to be a very dangerous thing.

Another way in which our national defense will be endangered by the Federal Government taking over the educational system is by providing a centralized arm of government much more easily penetrated by enemy ideological and espionage agents than could ever be the case in our 50 and more existing educational systems.

It is folly to say that the Federal Government can finance a program of government without controlling it. It is fundamental that a government which takes the responsibility of financing work must ultimately control the nature of the governmental operations. Federal control would mean regimentation of thinking, and America would lose by this process the strength which now comes to the American scene from diversified points of view, best expressed in the motto on the front of our national seal, "E Pluribus Unum," or "From Many One."

Education is the last important function of government which will move to Washington if we pass this legislation. Almost every other consequential function of government has already moved here. This is a move away from democracy because here we each represent much larger segments of population than the State legislators and we are more remote from our constituents in daily contacts with them. If we relieve local leaders from the responsibility to act and lead in this field, we will be further stifling civic leadership at the grassroots.

Finally, there can be no truthful assertion that there is a need for nationwide financial assistance to schools from the Federal Government. Many localities are doing very well by their schools. Many States are doing very well by their schools. Others could do so if they would amend their laws or State constitutions. There are a few States, probably well under 10, where a very difficult situation exists from a financial standpoint. A measure limited to such States could solve all of the problems needed to be solved without the danger involved in the measure before us. It is my personal conclusion that we should defeat this legislation for these very adequate reasons.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] made a most eloquent and touching appeal, but he failed to mention some of the hard facts. Among them, his district's responsibility for its present situation; the State's freedom, until recently, from public debt.

The gentleman has a wonderful and prosperous community down around the south end of the lake, Lake Michigan, a lake which brings the district an unlimited supply of power water, shipping

from all over the world, as well as an opportunity for an unexcelled recreational area.

There is no doubt but that the community is prosperous, that its people are intelligent and industrious; that they are law abiding. It is extremely doubtful that they would take pride in being characterized as being dependent upon other States for educating their children, for asking any other community to pay for any program which they thought necessary to the welfare of the community.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] was born on the 25th day of February, 1892. He lived there, as I understand for many years, perhaps all of his life. He is thoroughly familiar with the needs of his people, with their financial situation—with that of his State. There is no doubt about that.

I was 17 years of age when he was born. It was my privilege for 16 of those years to live at Constantine, Mich., on the banks of the St. Joe River, not many miles from the home of the gentleman from Indiana. Even in those days, Chicago was not too far away, and on many occasions, I had opportunity to go through his district and the adjoining territory with which I have been familiar ever since that time. It is a wonderful community; sand dunes; recreational areas; prosperous industries. The country back behind the dunes is very fertile, black rich land where they can grow anything. Sure, the gentleman is eloquent in behalf of his people. Justly so. He is able. He is industrious. He is progressive and he is aggressive. He is my cotenant over in the Methodist Building and has been for years. Under Bishop Oxniam, how could he be otherwise?

I doubt very, very much that his people, though he certainly knows their attitude far better than do I, who are self-supporting, who are proud of their community, who are intelligent, would be greatly pleased to hear him ask that other communities assume an obligation which is rightfully theirs.

But the gentleman from Indiana does not tell you how the situation which he describes so emotionally, so eloquently, so appealingly, and which we will all admit, is regrettable, came to exist. Permit me to tell you.

Some great capitalists, men with money, thought they could make some more money, so they went down there at the end of the lake, and what did they do? Steel plants. You can hardly see the sun at noonday because of the smoke. Mile upon square mile is covered with mammoth factories, factories which are in production from sunup until sundown, turning out steel and other products. Mammoth concerns, busy concerns, making great profit because the workers are industrious, the equipment up to date, and all, both capitalists and workers, competent, and industrious. Management brought in people from all over the country, steelworkers. How did they get them? They paid them more money than anybody else could afford to

pay them. Business, industry, and the workers prospered, the community grew.

And today, as one flies over or drives through, he sees adequate highways, shopping communities, of which any city could well be proud, and industries continually in operation—a prosperous industrial community of which any State might well be proud.

And the gentleman comes here asking for a handout. The gentleman tells us they have thousands of children for whom they have no educational facilities. They have gymnasiums, they have tennis courts, they have bowling alleys, they have swimming pools, and they have Lake Michigan at their door. There would appear to be no reason why they should not have adequate schools. The gentleman and his constituents live in one of the world's most favored spots, it is one of the world's most industrious and profitable localities.

The gentleman has a big heart. He has a big heart not only for the residents of his own district, but I have often heard him speak, eloquently and persuasively, always convincingly, in behalf of other people in other parts of the world. I suspect, though I do not know, that he would liberalize our immigration laws, that he would bring in from wherever in the world that they might be, people less fortunate than are his own people.

However, I doubt the wisdom of asking his community, his constituents, to impoverish themselves to take care of others less fortunate. Perhaps his factories need more workers and, if they do, the community as a whole should be prepared to take care of them and their children. The members of the increased population to which the gentleman referred, many of whom came in from other communities, will naturally have children.

You cannot prevent them from having children. Thank heaven for that. They should be taught, educated.

But what about the rest of us? It has been years since I have had anyone going to school, but I have voted for every bond issue that has come along.

Why do you not tax these capitalists who make all that money out of the steel industry? Why not tax the workers in the factories and the owners of the factories whatever may be needed to educate the individuals of that community? Are all the liberals in the gentleman's district in favor of creating a burden, then letting the rest of us carry it? Do the gentleman's constituents lack a willingness—they certainly have the ability—to care for their own needs, pay their own way?

I guess they have three shifts down there now, I am not sure, but I remember the day when they had two 12-hour shifts in their industries, and I hope we never return to it. But the money those boys get. There is only one group of workers, the electricians, who get more. They get \$6 an hour, as I understand. The people of that district ought to pay to educate their own children.

But what does the gentleman want to do? After building up that community, providing an opportunity for the wealthy to get wealthier, for the worker to get ever more money, what do they do? They come along and they do not want to pay their own way, or, if they do want additional educational facilities, they do not expect to pay the bill themselves.

While we outside issue bonds and build our schools and pay our teachers, they spend their money in some other way—as is their privilege. But it is not their right to ask us to educate their children. Educators have forgotten all about the multiplication table and the alphabet. All they think about now is how they can get a free trip to the moon, recreate the universe, get something for nothing.

Look at the bill we had up here yesterday: \$30,000 in it for entertainment. Not long ago another bill with a million dollars for liquor. Is that part of education? We are teaching altogether too many things which are desirable but not necessary and are asking someone else to pay for it. Is it fair? Is it right? I say it is not.

We ask those who get small wages to elect, let us say, Congressmen who will give them more—oh, yes; I see my good friend from Chicago, the chairman of our committee, a wonderfully capable gentleman, always in favor of giving somebody else something more, which is generous. I am glad you are here. You will vote for this bill, sure; you will vote for every doggoned bill that requires somebody else or a future generation to pay for it. Is it right? Is it fair? Is it decent? We love our children, we love all the children in the country; we want to do everything we can for them except pay the bills which we create that we pass on to them—to future generations.

In a few days will come a bill to increase the amount which we can borrow to \$290 or \$295 billion. Why go through the farce of writing a bill limiting our national indebtedness? It seems to be apparent that we will borrow as long as anyone will lend, spend, get reelected, but Hopkins-like, pass on to someone in the dim and distant future payment of the debts we make.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it was farthest from my thought to get into such an argument as the one we have just been listening to. As chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, let me tell you that both the subcommittee and the general committee spent months in the consideration of this legislation. It is particularly written and tailored to receive House approval. The job that faces me and other proponents of this legislation today is to see that it is not muddled up from the introduction of a lot of side issues.

I have listened to the talk of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], about our being so hard up that we are going to have to raise the debt ceiling; and he was joined by my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

MASON], of the Ways and Means Committee, who said they were seeking a rule to make in order a bill lifting the national debt ceiling because we would be overdrawn by the end of the fiscal year if that were not done. Let me say to those gentlemen that I have seen them vote here on the floor of the House for the foreign aid program of \$4,088 million. Rather than up your debt let me suggest that we clip foreign aid a billion dollars. Vote for that.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is he saying I voted for the foreign aid bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I notice the gentleman has a guilty look about him; I will yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Is the gentleman saying I voted for the foreign aid bill?

Mr. BAILEY. You voted for the rule that made it possible.

Mr. ALLEN. No, I did not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman made a statement to the effect that a great length of time was spent in considering this bill. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that there were no hearings held on this bill before it was reported.

Mr. BAILEY. There have been hearings before the committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. When was the last time the gentleman's subcommittee held hearings?

Mr. BAILEY. We have held hearings in the field of school construction over the past 4 years and held hearings on H.R. 22 only last year.

There were plenty of hearings held. Our subcommittee spent weeks and weeks in the consideration of the drafting of this measure.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In view of the gentleman's statement concerning the consideration given to this bill, I believe it is incumbent to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that hearings were held in the last session—not this year—on the Murray-Metcalf bill. No hearings were held on this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman just does not want to understand, that is all.

The gentleman from Illinois quoted a letter from the National Farm Bureau in opposition to this legislation. I am sorry he did not also include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, because those three are the major part of the opposition to this legislation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the Record a list of national organizations that are supporting this legislation:

National Education Association.
AFL-CIO.
American Federation of Teachers.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
American Association of School Administrators.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
American Association of University Women.
National Farmers Union.

American Library Association.
National Classroom Teachers Association.

United Automobile Workers Union.
Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A.
National Child Labor Committee.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

Legislative Assembly, State of Oregon.
American Parents Association.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative for this time. I am impelled to comment upon the solid logic and the plain, hard facts as given by the Rules Committee member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. He hit straight and he hit home. His remarks, I believe, are very effective.

Mr. Speaker, quite to the contrary of popular opinion, this is not a school bill. This is not an education bill. This is a bill on behalf of the theory and philosophy of Federal aid—Federal aid to anything.

When we come to legislate in any committee, the first thing we should do is to examine the need, to find out if we have a need for the legislation. In accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], we have not held hearings in the last 2 years, during which time this whole picture of need has rapidly changed.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would like to call the attention of the Members to the fact that if they will go over to the desk and ask for a copy of hearings on this legislation, they will find there are none available. The statement of the gentleman is correct that there were no hearings held during this session. Hearings were held a year ago on a different bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HIESTAND. That is correct. And there is no basis of need in the bill. If we are going to legislate to aid somebody or something we should have a basis of need so that the assistance will go to the places, the districts and the people who need it. But there is nothing like that in this bill, which to me is a basic weakness. Whether we agree on the philosophy of Federal aid to education or not, certainly that, in my judgment, is a fatal weakness.

Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to the statistics in the minority report on this matter with reference to the basis of need. The trend has shifted. We are rapidly catching up with what was alleged to be need. There will always be some spots in the United States where they need more schools. It will vary from time to time as various districts catch up. I have one district in the fast-growing district that I represent that has 38 empty schoolrooms. They overbuilt a little bit, but they will catch up eventually. This lack of basis of need is fatal. This formula of distribution of funds in this bill is based upon the number of children of school age in the vari-

ous States and in various areas, regardless of whether there are schools that have a need or not.

We would take from the people either by direct or indirect taxes nearly one thousand million of consumer dollars to redistribute without regard to need.

Now, Mr. Speaker, cannot that just be called ridiculous? Is that a worthy bill, worthy of consideration by this House? Furthermore I asked the members of the subcommittee whether this was Federal aid in a temporary or an emergency or a permanent program. I could not get the answer. They dodged and twisted and turned and had to agree that it was a 2-year proposition. But, you and I know that once the camel's nose gets under the tent, even if it is for \$10,000, up she goes from there. Most of this money, of course, will be spread, most of the actual money, right in the very first year, because there are no matching funds. From there on it is matching funds. But, from then on, Mr. Speaker, these will be consumers' dollars rather than taxpayers' dollars, because we may balance the budget shortly, and the money will have to be raised by indirect taxation.

Now, may I direct your attention to the fact that in the district I represent in Los Angeles County there is a very large school bond issue coming up this fall. And, I have no doubt that there are a lot of school bond issues coming up in many of your districts throughout the United States. If we pass this bill, do you suppose those bond issues are going to carry? Oh, no; they are going to fall flat, and they are going to fall flat rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill and I oppose the rule, and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KASEM].

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I represent the district adjacent that of the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND] who just preceded me. Our districts are very similar in character. We have both enjoyed a tremendous growth rate in the last 10 years. I cannot give you the specifics as to his district, but there is a desperate need for school buildings as well as for money to pay teachers in my district, although we have a high level of income compared to the rest of the United States in general.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any single reason that I wanted to be elected to the Congress of the United States, it was to come here and work towards the principle of Federal aid to education, because I realize that in these modern times—and it has been so for decades—the children of the United States are our principal and capital assets. To say that it is a local responsibility or State responsibility or national responsibility to educate and care for the children is the purest sophistry that has no logical base. The question is not who has the responsibility, but it is who is able to bear the responsibility. Home owners cannot indefinitely be asked to increase the burdens on their properties, and that is essentially where it comes from

in our district in order to bear the cost of education. The cost of education is properly chargeable to the people in commerce, in industry, and it is chargeable on the ability-to-pay program, which inevitably draws the Federal Government into the area of responsibility. The responsibility is where the ability lies.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering a resolution which would permit this House to deal with legislation providing Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. It is my very honest opinion that we cannot deal with this problem unless we take into consideration the fact that one out every seven children in America today attends nonpublic schools. Later in the day I hope that an amendment will be offered which will provide a loan program for these private schools. Since I have reason to believe that a point of order might be raised, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York, the manager of this resolution, whether or not the Committee on Rules had in any way discussed or considered this particular aspect of this legislation: a proposal to provide a loan program for private schools in this legislation?

Mr. DELANEY. There was general discussion on many subjects in the Committee on Rules and there were a number of bills before the committee. We had the Metcalf bill, we had a Senate bill and we had the bill now before us, H.R. 10128. We granted a rule, H. Res. 538, which makes in order this bill. It is an open rule. I think the question the gentleman asked would have to be taken up with the Parliamentarian to determine whether or not it is germane to the bill before the House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for that explanation. I should like to ask one final question. Am I correct in assuming that the Committee on Rules did not reject an amendment, or suggestion that when the bill comes up for amendment, an amendment could be offered to provide the loan program for private schools?

Mr. DELANEY. Of course, that would have no bearing on what the Committee on Rules did. As I said, we discussed a number of things. I do not think it is of interest to the House to know just what happened in the Committee on Rules. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer his amendment and have the presiding officer rule on it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. I think this should be added, that we did not have any request before the committee waiving points of order. All who appeared before the committee asked for an open rule, which we granted.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, folks in Texas I strongly suspect are heartily opposed to Federal aid to education. At least, we were earlier sent a resolution from the State legislature, and the logic of that resolution, which all Texas Members received, is certainly appropriate today. Federal aid means Federal control. There is no Federal money. The money comes from the same pockets back home. There is no greater interest in children and in education than that of parents and local groups. Another Federal law changes nothing and in this case solves nothing.

Therefore, I personally am opposed to the bill. I hope we will vote down the rule and, if we pass the rule, that we will vote down the bill.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

Whereas the last few years have witnessed unprecedented growth in enrollment in the public school system of Texas, and it is estimated that there will be even greater growth in the future; and

Whereas enrollment in the public schools of Texas has increased 34.5 percent since 1941 and it is estimated that such enrollment will increase 74.6 percent between now and 1970; and

Whereas it is further estimated that more than 64,000 new classrooms at a total cost of at least \$1,928 million will be required to care for this increased enrollment and to replace obsolete facilities; and

Whereas although many school districts in the State will be able to secure necessary financing of such additional facilities through ordinary commercial channels, others—especially those hard hit by drought conditions and other adverse economic factors, and those which have already incurred large bonded indebtedness—will find it difficult if not impossible to secure necessary financing through these sources; and

Whereas school districts in such circumstances will necessarily look to some higher level of government for aid and assistance in meeting their needs; and

Whereas there is currently pending in Congress a bill providing Federal aid for school construction which would provide about \$19 million a year to Texas schools for the next 4 years—or a total of about \$76 million for the 4-year period; and

Whereas Federal aid in the form of grants and loans is almost inevitably accompanied by Federal control and direction which could result in Federal usurpation of the right of the citizens of Texas to maintain, control, operate, and support their own public schools; and

Whereas the Texas Legislature now has under consideration a proposal to create a statewide public school building authority which would provide for the issuance of some \$200 million in bonds to create a revolving fund which could be drawn upon by local school districts which cannot secure adequate financing for building construction through commercial loan services; and

Whereas this proposal, if adopted, would provide Texas school districts with more than twice the amount of aid called for to the current Federal proposal and would enable Texas schools to meet their building needs without accepting Federal assistance and control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, the Senate concurring, most urgently recommends that the Texas congressional delegation in Washington oppose the bills now under consideration which would provide Federal financial assistance to local school districts, whether for construction of classroom facilities, supplementing teachers' salaries, or for other similar purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

WAGGONER CARR,
Speaker of the House.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include a telegram from the president of the Congress of Parent-Teachers' Association of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to call to the attention of the Members a telegram which I have received from Mrs. Horace H. Johnson, president of the Pennsylvania Congress of Parents and Teachers. Mrs. Johnson lives in Bridgeville, Pa., near Pittsburgh, and the telegram was sent from a meeting of the congress which was being held in Philadelphia on the event of our consideration of the education bill in Congress.

The telegram is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 24, 1960.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As president of the Pennsylvania Congress of Parents and Teachers I respectfully request that this telegram be read on the floor of the House on Wednesday when Federal support for education is being debated and discussed.

The Pennsylvania Congress strongly favors Federal support for education as provided in the Senate bills, as amended by Senator CLARK, of our State. Our State congress joins the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in pressing for passage of a measure at this session of Congress which will provide Federal moneys to school construction and/or teachers' salaries. The great majority of our 2,500 local unit leaders express a concern for the need for Federal support to aid in financing educational programs in their communities. This is an appeal to the Congressmen from Pennsylvania to vote for a measure which will provide Federal support for construction and/or teachers' salaries.

Mrs. HORACE H. JOHNSON,
President, Pennsylvania Congress of
Parents and Teachers.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 151, noes 47.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 309, nays 97, not voting 26, as follows:

[Role No. 103]

YEAS—309

Adair	Fallon	Lennon
Addonizio	Farbstein	Lesinski
Albert	Fasell	Levering
Alford	Feighan	Libonati
Andersen,	Fenton	Lindsay
Minn.	Fino	Loser
Anderson,	Flood	McCormack
Mont.	Flynn	McDowell
Andrews	Fogarty	McFall
Anfuso	Foley	McGinley
Arends	Forand	McGovern
Ashley	Ford	McIntire
Aspinall	Fountain	Macdonald
Auchincloss	Frazier	Mack
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Madden
Bailey	Friedel	Magnuson
Baker	Fulton	Mahon
Baldwin	Gallagher	Mailliard
Baring	Garmatz	Martin
Barr	Gavin	Matthews
Barrett	George	May
Bass, N.H.	Gialmo	Meader
Bass, Tenn.	Gilbert	Merrow
Bates	Glenn	Metcalf
Becker	Granahan	Meyer
Beckworth	Grant	Miller, Clem
Belcher	Gray	Miller,
Bennett, Mich.	Green, Oreg.	George, P.
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Miller, N.Y.
Bolling	Griffin	Milliken
Bosch	Griffiths	Mills
Bowles	Gross	Mitchell
Brademas	Gubser	Moeller
Bray	Hagen	Monagan
Breeding	Halpern	Montoya
Brook	Hardy	Moore
Brooks, Tex.	Hargis	Moorhead
Broomfield	Harmon	Morgan
Brown, Mo.	Harris	Morris, N. Mex.
Burdick	Hays	Morris, Okla.
Burke, Ky.	Healey	Morrison
Burke, Mass.	Hechler	Moss
Byrne, Pa.	Heoven	Moulder
Cahill	Hogan	Multer
Cannon	Hollifield	Mumma
Carnahan	Holland	Murphy
Casey	Holt	Natcher
Celler	Holtzman	Nelsen
Chamberlain	Horan	Nix
Chelf	Hosmer	Norrell
Chenoweth	Huddleston	O'Brien, Ill.
Church	Hull	O'Brien, N.Y.
Clark	Ikard	O'Hara, Ill.
Coad	Inouye	O'Hara, Mich.
Coffin	Irwin	O'Konski
Cohelan	Jarman	O'Neill
Collier	Jennings	Oliver
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Osmers
Cook	Johnson, Colo.	Ostertag
Cooley	Johnson, Md.	Patman
Corbett	Johnson, Wis.	Pelly
Curtin	Jonas	Perkins
Curtis, Mass.	Jones, Ala.	Philbin
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Mo.	Pirnie
Daddario	Judd	Porter
Dague	Karsten	Powell
Daniels	Karth	Price
Davis, Tenn.	Kasem	Prokop
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Pucinski
Delaney	Kearns	Quigley
Dent	Kee	Rabaut
Denton	Keith	Rains
Derounian	Kelly	Randall
Derwinski	Keogh	Reece, Tenn.
Diggs	Kilday	Rees, Kans.
Dingell	Kilgore	Reuss
Dixon	King, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Donohue	King, Utah	Riehlman
Dorn, N.Y.	Kirwan	Rivers, Alaska
Downing	Kluczynski	Roberts
Dulski	Knox	Robison
Dwyer	Kowalski	Rodino
Edmondson	Kyl	Rogers, Colo.
Elliott, Ala.	Laird	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott, Pa.	Lane	Rogers, Mass.
Everett	Langen	Rooney
Evins	Lankford	

Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
St. George
Santangelo
Saund
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers

Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Wainwright

Wallhauser
Walter
Wampler
Watts
Weiss
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wier
Wilson
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—97

Abbutt
Abernethy
Alger
Allen
Ashmore
Avery
Barden
Baumbart
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Chipperfield
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Dorn, S.C.
Dowdy
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester

Gary
Gathings
Goodell
Haley
Halleck
Harrison
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson
Jensen
Johansen
Kitchin
Lafore
Landrum
Latta
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McMillan
McSweeney
Marshall
Mason
Michel
Minshall
Murray
Norblad
Passman
Pilcher

Pillion
Poage
Poff
Preston
Ray
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Short
Simpson
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Taber
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Weaver
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Withrow

NOT VOTING—26

Alexander
Barry
Bentley
Blatnik
Boland
Bonner
Brewster
Buckley
Canfield

Cederberg
Dooley
Doyle
Durham
Ehébert
Kilburn
Machrowicz
Pfost
Scott

Sheppard
Siler
Spence
Steed
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Willis
Winstead

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Dooley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tollefson with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Sheppard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10128, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I understand that inquiry has been made about the program for the rest of the week. I want to take this opportunity to advise the Members that if this bill is disposed of on tomorrow, and if there is no opportunity to bring up the bill H.R. 11761, there will be no further business for the balance of the week. In other words, we will complete consideration of this bill this week. It is the intention to meet on Friday so we can adjourn over until Tuesday rather than going from Thursday to Monday, which is May 30.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. What will happen to the two agricultural bills that were scheduled for consideration this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we dispose of this bill in time to bring up one of them, I should like to call up for consideration the Farmers Home Administration bill. The other one will go over until next week anyway. Maybe both of them will go over until next week. But if we complete this bill on tomorrow, and I imagine it will take a good part of tomorrow, and there is no time to consider one of these bills, it is our intention to have no more legislative business except, as I said, if there is time we will consider H.R. 11761. We do not intend to have any legislation up for consideration on Friday. We will meet only to adjourn so that we may go over until Tuesday rather than to adjourn from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I understand the majority leader has asked the House to convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. I already have that permission.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, for the third time within the last 4 years, I speak here on the floor of the House in behalf of a bill authorizing appropriations to assist the States in the construction of public school facilities.

The bill that I recommend to my colleagues today is a compromise bill. You might say that it is the result of 4 years of effort to draft language which can be supported by every Member of the House who believes that it is necessary for the Federal Government to participate in the effort to improve educational opportunities for our boys and girls.

Before going into a summary of the bill, I should like to discuss the problem and the approach we have made to it in this bill.

In the first place I do not believe there is any responsible citizen of this country

who does not believe that improvement is needed in our educational systems. In order to meet the challenge of the cold war, as well as the challenge of the future, we must make it possible to offer higher caliber educational opportunities to a greater number of boys and girls. To say that we believe this is almost as if we were to announce our opposition to sin.

Regardless of the cliches, better caliber education does cost more money; in fact, even if our quality of education were to remain static, the cost would rise as enrollment increases, so dollars become an important factor in improving education.

I, for one, am firmly convinced that the Federal Government has an interest in improving education. We have that interest because of our requirements for national security, and we have that responsibility because of the very high mobility of our population. There was once a time, perhaps, when the people of one section of the country just did not give a tinker's damn about the education offered in another section of the country. Even if that were ever true, it is no longer the case. So the only way in which citizens in one area may express an interest in the educational opportunities of another area, is through the Federal Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not noted for having a pleasant disposition, and today it is especially bad, and I just want to tell the gentleman that I am going to hang around today and see that we have a quorum in order that the gentleman can be heard.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. You are a gentleman and a scholar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You deserve it.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, we have in this great land of ours a long tradition that education is controlled at the local level. Therefore, no one is about to suggest that the Federal Government express its interest in improved educational opportunities by imposing standards, by determining curricula, by determining teacher qualifications, and so on and so forth.

That leaves to the Federal Government only one avenue of assistance in upgrading educational opportunities, and that is by utilization of its broader tax base to provide the necessary funds.

Therefore, we come to the number of dollars which the Federal Government shall contribute; the purpose for which they will be contributed, and the duration of Federal participation, as the issues to be resolved. Broadly speaking, advocates of Federal participation fall into two major groups: One, those who feel that the Federal dollar should be used for the broadest possible support of education; and, two, those who feel that the Federal Government should be limited to what our colleague from Pennsylvania refers to as "brick and mortar."

Many who recognize the need for Federal participation—such as the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—have expressed the fear that if the Federal dollar is used for the payment of salaries of teachers, the risk of Federal control is too great. They subscribe to the theory that if the Federal Government assists in financing the cost of classroom construction, it will release additional State and local dollars to be used to pay higher teachers' salaries and for other educational costs. Furthermore, these folks believe that the best way to express the Federal responsibility is to get in now and get out quickly.

So, we have a bill which is confined to classroom construction assistance, and one that has the Federal Government getting out within 3 years; except for those States, if any, who choose the administration's debt retirement option.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that some of us have an additional feeling that if we can afford to spend millions of dollars building classrooms all over the world, we can also afford to spend some money for the same purpose here at home. I am advised that the current foreign aid appropriations bill contains something over \$41 million in new money for educational purposes. This does not include an item of \$20 million in the children's fund which is mostly educational. During recent years, we have spent over \$100 million on education in the rest of the world, but not \$1 to provide much needed classrooms in the United States except under Public Law 815, which, in part, is a payment in lieu of taxes.

Now what is the need, if any, for Federal assistance for classroom construction? As was indicated in the majority report, this bill was drafted with the 1959 survey on enrollment, teachers, and school housing as a basis. This is a survey conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department obtains its information from the people who have the most knowledge of conditions in the States—the chief State school officers.

Through the years it has been a favorite pastime of many to play a "numbers game" with these annual surveys. Admittedly, they are not precise data, but if they are reviewed in the proper light, they become very persuasive, and, they do, in fact, clearly reflect trends.

The General Education Subcommittee, which has primary jurisdiction over this legislation within the Committee on Education and Labor, has been dealing with these surveys for a number of years. It is our considered conclusion that if the estimates submitted by the chief State school officers of needed classroom construction within the individual States have erred, they have done so on the conservative side. Furthermore, some of the data included in the fall survey are not subject to estimation, but are readily determinable. The data to which I refer are the figures on classrooms built and those on pupil enrollment. It is extremely significant to note that from the fall of 1956 to the fall of 1959, 210,730 classrooms have been constructed in the

50 States and the District of Columbia, and yet, as of last September, the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity was 1,883,000.

This clearly indicates that the States and local communities are making a tremendous effort to provide the classrooms necessary to educate our boys and girls, but they are falling short by more than 50,000 as of this school year.

The bill, H.R. 10128, provided the maximum amount of Federal and State dollars are used, will construct between 40,000 and 41,000 classrooms.

We have another yardstick against which to measure the data submitted by the Department, and that is the experience under Public Laws 815 and 874. These two programs operate in every State in the Union. On the basis of the final applications for current year entitlement submitted by about 75 percent of the participating school districts, we find that enrollment of Federally connected children has increased during the present school year by 8 percent from the 1958-59 school year, and that the cost per pupil has risen by 8 percent. I should point out that the per pupil cost under Public Law 874 is tied directly to the per pupil expenditures by the States and local communities. I believe this proves conclusively that the States and local communities will find it increasingly difficult to do more than try to keep pace with the rising tide of enrollment.

The favorite phase of the annual survey, which those who play the numbers game seize upon are the statistics relating to the obsolescent classrooms. The numbers game people would have us believe that some sinister plot exists to declare obsolete any schoolhouse that is somewhat less sumptuous than the most recently constructed luxury hotel on the Florida gold coast. Yet we find that time and again even our most modern school buildings fall short of being adequate. We have seen a prime example under our very noses. Recently an elementary school at West Lanham Hills in Prince Georges County, Md., burned. Fortunately, the fire occurred at night when not one of the 600 pupils was in the building. The building was constructed in 1952. The Washington Evening Star for Thursday, March 24, in a page 1 news item had this to say:

County Fire Marshal Lawrence R. Woltz said if the school had been equipped with the proper number of firestops—areas insulated with sheetrock—the damage would have been confined to a much smaller area. He said that the county building code calls for firestops, but it has not been enforced.

Just last month architects told school officers that if the code was rigidly enforced, the cost of schools would rise 10 to 15 percent.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, not one life was lost in that fire, but I believe it points up the manner in which local school officials have been forced to cut corners to stretch the school dollar just as far as it possibly will go.

Let me give you one other example. One evening late last fall, at about 6:30, in Salt Lake City, Utah, a young mother came to the schoolhouse to pick up her 6-year-old daughter. Driving slowly,

she turned a corner and ran over a 9-year-old boy coming home from this same schoolhouse on his bicycle. The boy died. This tragedy happened because the 9-year-old boy and the 6-year-old girl were attending school on a swing shift, and during many months of the school year, the schoolday closed after darkness had fallen.

Do we dare, Mr. Chairman, to beguile ourselves with doctrinaire arguments and the numbers game when newspapers remind us that the lives of children—the same little children we expect to lead us tomorrow—are endangered? I think not. Mr. Chairman, before going into the summary of the bill itself, I should like to discuss one other survey made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I refer to the survey of public school classroom shortages in the fall of 1959 in borrowed-up districts.

This survey showed that in 237 borrowed-up districts there was a classroom shortage of 3,056. Now, these data would tend to indicate that the problem of classroom shortage in school districts unable to finance new construction is very small.

The Department itself admitted that its definition of a borrowed-up district was narrow and restricted. It further admonished that only a small part of the problem of financing school construction is measured by the survey—the first such survey that has ever been undertaken. Furthermore, the Department is conducting a new survey in somewhat more detail in an attempt to determine the number of school districts where the issuance of new bonds is a practical as well as a legal impossibility.

I think I should need only to point out that in my own State of West Virginia, there are at least seven counties which, under the narrow limitations of the survey conducted in February of this year, would be shown to have borrowing capacity, but whose borrowing capacity amounted to \$25,000 or less. In the fall of 1957, the Subcommittee on General Education submitted a questionnaire to each of the school districts in the county that has participated in Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. School district after school district reported that when they had used up 75 to 80 percent of their legal debt limit, it became a practical impossibility to market construction bonds.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill is not limited to the narrow purpose of providing classrooms only to those areas where there remains no more bonding capacity and where there exists a shortage of classrooms.

The goal of this bill, as well as the program recommended by the administration, is not only to accomplish this purpose, but to provide some assistance that will in turn release to the local community tax dollars for teachers' salaries.

This bill, H.R. 10128, is a modest bill. The annual appropriation of 325 million is the amount the President recommended himself in 1957. We have compromised conflicting ideologies within the subcommittee by having it a straight grant for the first year, and by providing

for matching for the second and third year; also during the second and third year, we have given to the States the option of a capital grant or of debt retirement assistance. I might point out that this is the big area of compromise between the majority members of the committee and the administration.

The number of classrooms to be constructed under this bill is between 40 and 41 thousand, somewhat less than the number required to take care of the excess enrollment at the beginning of 1959, so that however you play the "numbers game," the bill is aimed most directly at the shortage that may be most accurately measured. Moreover, we have provided in the bill that the State education agency will make reports to the Commissioner annually with respect to the progress of construction of school facilities on forms to be provided by the Commissioner, and we require that the Commissioner shall report these data to the Congress. In this way we believe we can determine accurately whether this bill is adequate or inadequate.

This is a good bill, and if we pass it, I am confident we can reach an early agreement with the other body, and I believe that its modesty will act in its favor at the White House.

In February 1960 during hearings on the mutual security bill, Mrs. CHURCH asked—page 20, part 1 of hearings:

What is the whole amount in the proposed bill for educational purposes?

Agency supplied the following information—page 34:

In addition to the \$20 million program for education and training in tropical Africa, the proposed fiscal year 1961 programs include \$41,955,000 in the field of education per se. This amount is made up of \$31,676,000 under the bilateral technical cooperation program; \$7,519,000 under special assistance; and \$2,760,000 under defense support.

It could be said that the entire technical cooperation program for which \$206,500,000 is requested, is "education," in that it is primarily a program of exchange of knowledge. On this basis, the total for education and training in the fiscal year 1961 request is \$236,779,000.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Briefly.

Mr. DENT. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the present amended Mutual Security Act counterpart funds owed to the United States by debtor nations are forgiven if that country uses said funds for educational purposes or loans them to other underdeveloped nations for educational purposes?

Mr. BAILEY. Provided they are allowed to engage in other improvements of a local character. What I am trying to say is that it is not confined alone to education. They can use it for educational purposes but there are other purposes for which they are permitted to use it.

Mr. DENT. The main point that I am trying to make is that the debts are forgiven if they use the money for educational purposes; and these debts represent American taxpayer dollars.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, let me make this observation. During recent years we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on education in the rest of the world but not one dollar to provide much needed classrooms in these United States, except under Public Law 815 which in part is for payment in lieu of taxes.

May I remind you that I was the sponsor of Public Law 815. I know before the afternoon's debate is over somebody is going to say to the members of the Committee that it is a bad precedent for the Federal Government to get into the field of local educational matters. They say it is a bad precedent.

Let me remind the Members of the House today that in 1836 during the second administration of Andrew Jackson the Congress of the United States found itself with \$47 million surplus in the Treasury. Do you know what the Congress did at that time? They passed legislation and they passed an appropriation distributing that money to the 38 States then members of the Union for the purpose of building school buildings. Every one of the 38 States took the money and built school buildings with it, and they did not destroy the National Constitution and they did not destroy the American way of life. The passage of this legislation today to build some classrooms will not destroy our Constitution nor destroy the American way of life.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the gentleman the thought in his mind that we will ever have a surplus in the Federal Government again?

Mr. BAILEY. We claimed to have money at the end of the last fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but I mean actually, does the gentleman think we will ever have any loose money?

Mr. BAILEY. I have never seen a balanced budget in the 14 years I have been in Congress, actually balanced. If I stay here 14 years more I do not expect to see one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you would cut out some of the things that you folks are competing for we might have one.

Mr. BAILEY. There the gentleman and I can agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to give my distinguished colleague 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman care to discuss section 4(d) at this time, or would he prefer to have the discussion of that feature delayed until the general debate has gone on further?

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure the author of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], who will be

called on shortly, will give the gentleman the details. I am not prepared to analyze the bill section by section.

I would like to mention one other point. I mentioned previously the question of setting a precedent. How many Members of the House or of the committee, may I inquire, have any idea that under Public Law 815, the construction act of which the gentleman from California who addressed the House during the consideration of the rule is one of the largest beneficiaries. And I am talking now about Public Law 815. The gentleman from California is inclined to get money out of the Federal Treasury under Public Law 815 for those districts, and let me say that California got \$37 million under the bill last year, and a good, big part of it went to the gentleman's district and, yet, he will not support general classroom construction.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield, yes; but I do not want an argument. I yield to the gentleman for an answer.

Mr. HIESTAND. I will say, since the gentleman has pointed me out, I appreciate his position, but we are not asking for any more money in those areas. In fact, I do not think we need any more money at all.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to know the gentleman is in the midst of prosperity.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in support of the administration bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious already that this subject we are discussing today is one in which there are sharp differences of opinion. Certainly, I will not attempt to resolve those differences. At the outset, I should like to make my own position clear.

I am very much in favor of a reasonable Federal program of assistance to help to build needed classrooms. Without any question there is a continuing and pressing need for such classrooms. That need, in my opinion, justifies an emergency Federal program to meet this shortage. I realize, of course, these questions of what constitutes an emergency and how long the program should be, are ones which cannot be resolved simply. In my opinion, if we do enact legislation and the shortage of classrooms is thereby substantially reduced, the emergency will cease and the need for a continuation of the program will be eliminated.

I feel a Federal program should be adequate in scope and the money should be allocated where it will be most useful. It should be developed along lines which are consistent with sound fiscal policy. For that reason I am very strongly in favor of the proposals of the administration in this area.

These proposals are incorporated in two bills, H.R. 11122, which I introduced on March 11, and H.R. 12259, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS]. In my opinion, these bills, if enacted, would provide a far less expensive way for the Federal Gov-

ernment to give assistance, and would build far more schools than the bill which we are presently considering. An estimated 75,000 classrooms could be built under this program as compared with a total of something over 40,000 under the committee bill.

If those of us who favor the administration approach are not successful in prevailing on this body to accept those ideas, I feel strongly that the committee bill should be tightened. I am often asked what sort of a bill this is that the committee has approved. What does it provide? How does it compare with the bills defeated on the House floor in 1956 and 1957? I am also asked along a slightly different vein how good a bill is this? How effective will it be? How might it be improved?

For me, the best way to provide any serious evaluation of the bill is to review previous efforts which have been made to develop school construction legislation. A brief, and of necessity oversimplified, recapitulation will reveal, among other things, that the present sharp disagreement regarding the Federal Government's responsibilities in this area is nothing new. Neither are we discussing for the first time the difficulty of developing a specific program, even though a majority unquestionably favors some form of assistance. Indeed, we must admit, disagreement on such points has led us previously to deadlock and defeat.

Many of us will recall that H.R. 7535 was defeated by a vote of 194 to 224 on July 5, 1956. Just over a year later, on July 25, 1957, H.R. 1 was defeated by the narrow margin of 208-203. Both these bills were commonly known by the name of their sponsor, the popular and respected gentleman from Pennsylvania, the late Augustus Kelley. I trust that in our present deliberations that the reasons for defeat of these bills can be examined, and a similar result avoided this year.

The Kelley bills had evolved slowly over a period of years and after the accumulation of considerable testimony. I was first assigned to the Education and Labor Committee back in January 1953, at a time when a new Republican President and the 83d Republican-controlled Congress were assuming historic new responsibilities. Our initial efforts as a committee under the inspired leadership of Mr. McConnell as chairman, were aimed first at the knotty question of amending the Taft-Hartley law.

A special subcommittee on education was established in the 83d Congress. It was headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], presently our distinguished ranking Republican and always a source of strength on educational matters. In December 1954, that subcommittee, of which I was a member, unanimously recommended that Congress promptly take steps the following year to enact Federal legislation "to encourage State and local efforts" to meet the construction problem. "Care must be taken," this report continued, "to avoid any possibility of Federal control over local school systems, or any tendency for Federal action to supplement State and local efforts."

In January 1955 President Eisenhower in the State of the Union message called attention to "grave educational problems" and "an unprecedented classroom shortage." The next month he sent an historic special message on education to Congress. I say historic advisedly for no President ever before had specifically addressed himself to this subject. Specific recommendations were made for Federal action to meet an "emergency" shortage of classrooms. These formed the basis for legislation which was developed some time later.

Just prior to this message, I might say, the other body through its Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had begun hearings, presumably aimed at shaping legislation. Mrs. Oveta Hobby, the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was sharply questioned regarding her views, even before she could finish advising the President as to the kind of program he should recommend to Congress. The able Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL, then as now was keenly interested in these matters.

Regrettably, however, nothing came of these early activities of the other body. It was the House Committee on Education and Labor which in the following years took the initiative. Bills were approved in the field of school construction, and legislation developed which resulted in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Indeed, it was not until February 4, 1960, that the Senate again seized the initiative by passing S. 8.

We all know in a general way at least that this proposal, if enacted, would authorize a 2-year broad program of aid, costing some \$1.8 billion, available both to build schools and to pay teachers. Despite this vote I have been unable to detect, either now or previously, much enthusiasm for this approach to an admittedly difficult question, that of developing an appropriate Federal role in strengthening our educational system.

While on the subject of S. 8, I might remind my colleagues that this bill was passed by a vote of 51 to 34. That would seem to reflect the opinion of a substantial majority of the other body, not only that something should be done, but also what the specific program should be. Efforts to restrict S. 8 so as to provide aid only in the building of schools were beaten off. Partly perhaps because of the strenuous activities of organizations representing teachers, Federal funds were specifically to be made available to help improve teachers' salaries.

This reference to S. 8 leads logically, though not chronologically, to H.R. 22. This bill was approved by our Committee on Education and Labor on June 8, 1959. It is more familiarly known by the names of its two distinguished sponsors from Montana, Senator MURRAY and Mr. METCALF, the latter for several years an able member of our Education and Labor Committee. This bill incidentally was discussed, along with H.R. 10128, by the Rules Committee only last week.

As the committee report on H.R. 10128 reveals, though somewhat cryptically, H.R. 22 has certain weaknesses. The bill

apparently has flaws which would make its consideration by the House less likely to be successful than a more modest program. Those who had reported the bill favorably in June 1959 admitted, on page 7 of the present committee report, that by September it has become apparent that a bill as broad in scope as H.R. 22 would not be considered by the House of Representatives. It was for that reason that the bill we are presently discussing was developed.

Nonetheless it must be recognized that H.R. 22 is closer to the provisions of S. 8 than to H.R. 10128. Both bills involve large expenditures with few strings. In both, Federal funds can be used to pay teachers' salaries. Efforts may easily be made to broaden H.R. 10128 along the lines of H.R. 22. I trust that will not succeed. Excessive broadening of this bill could weaken its chances for enactment. What we need is not a scatter shot approach but a carefully defined Federal program.

H.R. 22, despite weaknesses, is one of the relatively few major current proposals for providing Federal aid. For that reason, perhaps, it should be described briefly. Even though apparently abandoned by many of its sponsors, its provisions may give us perspective. H.R. 22 as originally introduced would provide an estimated \$4.4 billion annually for four years in Federal grants, allocated on the basis of school-age population. In committee the annual cost was reduced to \$1.1 billion annually. No State matching of Federal grants was required, and the funds could be used by States for school construction or teachers' salaries. It can be argued that a broad diffusion of dollars such as envisaged in H.R. 22, without any attempt to define areas of need, would not result in an effective Federal program.

For those Members who were not here in 1956 and 1957, it should be noted that H.R. 22 abandons the legislative approach attempted in those years. The bills developed then sought to "pinpoint" aid to needy school districts. On both those earlier occasions, and now in H.R. 10128, the only aim has been to help build needed classrooms, not to subsidize teachers. All these bills differ also from H.R. 22 in their recognition of the value of matching Federal funds.

Perhaps a brief summary of the Kelley bills would be in order at this point. In 1956, H.R. 7535 provided for \$400 million for each of 4 years, allocated on the basis of school-age population. In addition, provision was made for the purchase of school bonds under certain circumstances, from a revolving fund of \$750 million. There was also to be a Federal contribution totaling \$150 million to a reserve fund equal to a year's principal and interest on local school bonds.

In 1957, H.R. 1 would have authorized a 5-year program, with a total of \$1.5 billion in grants to States on a dollar-matching basis. The allocation was to be made half on the basis of school-age population, and half on the basis of a State's per capita income and its effort to meet school needs. Once again pro-

vision was made for a \$750 million revolving fund, and \$150 million to improve the credit of State construction agencies.

This hasty recapitulation, I hope, indicates the type of programs actively considered in previous years. Both Kelley bills bear certain similarities to H.R. 10128. Nonetheless there are dissimilarities too.

For instance, no provision is now being made for the direct purchase of bonds. Instead of setting up a reserve to bolster the credit of locally issued bonds, the Federal Government is now agreeing, if any State so elects, to pay half of the principal and interest on certain bonds as they come due.

This brings me to the crucial questions. "How effective a bill is this? How could it be improved?" As has already been said, H.R. 10128 has much of the same kind of appeal as previous school construction bills. Appeal may not be quite the right word, but at least a program such as this might accelerate needed classroom construction.

In my personal opinion, however, other programs might be more effective, and less costly, than that contemplated in H.R. 10128. Federal grants-in-aid may not be the best way for Washington to lend a hand. I say this recognizing fully that President Eisenhower has in the past advocated this method of providing assistance. The administration's current recommendations, embodied in my bill, H.R. 11122, and Mr. KEARNS' bill, H.R. 12259, may provide far more help in building classrooms at far less annual cost.

The administration proposals would advocate over a 20- to 30-year period the expenditure of something over \$2 billion of Federal money. This would be provided to States to help pay one-half of the annual principal and interest on a total of \$3 billion of local school bonds. Under this program the impact on the budget would be far less than a direct capital grant program such as we are considering in H.R. 10128.

In the initial year, for instance, it is estimated that only \$5 million would be needed. At the end of 5 years when the maximum expenditure will be contemplated no more than \$90 million would be required.

The amounts allocated would be based on a combination of three factors: The relative income per child of school age in each State, the relative number of public school children in that State, and the relative financial effort for school purposes made by the State.

The allocation thus made would be reduced by the percentage, if any, that the State school effort index was less than the national index. A State school effort index, I might add, would be determined on the basis of the ratio of school expenditure per child in average daily attendance in public elementary or secondary schools to the State's income per child of school age.

This proposal would require a State plan which would restrict Federal grants to those local educational agencies which undertook to exert a reasonable

tax effort in financing their own school construction needs, and which would still be unable to finance their own school buildings even if they exerted this reasonable tax effort and fully utilized resources from all sources to pay the principal and interest on school bonds.

The plan would set forth standards of procedures for determining what a reasonable tax effort would be for each local educational agency. The highest priority would be given to those local school districts which would be least able to finance the full cost of urgently needed school facilities.

That, very briefly, is the basic approach of the administration's recommendations. However, as a practical matter, we must admit that Federal grants are a traditional form of assistance. Therefore, regrettably, the alternative which I favor may not be accepted. If that should be the case, it seems to me that H.R. 10128 very definitely needs improvement.

In the first place, the allocation of funds now proposed is simply on the basis of school age population. In other words, a State will receive an allocation based simply on the number of children of school age residing in the State as compared to the total in the Nation. In my opinion, the per capita income of a State should also be considered in any allocation of funds.

An even more serious weakness of the committee bill is its failure to provide for any matching by the States of Federal funds until the second year of the program. It is my hope to offer an amendment to provide for immediate matching. This is a valid and generally accepted principle which, as I have indicated, has been incorporated in bills considered by this body in 1956 and 1957. Matching of Federal grants is almost universally accepted as a reasonable way for the Federal Government to provide assistance. The recipient benefits from this encouragement of additional assistance from other levels of government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that unless the administration bill, so-called, which he referred to, is approved anything else would be unacceptable? Is that the term the gentleman used?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I can only reply to the gentleman by stating that I speak for myself and I assume the gentleman is speaking of my position.

I voted favorably on H.R. 10128 in the committee. If I have no alternative, I would certainly accept the basic provisions of the committee bill. However, I will try to improve those provisions.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman said he was talking about the administration bill, and I got the impression you take the administration bill or nothing. Was I wrong about that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would accept a bill along these lines.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 10128, is in its very essence as simple, uncomplicated, and unadorned a bill as those of us who have been struggling with this problem for a number of years can design.

Briefly, it provides for the expenditure of \$325 million a year for each of the next 3 fiscal years. The allocation is on the basis of the school-age population of the States; that is, the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 years in those States, and the proportion in the State to the proportion in the Nation. The bill calls for matching in the second and third years, and in the first year for direct grants of each State's allocation. This was done after considerable thought relating to the problems of the States which have legislatures which do not meet each year, and to the immediate need for moneys to reach the States for classroom construction. In this manner the States can begin construction by the direct allocation of the first year's funds and will have time for their legislatures to meet and enact the necessary legislation, if required.

The funds appropriated are to remain allocated for a 3-year period, thus anticipating any legal difficulties which might arise in the State. The bill requires each State educational agency simply to certify that it has a plan and that the State educational agency will administer the plan. It has a very strong Federal disclaimer section.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I regret to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought, but while you are on this question of Federal control I wonder if you would give the committee your opinion—and I am sure the committee will have a great deal of respect for the distinguished gentleman's opinion, because he is a very able attorney—with regard to whether any money allocated to a State school system or to an individual school system which practices segregation in the public schools could be withheld from that State by the Commissioner of Education or by any executive direction from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Since the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Brown against The Board of Education, a decision which was based on the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution, segregation of school facilities is unconstitutional and the States, through that decision, have been directed to proceed with deliberate speed to desegregate. Those which are proceeding with deliberate speed need have no fear. It would be my opinion that individual school districts in defiance of the opinion, without the addition of any

amendment to this legislation, which would be extraneous—because we do not need legislation with respect to self-enacting clauses of the Constitution—could be deprived by enforcement of the existing law if they were in defiance, by order of the U.S. Attorney General.

Only after it has been adjudicated that a local school district is in defiance of the Supreme Court decision would the Commissioner be authorized to withhold funds from that district. The gentleman will note from the language of H.R. 10128 that it is mandatory for the Commissioner to allot funds to which a State is entitled and he must do so within 60 days after appropriation. Thus the funds would be in the hands of the State authorities. The fact that one or two authorized districts may be adjudicated in defiance by the Federal district court under Brown against The Board of Education, would mean only that those particular districts could be denied funds. In these cases, however, the Commissioner would not be authorized to withhold any of the funds from the State and, in turn, it follows that all other districts in the State would be clearly entitled to their share of the funds. The gentleman might note further that in the cases where the Federal Government intervened, State funds only have been involved.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for just one brief question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would the gentleman state that he intends to say to the committee that it is his opinion that with or without so-called Powell amendment, or segregation amendment, money could be withheld from a State or a school district—which is in defiance of the Supreme Court decision against segregation in public schools?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not know how my opinion would clarify the legal question; but it is my estimation that with or without a segregation amendment the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government could deny funds to school districts that are in defiance of the courts.

Mr. LANDRUM. And is it the opinion of the distinguished author of this bill that the executive agency should deny those funds?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It happens to be my personal opinion, yes.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. UDALL. The point that I think our colleague from Georgia misses—and I wonder if my colleague would agree with me on this—is that compliance is a matter of the practice of each school district. In his own State of Georgia today, for example, there are no school districts any of us know of that are not complying, that are under court orders, and under Public Law 815 and 874, there

is no obstruction to the receipt of Federal funds under any programs there at the present time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is precisely the point.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to ask another question of the distinguished author of this bill relating to another field entirely. With regard to school districts now bonded to capacity under their State constitutions for school building purposes, is it the opinion of the distinguished author of this bill that school districts which are bonded to capacity, where the buildings have already been constructed, can receive any money under this bill for the payment of bonds issued to build buildings already constructed?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I conceive this to be a prospective bill. It is designed to build school buildings, and my answer would be in the negative. I might point out to the gentleman, however, that the funds are to be distributed on the basis of need within the States by the State agencies, and that there will be in many, many States sufficient tax relief so that the State will have funds freed to alleviate the distress of those districts in financial trouble now.

Mr. LANDRUM. One additional question, if the gentleman will kindly indulge me further.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can answer the gentleman's question, if the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. On page 14 of the gentleman's bill, subsection (d), there is clearly answered the question of the gentleman from Georgia:

No funds from any year's allotment shall be used to assist in financing, through grants under section 5(a) or through Federal commitments under section 5(b), any of the costs of constructing a school facilities project which are incurred prior to the approval of such project by the State educational agency or prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which such allotment is made.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman from Montana. I agree that the bill does prohibit such payments, but I wanted to ask this of its author. Then a school district which is bonded to capacity but still in need of additional classrooms, cannot get any money under this bill except by direct grant; is that right? If it must do any matching, there is no money available; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is correct if one assumes that the State is so impoverished that the relief which it will get through this legislation cannot be distributed to that district. So that I would say as a practical matter the answer would be in the negative.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I notice in the gentleman's report that there is a list of States showing how much would be allocated. I believe Alabama starts off with about \$5 million a year. If the States cannot assume their responsibilities now to construct schoolhouses and if the people of the States are unwilling to do that—and my people have assumed their responsibilities—where are they going to get the matching funds, if they have not had the guts or the sense of responsibility to build schoolhouses up to this point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not think there is a State in the Union that has not made absolutely prodigious efforts in this direction. The fact is, however, that they are simply unable to transfer any further onto the backs of the local property owners more ad valorem taxes and school district taxes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Would not the matching funds come from more ad valorem taxes? They have got to come from the people in some way.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is inconceivable to me that any State in the Union would be unable to raise any of the matching funds required.

Mr. HEMPHILL. If they are able to raise the matching funds they ought to be able to raise the original school construction funds, if they are willing as States to assume their constitutional responsibility. I can cite the gentleman certain States which do not believe in integration but which have built schoolhouses. The people of South Carolina have built their schoolhouses.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We are perfectly willing to help you because we pay more taxes than you do.

There has been a question raised by the distinguished gentleman from California in the minority report to the effect that there are only 237 districts in the United States which have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. I should like to put this to rest. The fact is that a survey was made on a very narrow ground by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has been expanded. It has been ascertained since that figure came to light in a colloquy between two Members of the other body that there are 131,000 classrooms short in the United States.

In this connection I have the statistics available of two States, statistics made available since that survey. The State of Pennsylvania, which was shown as having very few classrooms short in the original survey on the narrow ground, in answer to the expanded line of questions from the Secretary has reported, after a careful survey, a shortage of 5,000 classrooms in 863 school districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield me his time? The gentleman in our colloquy said he would yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the Chairman is inclined to yield the gentleman the time, I will be glad to give it to the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to know if the gentleman will be in my corner of the ring when the time comes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I probably will not vote the same way the gentleman will, but I am for him otherwise.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. In view of the fact that the gentleman referred to the statement I made in the minority report, may I ask if I understand him correctly to say that there are 800-some districts that are in financial trouble?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is in the State of Pennsylvania alone.

Mr. HIESTAND. Does the gentleman have a national figure he can give us at this time?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We are informed by the Secretary that there are in the United States 131,000-some-odd classrooms short as of now.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is classrooms. I meant school districts in trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The Secretary informed us only the day before yesterday that the survey is not complete. I have the figures for New Jersey and Pennsylvania here. I might point out to the gentleman from California that with respect to New Jersey, for the period 1958-59, 96 hearings were held on applications of borrowed-up districts. Sixty-three hearings between July 1, 1959, and March 1, 1960, were held on applications involving \$77 million.

May I point out further that in the State of New Jersey, which has spent an average of \$100 million a year for the last several years, 100,000 children are housed in substandard facilities or attend school on a part-time basis.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is on the basis of figures of districts in trouble?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. These statistics are from a letter dated March 25, 1960, from the New Jersey Department of Education.

Mr. HIESTAND. Would the gentleman care to project that nationally and hazard a guess as to the number of districts in trouble financially?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I cannot hazard a guess of the number that are in trouble financially because the standards vary so.

Mr. HIESTAND. Or those that are financed up to their limit?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have no way of ascertaining that.

Mr. Chairman, for all practical purposes, this survey on the narrow ground on which it was made and the results of which were taken out of context does not include, for instance, a school district which has borrowed to within 5 percent of its statutory limitation and which, if it needed to construct classrooms or needed to raise money to construct needed classrooms, would go, perhaps, 50 percent over. So that you see this was on the narrowest possible ground, as the Secretary stated, in an exchange of letters with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

There are, the fact is, a great many and an unascertained number of bor-

rowed up districts and there are 131 thousand and some odd hundred classrooms short. This does not count a recent calculation. It was only a couple of months ago, last August, when Secretary Flemming said:

However, if we add 5.9 million urban elementary pupils affected by overcrowding merely to the 1.8 million pupils enrolled in excess of capacity throughout the Nation, we have a figure of about 8 million children. We know, however, this is by no means the total number of pupils affected by crowding since it does not take into account additional pupils affected in this way in any high school or any rural school, elementary school anywhere in the Nation.

Even this is not the only disturbing fact about the classroom shortage for in addition to the pupils reported as excess in the national study, there are more than 2 million others estimated as housed in obsolete or otherwise inadequate buildings. By this measurement alone, therefore, the number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees is about 10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any time that he can yield to me?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the spirit of good nature, I will yield the author and sponsor of the bill on the other side 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I certainly yield to my chairman.

Mr. BARDEN. As the gentleman knows, one of my reasons for disliking this bill is the fact that \$325 million is simply divided up among the 50 States without any formula on the basis of need being provided. The money is just simply divided up on a per-child basis. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] showed that illiteracy ranges from 1 percent to 27 percent in the various States. The gentleman from New Jersey, since he has been on his feet, has shown conclusively that there are areas where a great need exists—conclusively, that is, in his own mind. And since the gentleman points to the great needs that exist, it is just rather confusing to me when I hear the gentleman resist any formula on the basis of need.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think I can clear up my chairman's confusion. In the first place, I do not know at the moment that I am resisting, but I might point out to my distinguished chairman there is in this legislation, and in any such terms, more than an inherent equalization.

Mr. BARDEN. I want one that is real. I want one that is obvious and real.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In that case, I suppose the chairman would want something, I suppose, as was contained in the bill passed by the other body in which the actual figures of equalization were worked out to about 16 to 1. We think this is disparate. We think that the inherent equalization is caused by the fact that the States in

the greatest need pay their teachers less; their construction costs are less; their land acquisition costs are less; their heating facilities are not as badly needed or as expensive; and all of these factors are involved in this inherent equalization and entered definitely into the picture.

NOT IN THE CONSTITUTION

I do not look at all upon Federal aid to highways in the same manner I look upon Federal aid to education. When the Constitution has charged the Congress with a duty of doing something which requires money, not only do we have a right but also we have a command to do it. But never in the Constitution was it intended that this power should be extended to education (Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Feb. 3, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1927).

It is always a temptation to speak for the Founding Fathers. Let us for a change allow the Founding Fathers to speak for themselves as regards Federal aid to education.

Pushing aside the mists of the historical past, what did George Washington have to say on this subject:

In a country like this * * * if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power, which requires a steady, regulating, and energetic hand to correct and control it.

A man soundly grounded in conservatism was Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury. Echoing Washington, he stated:

Whatever concerns the general interest of learning * * * are within the sphere of the national councils, as far as regards an application of money.

Bolstering their opinion that the Federal Government should have more than a passing interest in education was President John Adams:

The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and be willing to bear the expense of it.

These are their words. What actions did they leave us as a part of our historical legacy that the Federal Government has a shared responsibility with State and local governments in the field of education? Can we forget that as early as 1785, in the most lasting contributions of the Continental Congress, the American Government provided for the ceding of the 16th section of every township in the public domain for educational purposes, and in the great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Have we so forgotten our history that as we approach the centennial of the Morrill Act of 1862, through which the Federal Government set up the great land-grant colleges that now grace our educational endeavor, we ignore the act was signed by President Abraham Lincoln?

And as long as I am mentioning Republican Presidents, I might remind the House that it was President Theodore Roosevelt who declared:

The share that the National Government should take in the broad work of education

has not yet received the attention and care it rightly deserves.

Let us not forget that the Constitution contains a general welfare clause which was cited by the Supreme Court in the case of *Helvering against Davis* as giving Congress the authority to make "reasonable financial support of items of major national concern like education."

Knowing the history of his country the late great Senator Robert Taft said on the floor of Congress in 1948:

I should like to point out that Federal aid to education is not new in principle, that the Federal Government has always shown an intense interest in education throughout the United States * * * the general interest of the Federal Government in education cannot be questioned from a historical standpoint.

THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

"The number of classrooms short * * * is not 100,000, not 240,000, not 300,000, but 3,086. That is the number of classroom [sic] short in 237 school districts out of more than 40,000 which are today borrowed up" (Senator DIRKSEN, Feb. 3, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1917).

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, much has been made by the opponents of Federal support for education of figures purporting to show that America has a shortage of only 3,086 classrooms in 237 school districts out of more than 40,000.

The survey from which these figures are quoted was made by the U.S. Office of Education in telegrams addressed to the chief State school officers of the 50 States last January 8. It was undertaken for a limited purpose and dealt with only one minor phase of the school finance problem.

As the Office of Education reported in releasing results of the survey:

Only a small part of the problem of financing school construction is measured by this survey, because there are many problems other than those caused by the ultimate legal limits of borrowing. This point was strongly emphasized by the respondents, as may be seen by reference to the table annotations for Kentucky, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what the U.S. Office of Education had to say about the limitations of its own survey. It did not even pretend to measure the total classroom shortage. It measured only one small phase of it, the extent of the shortage in certain school districts which were "borrowed up."

Kentucky, for instance, reported that, in a technical sense, it had no "borrowed up" districts, because there was on the books an unused law, regarded as unrealistic and impractical, which set up special procedures for borrowing beyond the ordinary limits.

New Jersey reported that more than half of its school districts had exceeded their normal borrowing capacity for school construction at least once in the last 10 years and that more than half of the districts presently were faced with severe financial problems. A New Jersey provision enabling school districts to exceed their debt limits with the permission of the State commissioner of education and the State treasury department was, New Jersey pointed out, no guarantee against serious financial problems.

Pennsylvania reported it had school districts which just could not market any more school bonds although technically they were within debt limits. Tennessee reported no legal debt limit, but said that in practice a county or municipality with a debt of 10 percent or more of assessed valuation could not borrow except at prohibitive interest rates. There were 87 Tennessee school districts in which this condition obtained.

Just last month the U.S. Office of Education, reporting on "National Goals in the Staffing and Construction of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools," fixed the classroom shortage, in the fall of 1959, as 131,600 classrooms.

This report also estimated future needs. "During the 5 school years 1959-60 through 1963-64," it said, "construction of 416,000 classrooms is needed to take care of normal needs and to eliminate the backlog."

At present rates of construction, if new construction were distributed among the States as needed, the report added, the classroom shortage at the end of the 5-year period would be 63,600.

And, Mr. Chairman, we have no assurance that the present rate of construction can be maintained, without substantial assistance from the Federal Government. We have all read news reports, and some of us have observed in our own communities, that voters have been rebelling against needed school bond issues on the ground that local taxes were too high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, under this bill we propose to divide \$325 million around the country each year in order to build school buildings. There are four clear faults in my mind to this legislation that makes it bad legislation, no matter whether you are for or against extension of Federal aid to education. The first one was mentioned by our distinguished chairman, that the funds are not allocated according to need. They are divided all over the country according to the number of children of school age. This would be the same thing as if a local community around Christmas time decided to allocate a certain amount of money to give Christmas baskets to the needy people, but in order to get enough money they decided to give it to all the folks. The result would be that little would be left for the needy. That is the same situation here. I do not believe anybody can say here that there are no school districts that are in need. But this bill is the wrong way to go about it, if we want to spend the money most expeditiously.

Then, further than that, under the allocation formula, it allocates the money according to the number of children of school age, not children in public school. In some States there are less than three-quarters of the schoolchildren who go to public school while in others practically all go to the public schools.

The third defect is that it does not include the State matching formula the first year. If this principle is good, it should go into effect the first year. If the Federal Government aid finances the entire amount the first year, how difficult it would be to put it into effect the second year and third year.

Fourth, it would not be given only for academic facilities but other facilities as well. The provision in the bill provides aid for any structure except where the primary purpose of the building or rooms are for contests where admission is secured.

There can only be two reasons for giving Federal aid. One is that the States are unable to finance their education facilities; secondly, that they are unwilling to provide for adequate education facilities. First, let us take State and local governments' ability. Many people state it is not possible to provide adequate tax revenue in a State for education. I agree that local communities cannot finance the entire education load because they are almost entirely dependent upon real estate taxes. However, one of the reasons why schools have reached their debt limit is that the States refuse to tax according to the market value of property, but the State assesses a valuation considerably less than the market value. If the States took the situation in hand and raised their assessed values up to the market value, they would be able to stay below the debt limit. However, State governments have the ability to levy almost any tax; every tax that the Federal Government levies, with the exception of import duties, can be utilized. When you say they are unable to secure enough money, it is not true, because a State can have an income tax, a sales tax, a luxury tax, an excise tax, and all the various kinds of taxes necessary to secure enough money.

This bill does not take into consideration the State's ability to pay. To give you an idea of the disparity of this bill, take the situation in New York. The personal income per child of school age in New York in 1957 was over \$12,000, but in the State of Mississippi it was \$3,426.

At this time, I would like to present some very meaningful tables—which I have secured from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—which show the personal income per child of school age in every State in the Continental United States, which follows:

Continental United States (excluding District of Columbia and Alaska)	
Alabama	4,811
Arizona	7,050
Arkansas	4,284
California	11,380
Colorado	8,348
Connecticut	12,884
Delaware	12,245
Florida	8,062
Georgia	5,338
Idaho	6,029
Illinois	11,049
Indiana	8,482
Iowa	7,719
Kansas	7,854
Kentucky	5,208
Louisiana	5,859

Maine	\$7,031
Maryland	9,086
Massachusetts	11,106
Michigan	8,977
Minnesota	7,643
Mississippi	3,426
Missouri	8,830
Montana	7,518
Nebraska	7,976
Nevada	10,966
New Hampshire	8,192
New Jersey	11,653
New Mexico	6,004
New York	12,185
North Carolina	4,945
North Dakota	5,467
Ohio	9,718
Oklahoma	6,740
Oregon	8,196
Pennsylvania	9,521
Rhode Island	9,475
South Carolina	4,094
South Dakota	6,214
Tennessee	5,426
Texas	7,047
Utah	6,189
Vermont	6,956
Virginia	6,662
Washington	8,994
West Virginia	5,816
Wisconsin	8,096
Wyoming	7,951

Now in H.R. 10128 we are going to give the same amount of aid per child in Mississippi as in New York, even though New York has about four times as much personal income per child of school age.

In Mississippi, State expenditures per public school child were \$158 in 1957; in New York, \$575. Let us now look at the record of school expenditures per public school child for the years 1955-56, which are supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They are as follows:

Continental U.S. (excluding the District of Columbia and Alaska)	
Alabama	\$388.03
Arizona	194.20
Arkansas	413.86
California	182.99
Colorado	519.63
Connecticut	442.16
Delaware	435.67
Florida	504.37
Georgia	346.18
Idaho	269.21
Illinois	316.84
Indiana	468.16
Iowa	368.04
Kansas	368.95
Kentucky	400.56
Louisiana	185.33
Maine	344.08
Maryland	244.68
Massachusetts	414.97
Michigan	393.02
Minnesota	448.52
Mississippi	457.87
Missouri	158.55
Montana	341.62
Nebraska	431.28
Nevada	352.78
New Hampshire	471.77
New Jersey	347.10
New Mexico	511.48
New York	443.50
North Carolina	575.35
North Dakota	228.78
Ohio	343.88
Oklahoma	380.69
Oregon	324.98
Pennsylvania	444.65
Rhode Island	439.94
South Carolina	353.33
South Dakota	281.38
Tennessee	361.74
Texas	217.31
Utah	337.69

Utah.....	\$369.15
Vermont.....	312.31
Virginia.....	269.03
Washington.....	452.14
West Virginia.....	219.60
Wisconsin.....	429.52
Wyoming.....	542.68

Referring to these figures, we may well ask, Why does not Mississippi do better than that?

The fact is Mississippi is expending 3.4 percent of their personal income per child of school age toward education, while New York is expending only 2.5 percent.

At this point, we might consider statistics showing the expenditure and effort for public schools for the years 1955 and 1956. In this table, expenditures as a percentage of personal income are listed as follows:

Mississippi.....	3.4
Arkansas.....	3.0
South Carolina.....	3.5
Alabama.....	3.3
Kentucky.....	2.4
North Carolina.....	3.2
Tennessee.....	2.9
West Virginia.....	3.2

Average..... 3.1

Massachusetts.....	2.2
Illinois.....	2.2
California.....	2.7
New York.....	2.5
Nevada.....	2.6
New Jersey.....	2.4
Delaware.....	2.0
Connecticut.....	2.1

Average..... 2.3

A study of the statistics shows that Mississippi is expending considerable effort. You can go down through the eight States with lowest personal income per child and find the same thing happening, and also you can take the eight top States in personal income per child and find the same thing happening. Percentage-wise the wealthy States are not spending as much for education as the poorer States are spending and shows the reasonableness of basing allotments on need.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. Coming from the State of New York and having been identified with and familiar with the formula for State education of children for years, I cannot quite understand the gentleman's reasoning in saying that there is \$12,000 of income behind each child of school age in New York. Does the gentleman mean income or property value?

Mr. QUIE. Income value, personal income.

Mr. BECKER. Personal income?

Mr. QUIE. These figures are based on personal income per school-age child.

Mr. BECKER. Is that gross income or net income?

Mr. QUIE. This is net income, the data derived from the Department of Commerce. I will put the figures in the RECORD so the gentleman may examine them tomorrow.

Going further, to the second reason why the allocation formula is bad, I will again compare New York with Missis-

issippi. In New York only 75 percent of the children of school age go to public schools, but in Mississippi about 90 percent do. In New York the allocation formula will give aid according to the number of children of school age to the public schools only. This is the same in Mississippi but must be divided among proportionately more children. In Rhode Island only 66.6 percent of the children of school age go to public schools, but in the poorer States they do not have many private schools and parochial schools which is detrimental to them in this formula.

The following table shows public, full-time day school K-12 enrollment as a percentage of the July 1, 1958, school-age population from 5 to 17 years of age. Column 1, showing the population from 5 through 17, is an Office of Education estimate derived by interpolation. The second column, "Enrollments K-12," is composed of revisions of data in the fall 1958 survey:

	July 1, 1958, population, 5-17	Fall 1958 enroll- ments, K-12	Percent
Aggregate.....	42,719,000	34,668,553	81.2
Total 50 States and District of Columbia.....	41,936,000	34,080,844	81.3
1. Alabama.....	878,000	780,000	88.8
2. Arizona.....	301,000	273,734	90.9
3. Arkansas.....	470,000	420,700	89.5
4. California.....	3,297,000	3,035,000	92.1
5. Colorado.....	421,000	360,972	85.7
6. Connecticut.....	516,000	440,832	85.4
7. Delaware.....	105,000	73,551	70.0
8. District of Colum- bia.....	153,000	113,030	73.9
9. Florida.....	1,000,000	857,723	85.8
10. Georgia.....	1,040,000	893,431	85.9
11. Idaho.....	177,000	149,638	84.5
12. Illinois.....	2,224,000	1,612,145	72.5
13. Indiana.....	1,121,000	910,000	81.2
14. Iowa.....	672,000	554,223	82.5
15. Kansas.....	507,000	441,620	87.1
16. Kentucky.....	809,000	614,607	76.0
17. Louisiana.....	850,000	655,191	77.1
18. Maine.....	228,000	191,622	84.0
19. Maryland.....	723,000	557,540	77.1
20. Massachusetts.....	1,053,000	809,100	76.8
21. Michigan.....	1,957,000	1,574,999	80.5
22. Minnesota.....	832,000	650,800	78.2
23. Mississippi.....	617,000	552,000	89.5
24. Missouri.....	965,000	787,419	81.6
25. Montana.....	175,000	136,901	78.2
26. Nebraska.....	344,000	267,618	77.8
27. Nevada.....	65,000	56,396	86.8
28. New Hampshire.....	134,000	98,953	73.8
29. New Jersey.....	1,298,000	971,000	76.6
30. New Mexico.....	243,000	204,137	84.0
31. New York.....	3,485,000	2,624,582	75.3
32. North Carolina.....	1,225,000	1,061,171	86.6
33. North Dakota.....	173,000	128,067	74.0
34. Ohio.....	2,239,000	1,782,637	79.6
35. Oklahoma.....	551,000	540,433	98.1
36. Oregon.....	432,000	359,215	83.2
37. Pennsylvania.....	2,522,000	1,915,051	75.9
38. Rhode Island.....	188,000	125,165	66.6
39. South Carolina.....	699,000	558,212	79.9
40. South Dakota.....	179,000	145,608	81.3
41. Tennessee.....	899,000	769,506	85.6
42. Texas.....	2,436,000	1,956,000	80.3
43. Utah.....	245,000	218,157	89.0
44. Vermont.....	92,000	71,061	77.2
45. Virginia.....	981,000	803,719	81.9
46. Washington.....	675,000	595,850	88.3
47. West Virginia.....	527,000	458,425	87.0
48. Wisconsin.....	951,000	675,000	71.0
49. Wyoming.....	84,000	77,218	91.9
50. Alaska.....	48,000	36,418	75.9
51. Hawaii.....	160,000	134,467	84.0
52. Puerto Rico.....	748,000	562,487	75.2
53. Virgin Islands.....	10,000	6,515	65.2
American Samoa.....	7,000	5,615	80.2
Guam.....	18,000	13,092	72.7

We talk about the unwillingness of some areas to provide adequately for their needs. National averages show a willingness, however. Look what has happened. Fifty percent of the classrooms in the country were built after World War II. If you take the figures

from 1950 to 1960 you find a 56 percent increase in enrollment and 642 percent in education.

Here are statistics showing educational expenditures and enrollment from 1940 to 1960:

Educational expenditures¹ and enrollment, 1940-60

School year	Expenditures (thousand dollars)	Enrollment (pupils)
1939-40.....	3,190,593	29,751,203
1949-50.....	8,795,635	31,319,271
1955-56.....	16,811,651	39,103,059
1959-60.....	24,000,000	46,480,000
Percent increase, 1940-60.....	642	56

¹ Includes public and nonpublic schools at all levels (elementary, secondary, and higher education).

Sources: 1940-56, U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955-56." 1960, expenditures, estimate; enrollment, U.S. Office of Education release Aug. 30, 1959.

I would not say that this shows an unwillingness to provide for education. Also it is stated by many people that not enough of our income is spent for education, that too much is spent for liquor, tobacco, horse races, gambling, and everything else. Let us take the figures from 1950 to 1960. The percentage of the national income spent for education in 1950 was 4.1 percent. In the 10-year period following, it increased so that 6 percent of the national income goes for education in 1960. I think this shows that we have realized the necessity of providing adequately for education and that we can depend on the States and local communities to continue to do a good job.

I now present statistics showing expenditures for education as a percent of the national income from 1890 to 1960:

Expenditures for education as percent of national income 1890 to 1960	Percent
1890.....	1.4
1913.....	2.2
1930.....	3.7
1950.....	4.1
1956.....	5.1
1960.....	6.0

(Sources: 1890 and 1913, Roger A. Freeman, op. cit., p. 5; 1930-56, U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955-56"; 1960, estimated.)

I think people are just deluding themselves if they think we can have Federal aid without regulations and controls.

There are already instances of Federal supervision in Federal aid to education—aid to federally impacted areas—the National Defense Education Act and vocational education. For instance, in order for a teacher to be an instructor in vocational education he has to be educated in specified schools, those under public auspices. That is a control that comes over Federal education.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that there was lots of Federal interference under Public Laws 817 and 874?

Mr. QUIE. There is Federal regulation and control under both of those laws.

If you will look at the law and the controls that are available to the Department of Education for the construction of those facilities, this is very much in evidence.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman will agree that there is ample testimony before the Committee, given principally by such gentlemen as my colleague from California [Mr. Urr], that in the actual administration of the bill there has been no Federal interference. I think it is a wrong impression to leave, that there is any criticism.

Mr. QUIE. Not criticism. I doubt if there would be any criticism of this bill or any other effort in which the Federal Government actually had the proper regulation of the expenditures. But there are controls and I personally feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that the funds are adequately used.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Any restrictions are simply designed to guarantee that they build classrooms and not such things as are not needed in an educational system. Does the gentleman call that control?

Mr. QUIE. There are regulations and there has to be regulations. If anybody says there should be no control whatsoever over the money, they are deluding themselves. There has to be a certain amount.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We say there should be regulation. The State must certify an adequate plan under which the moneys will be distributed to the needy districts. To that extent, at least, we outline a course of action.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. So that we get this a little bit clearer right now, there will not be a dollar of this money spent in building buildings that the Secretary of Labor does not supervise, fix the price of wages, and classify the workers. He fixes the wages that are paid to the men. I happen to know something about this because there was one in my area and it only took about 3 years to get it settled, because this man was rated as a bricklayer when he should have been a helper and the other man was rated something else, and that was it. I do not think it is quite accurate to say there is not any interference or regulation. If you do not think there are, ask contractors that have been through this.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

The Bureau of the Budget made a study recently of the Department of Education fall report for 1959 in which they reported a backlog of 132,000 classrooms and came up with information which is interesting.

Because of the great variation among the States—and even within many States—of standards as to what constitutes normal capacity or an unsatis-

factory facility, the Office of Education leaves the matter of standards and specific definitions up to the judgments and practices of each State. In many cases, a State in turn depends upon local superintendents to apply local definitions and standards in reporting data.

As a result of the absence of agreed-upon standards, the Office of Education fall report represents a compilation of State reports which in most cases are similar compilations of local reports. The national totals consequently are to a large degree the result of the addition of nonequivalents, but since local communities are primarily responsible for their own education programs, the national totals are meaningful if the data reported to the Office of Education reliably reflect State and local standards as to need.

The field trips produced information which indicates that the methods of collecting data and the concepts used to measure need may have produced both understatements as well as overstatements of classroom building needs. Some examples follow:

(a) Some States do not make a questionnaire survey to collect data for the fall report, a method recommended by the Office of Education, but use information from other reports, collected for State use, to estimate classroom needs. Use of such separate feeder reports can produce some double counting of classroom needs in cases where excess enrollment is located in unsatisfactory facilities. It should be noted that the Office of Education questionnaire form cautions the States on this point.

(b) There is also the possibility that in some cases the States have reported an equivalent requirement of need rather than an actual building requirement. For example, in a situation of an unsatisfactory school plant located in an area which is rapidly changing from residential to commercial—not uncommon in large cities—the decision of the school authorities may be to continue to use the facilities until utilization declines to the point where the students can be assigned to other schools. However, the local school system may report the need to replace the unsatisfactory school when in fact there is no actual building requirement. It should be pointed out, however, that the Office of Education requests that the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities be reported, not the number of unsatisfactory classrooms.

(c) Some States, instead of conducting a questionnaire survey each year, will revise the results of a previous year's survey by subtracting the number of classrooms subsequently built, adding the number of classrooms abandoned, and adding the number of classrooms needed for increased enrollment. This method has a conservative bias if statewide figures are used, since it necessarily assumes that all construction and abandonments occur in those school districts—and areas within those school districts—which had previously reported shortages. It has a possible liberal bias to the extent that some of the increased enrollments occur in areas where schools may be underutilized.

(d) There are some indications that local superintendents may have reported unsatisfactory facilities only to the extent that replacements are to be made under current building plans rather than actual building needs.

(e) It was found that in many areas enrollments hit an annual peak in January or February rather than in the fall when classroom shortage data are reported. For areas of continual enrollment growth, reports as of October understate the need for additional facilities.

(f) In areas of new development local school authorities, on the basis of studies of probable land use and population patterns, may forecast a peak enrollment from which there will be a decline. The decision may be to build schools to accommodate less than the temporary peak enrollment, rather than to have a school underutilized for a large part of its life. However, local officials may report excess enrollments and additional classrooms needed which would not represent an actual building requirement.

As these examples suggest, there may be both understatements and overstatements of need in particular areas. Although we cannot express these in quantitative terms, they undoubtedly affect the accuracy of the national totals. However, in our judgment, these overstatements and understatements would not invalidate a conclusion that there are sizable classroom shortages in certain areas in many States. The national totals do not represent a precise measure of building requirements and should be taken only as orders of magnitude.

In addition, the survey indicates that it is fallacious to compare successive years' totals to indicate a decline or increase in the classroom shortage. For example, Alabama used radically different means of determining the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities in 1959 than it used in 1958, with the result that its shortage appeared to decline dramatically. Aberrations such as this negate year-to-year comparisons, but changes over a period of years probably are meaningful.

IMPROVEMENT OF CLASSROOM SHORTAGE DATA

The above indicates that the classroom shortage data could be significantly improved:

(a) Methods of collecting the data in the nine States varied from excellent to poor. We believe that the Office of Education should do considerably more than has been done in providing leadership and assistance to the States in improving collection methods.

(b) The concepts used to measure the classroom shortage could be significantly sharpened so as to clarify the requests for information. The questionnaire form now used by the Office has the virtue of brevity. There could be an elaboration of the instructions and definitions which might help produce more reliable data without mitigating that virtue.

The Bureau of the Budget plans to hire a consultant to evaluate certain statistical series of the Office of Education, including the fall report. The information gathered on these field trips should be beneficial in his task.

USEFULNESS OF FALL REPORT FOR PUBLIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The fall report figures on the classroom shortage have, in our opinion limited usefulness in discussions on Federal aid for school construction. This would be true even if these figures were precise measures of classroom needs, an elusive concept, indeed.

First. Although a sizable shortage exists, so long as school enrollments continue to grow there will be a normal shortage of unknown size for two reasons: (a) The physical inability of a school district to erect buildings fast enough to keep pace with enrollment growth, and (b) conscious administrative decisions not to attempt to build to keep pace with or ahead of enrollment increases. In the first instance, there are cases where school facilities have been built on the basis of enrollment projections that proved too conservative and there are other cases where the enrollments arrived before there had been enough time to plan and construct sufficient facilities. In the second instance, school districts will frequently hedge their projections by using temporary portable facilities—reported as unsatisfactory to the Office of Education—until such time as land use and population patterns stabilize. Florida is a notable example. A normal or frictional shortage obviously is not related to any need for Federal assistance.

Second. The classroom shortage figures reveal nothing about the financial capability of the States and local communities to handle the problem without Federal aid. This is the critical question which has remained unanswered. This is a question that affects considerations of Federal aid not only for school construction and other educational costs as well, but also for public services of all kinds. The present state of our knowledge is sufficient to establish the existence of sizable and persistent needs, but it is not adequate to state with certainty whether or not those needs can be met from State and local financial resources. I say every time there is a need it should not be necessary for the Federal Government to step in.

ALABAMA

Conclusions on State report on classroom shortage: In our opinion, neither the 1958 nor the 1959 report provides a reliable figure on the classroom shortage. Application in 1958 of school facilities standards developed by Teachers College, Columbia, may have resulted in an overstatement of the number of unsatisfactory classrooms in Alabama in terms of local standards. The 1959 reports by local superintendents totaled 2,416 unsatisfactory classrooms as compared to 10,037 in 1958, indicating that the Teachers College standards are much higher than those local superintendents in Alabama realistically expect to attain.

The method used to determine the 1959 shortage was inadequate because the form that was used by the State agency was not designed to obtain the data requested by the Office of Education. The State figure for classrooms needed for excess enrollment include in the case of many school system class-

rooms needed for replacement as well, a fact which probably accounts for part of the reported increase in shortage on account of excess enrollment from 1,899 rooms in 1958 to 3,948 in 1959. The 1959 State survey was so poorly designed that the resulting data are not meaningful. However, it would appear that the number of classrooms reported as needed for excess enrollment may be somewhat overstated as of fall 1959, although peak enrollments are generally not reached until later in the school year.

FLORIDA

Nature of classroom shortage: In fall 1959, 10 county school systems out of a total of 67 accounted for more than three-quarters of the total reported classroom shortage. Although the total shortage is divided about equally between classrooms needed to house excess enrollments and those needed to replace unsatisfactory classrooms, the shortage can be attributed chiefly to Florida's rapid population growth. This apparent contradiction is clarified by the fact that a large portion of the unsatisfactory classrooms are temporary portables. Typically, in an area of new development the school system will use portable facilities until such time as the pattern of population changes, land use, and school population become fairly stabilized.

Permanent facilities are then built, and the portables are transported to another area. Dade County, for example, reported a total shortage in fall 1959 of 680 classrooms, of which 397 were considered unsatisfactory. All of these rooms reported as unsatisfactory are portables.

GEORGIA

Nature of classroom shortage: Almost three-quarters of the total classroom shortage in Georgia is the result of enrollments in excess of normal capacity. State personnel indicated that as much as 90 percent of the classroom shortage is in 30—of 198—school systems, all of which are in metropolitan areas of substantial population growth; the five counties around Atlanta are the principal areas. This fact is a reflection of the growing industrialization and urbanization of the State.

State personnel expressed the opinion that the serious problem in the past of old and obsolete school facilities, chiefly in rural areas, had generally been overcome, in large part as a result of the operation of a State school building authority and State aid programs. The major current problem is to keep abreast of enrollment growth in the urban centers.

The superintendent of the Cobb County school system was interviewed. Cobb County has had continuous population growth since World War II. Currently it has the fastest growing school system in the State. A federally affected area by virtue of an aircraft plant, an Air Force base, and a naval air station, and other Federal installations, the county is also affected by the general suburban growth around Atlanta. Because of impossibility of building schools rapidly enough to keep pace with enrollments, nonteaching space has had to be converted into classrooms and nonschool buildings have been leased and renovated.

NEW YORK

Method of determining classroom shortages: New York has not developed a plan for providing the Office of Education with a consistent set of fall data each year. For example, the 1959 and 1958 data on 4,000 additional classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities are based on a single comprehensive inventory study done in 1958. Data for New York City are not available and there is no plan to maintain the inventory started in 1958. Because of the use of "feeder" reports, there is some double counting of additional instruction rooms needed where excess enrollment is located in unsatisfactory facilities.

Most of the discussion in New York City centered on the question of the usefulness of the concept "additional classrooms needed to accommodate excess enrollment" as a guide to needed construction. The problem of planning to accommodate a temporary peak enrollment is particularly difficult in New York City. It is impractical to build a new school to take care of peak enrollment for a few years where there may be a projection of a future decline in school population and then to have the school remain underutilized for the greater part of its life. The situation is generally met by planning the school's capacity below the anticipated peak enrollment and living with the temporary peak.

Now, in studying what in the world causes this need for classrooms, there are some figures that I will put in the RECORD showing what has happened to enrollment.

Number of children in following categories

	Ages 5 to 17	Entering 1st grade	Grades 1 to 8	Grades 9 to 12
1919-20	21,578,316	4,320,823	19,377,927	2,200,389
1921-22	23,239,227	4,176,567	20,366,218	2,873,009
1923-24	24,288,808	4,184,232	20,898,930	3,389,878
1925-26	24,741,468	3,976,750	20,984,002	3,757,466
1927-28	25,179,696	4,171,037	21,268,417	3,911,279
1929-30	25,678,015	4,150,919	21,278,593	4,399,422
1931-32	26,275,441	3,930,196	21,135,420	5,140,021
1933-34	26,434,193	3,716,852	21,765,037	5,669,156
1935-36	26,367,098	3,530,325	20,392,561	5,974,537
1937-38	25,975,108	3,317,144	19,748,174	6,226,934
1939-40	25,433,642	3,018,463	18,832,098	6,601,444
1941-42	24,562,472	2,930,762	18,174,668	6,387,805
1943-44	23,266,616	2,878,843	17,713,096	5,553,520
1945-46	23,299,941	2,894,588	17,677,744	5,622,197
1947-48	23,944,532	2,951,300	18,291,227	5,653,305
1949-50	25,111,427	3,170,343	19,386,806	5,724,621
1951-52	26,562,664	2,957,485	20,800,867	5,881,797
1953-54	28,336,032	3,665,466	22,545,807	6,290,245
1955-56	31,162,843	3,494,997	24,290,257	6,872,586
1956-57	32,334,333	3,491,387	25,015,873	7,318,460
1957-58	33,632,000	3,587,700	25,728,000	7,903,000
1959-60	35,286,177	-----	24,034,381	11,251,796

¹ Preliminary.

² Estimated figure, not comparable.

One interesting thing, I think, for the last year I have the figures is that the number of children entering first grade in public schools was 3,587,700. In 1919 that figure was 4,320,823. At no time since 1919 through 1930 have we had the enrollment in first grade as we had in that period of time. So, it is not the increase in birth rate so much that has caused this great increase in expenditures for classrooms. The reasons have been these. A greater proportion of the children are staying on through the eighth grade and into high school and through high school. And, a high school is a much more expensive proposition in building classrooms and educating these

children than the first few grades. This has added to the cost of education. The second reason, there is a tendency, and a very strong tendency, to close up the one-room schoolhouses in rural areas, because people have moved out from the rural areas. The average in the last 30 years has been 500,000 per year. This has caused necessarily the building of centralized school buildings in order that they can provide better education as the children move into the centralized areas. These are the two biggest reasons.

So, as we look at the projected enrollment, I think we find this to be the case. The children that were born in the 1920's were the ones that raised the children after the war and at the present time are causing this increase in enrollment. The children born in the late depression and war years are now coming to the age where they are bearing children, and therefore the curve will level off. It shows whereas from 1955 to 1960 the average annual increase in children was 1.2 million per year, in the years 1965 to 1970 it will drop to one-half, only 600,000 additional per year.

The following tables are important:

TABLE 1.—Projected enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools and estimated number of additional classrooms needed, 1960–69

School year	Projected enrollment (in thousands)		Estimated number of additional classrooms currently needed for each year		
	Number ¹	Net increase over previous year	For increased enrollment (rounded to nearest 100) ²	For replacements ³	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1960–61	37,196	1,212	40,400	16,000	56,400
1961–62	38,047	851	28,400	16,000	44,400
1962–63	39,187	1,140	38,000	16,000	54,000
1963–64	40,320	1,133	37,800	16,000	53,800
1964–65	41,484	1,164	38,800	16,000	54,800
1965–66	41,488	404	13,500	16,000	29,500
1966–67	42,514	626	20,900	16,000	36,900
1967–68	43,148	634	21,100	16,000	37,100
1968–69	43,840	692	23,100	16,000	39,100
1969–70	44,497	657	21,900	16,000	37,900

¹ Source: U.S. Office of Education, tabulation dated Jan. 21, 1960. Project enrollments based on Office of Education official school enrollment data and Bureau of the Census official projection of population aged 5–17.

² Computed on basis of 30 pupils per classroom (col. 3 above ÷ 30). Most estimates in recent years are on this basis, although some use 28 pupils per classroom. Application of the 28-pupil basis would increase the annual figures by about 7 percent. On the other hand, it should be noted that these projections are on basis of total enrollment for the entire school year, which exceeds total enrollment at the beginning of each year and is approximately 11 percent greater than the average number of pupils actually in daily attendance in the schools.

³ Based on average number (15,941) of classrooms abandoned or replaced during past 4 years, the only years for which data are available from Office of Education.

The dramatic decline in the annual enrollment increase begins for the school year 1965–66. Summary of the data is as follows:

Average annual increase, 1955–59. 1,200,000
Average annual increase, 1960–64. 1,100,000
Average annual increase, 1965–69. 600,000

Translation of the enrollment increases into classroom needs is shown in

column 4 of table 1. Summary of these classroom facts is as follows:

Average number needed annually,
1955–59. 40,000
Average number needed annually,
1960–64. 36,700
Average number needed annually,
1965–69. 20,000

Determination of the number of classrooms needed each year to replace facilities currently abandoned is much more uncertain. Where obsolescence is involved, the practice varies widely all over the country as to just how long a school facility will be continued in use or whether it will be remodeled rather than abandoned. For the purpose here we based the estimate on actual practice as reported by the Office of Education. The available data show that abandonments have averaged a little less than 16,000 classrooms per year.

Combination of these two categories of current classroom needs each year gives the total classroom requirements for additional new facilities needed. These annual totals, which appear in column 6 of table 1, are summarized as follows:

Average total needed annually, 1960–64. 52,700
Average total needed annually, 1965–69. 36,100

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION RATES IN RELATION TO THE NEED

When America's public schools open next fall for the beginning of the 1960–61 school year, the Nation's overall physical plant will contain approximately 1,330,000 classrooms. These are instructional rooms, including laboratories and shops, but not including auditoriums, gymnasiums, lunchrooms, libraries, study halls, and multipurpose rooms. Approximately 680,000 classrooms, or more than one-half the total, will have been constructed since World War II. With the exception of a relatively small volume of facilities constructed with Federal assistance in federally affected areas (under Public Law 815, 81st Cong., as amended) these classrooms will have been built with State and local resources.

The construction rate in each of the last 10 school years is as follows:

1950–51. 44,000
1951–52. 48,000
1952–53. 50,000
1953–54. 55,000
1954–55. 60,000
1955–56. 63,280
1956–57. 68,660
1957–58. 72,070
1958–59. 70,000
1959–60. 62,700

Summary of the construction rates is as follows:

Average annual construction, 1955–59. 66,900
Average annual construction, 1950–59. 59,400

In terms of the overall national outlook, it is perfectly clear that the States and localities have mounted the construction effort necessary to meet the need without any program of general Federal aid for this purpose. It is also

evident that the construction peak has been crossed and within 5 years the number of classrooms required to keep fully abreast additional needs will be only half as much each year as actually have been built in the past few years.

Not only are past and present construction rates adequate to keep up with the future needs each year to house expected enrollment increases and provide replacements for abandoned facilities, but they are adequate, also, to produce a number of additional classrooms more than equivalent to the backlog of 132,400 as of the present school year—1959–60. Moreover, the backlog would be reduced to inconsequential proportions in little more time than the period covered by H.R. 10128.

The construction rate for the preceding 5 school years—1954–58—averaged 66,800 classrooms per year. Projection of this annual average, a rate which the States and localities have demonstrated they can attain, would produce 467,600 classrooms by the beginning of the 1966–67 school year. Since only 329,800 classrooms would be needed for annual enrollment increases and replacements up to then, the remainder would be more than equivalent to the 132,400 backlog for 1959–60.

This will mean if we continue to build schoolhouses at the average rate that we have in the last 5 years, in the next 5 not only will we have built enough school buildings to take care of the backlog, but also the increase in enrollment and the needed facilities to replace the obsolete classrooms. If this can be done, it will take about an extra year without Federal aid as it will be this way with Federal aid.

Similarly, the construction rate for the present school year is reported by the States as 62,700. Projection of this lower rate in like manner would produce 501,600 classrooms by the 1967–68 school year as compared with new enrollment and replacement needs of 366,900 or an excess of 134,700.

On the basis of still another assumption, namely, a declining rate that would average 58,000 classrooms per year, a total of 580,000 classrooms would be produced up to the beginning of 1969–70, as compared with additional enrollment and replacement needs of 443,900, or an excess of 136,100. It should be noted that the average annual rate of 58,000 classrooms used in this computation is less than the annual average of 59,400 classrooms constructed during the 10-year period 1950–59, and very substantially less than the highest annual rate of 72,070 in 1957–58.

These projections have made full allowance for the reported backlog as of 1959, in addition to new classroom requirements each year. Even making such allowance for the backlog, a great deal less construction will be required over the next 5 to 10 years than has taken place in recent years. But we are convinced that careful analysis of the actual composition of the backlog figure would reveal that a very considerable volume of the reported backlog is of an

unavoidable or temporary nature, having no direct bearing on the issue of the need for Federal aid, while some more

of it arises out of the method of compiling the figures and is irrelevant to the question.

TABLE 2.—Estimated construction of public elementary and secondary classrooms and excess over current annual needs, 1960-69¹

School year	Estimated classrooms constructed and excess over current needs for each year					
	At average annual rate for preceding 5 years		At present (1959-60) rate as an average annual rate		At a declining annual rate averaging below present rate ²	
	Number	Excess over col. (6) in table 1	Number	Excess over col. (6) in table 1	Number	Excess over col. (6) in table 1
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1960-61.....	68,800	10,400	62,700	6,300	58,000	1,600
1961-62.....	66,800	22,400	62,700	18,300	58,000	13,600
1962-63.....	66,800	12,800	62,700	8,700	58,000	4,000
1963-64.....	66,800	13,000	62,700	8,900	58,000	4,200
1964-65.....	66,800	12,000	62,700	7,900	58,000	3,200
1965-66.....	66,800	37,300	62,700	33,200	58,000	28,500
1966-67.....	66,800	29,900	62,700	25,800	58,000	21,100
1967-68.....	(7)	(7)	62,700	25,600	58,000	20,900
1968-69.....			(4)	(4)	58,000	18,900
1969-70.....					58,000	20,100

¹ Source: Computations based on U.S. Office of Education construction data in tabulation dated Jan. 26, 1960, and related tabulations.

² The present rate for 1959-60 of 62,700 classrooms is a net 4,100 below the previous 5-year average. The projected average of 58,000 is 4,700 per year below the previous 5-year average. Construction has not been below 58,000 in any year since 1953-54 when the total was 55,000.

³ Classrooms equivalent to backlog would be constructed as of beginning of 1966-67 school year since construction of new requirements for each year occurs largely during preceding year. Thus, construction rate beginning in 1966-67 need be no greater than necessary to meet current annual need in each following year (col. 6, table 1).

⁴ See note 3 above. Backlog equivalent as of beginning of 1967-68 school year.

⁵ See note 3 above. Backlog equivalent as of beginning of 1969-70 school year.

All that has been reported in the basic statistics is that as of the fall of 1959 a total of 132,400 classrooms were needed, of which 66,000 were to replace unsatisfactory facilities and 66,400 to accommodate excess enrollment. Before basing any national policy on these backlog figures, we ought to know the circumstances surrounding the classrooms that go into the count. For example—

First. How many of the backlog classrooms represent new or replacement facilities, the construction of which has already been authorized by local or State authorities, or which is in the planning stage preliminary to such authorization?

Second. How many classrooms in the backlog represent needed replacements, or additional new facilities, in school districts having adequate financial capacity, but whose voters or State authorities have not authorized the necessary bond issues or other financial arrangements?

Third. How many of the backlog classrooms represent replacements for outdated one-room schoolhouses or multiple-room facilities in districts which would be consolidated, but whose voters have not yet approved of the consolidation?

Fourth. How much of the backlog is made up of classrooms needed to replace unexpected losses because of fire, storm, or other disaster, and to what extent were such losses covered by insurance?

Fifth. What part of the backlog is attributable to an unexpected influx or shift in population, the essential problem being a lack of lead time in which to provide new facilities?

Sixth. Inasmuch as excess enrollment is "the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity" and "normal capacity" is, by definition, determined according to varying State and local standards, there can be little doubt that a consider-

able amount of the backlog reported as needed for excess enrollment is merely a "paper" shortage as far as any Federal aid question is concerned. For instance, "normal capacity" may vary anywhere from say 28 or less pupils per classroom in one place to 30 in another and if both places have 30 pupils in a class, one has excess enrollment and the other does not. More importantly, unknown thousands of the Nation's 40,000 school districts could and undoubtedly do report excess enrollments averaging 1 or 2 pupils per class. These would go into the national totals, even though the reporting districts have no intention, or any urgent need, to build new facilities for such enrollment. There is an average of about 33 classrooms per school district in the United States. Excess enrollment averaging only 1 pupil per classroom would contribute 33 pupils to the national total, although posing no particular problem locally and certainly

no emergency. Similar contributions to the total from only one-third of the school districts would result in a national "paper" backlog of approximately 15,000 classrooms for this reason alone. Accordingly, before accepting such backlog figures as a reliable indication of classroom need, we should at least find out how many districts have significant excess enrollment problems and where they are—on a comparable basis from State to State.

We are firmly convinced that the answers to these questions and other related ones would enable us to see the classroom backlog problem in its proper perspective. There can be no doubt that refinement of the figure would show, as we mentioned earlier, that at any given time of enumeration there would be a substantial number of classrooms needed which would represent a residual or irreducible minimum. Classrooms in this category would be reported in the backlog whether or not there were any general Federal aid for school construction. We believe, also, that a substantial part of an accurate backlog count would be a reflection of a 1- or 2-year timelag in meeting the need rather than any indication of an emergency situation requiring Federal intervention.

The implication of this analysis is that actual State and local construction requirements, over and above the number of classrooms necessary to meet current new needs each year for the next 5 to 10 years, will be much less than the reported backlog of 132,400. Accordingly, overall construction rates can be expected to decline markedly, particularly within 5 years, and the financial obligations imposed upon State and local resources will correspondingly diminish. At the same time, most States and regions of the country can be expected to be on a approximately current construction basis.

Even without any refinement of the backlog figures as reported, many of the States already appear to be on or near a current construction basis. The Office of Education report on the 1959 fall survey shows the following States, for example, which are anticipating their needs and have scheduled more construction during the present year than the classrooms they reported in their backlog at the beginning of the year:

State	Total classrooms, fall 1959	Backlog as of fall 1959	Classrooms scheduled for completion 1959-60
Delaware.....	3,150	111	222
Indiana.....	33,980	1,505	2,000
Ohio.....	65,822	2,634	2,367
Wisconsin.....	31,241	310	1,650
California.....	108,000	4,600	10,000
Oklahoma.....	25,997	1,009	1,125

A most serious thing about this bill is that we use the shotgun method of giving aid. We should give the aid only to the areas that need it. Under this bill we are spreading it all over, throughout the whole country and that would have this effect. Every community will look to see whether it can get Federal aid before they build. This can have the effect of slowing down the building of class-

rooms, which is going on now at such a tremendous rate. If it has that effect this will be the most harmful piece of legislation we could possibly pass and it would be contrary to the best interests of the boys and girls of this country instead of to their best interests.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very limited time I have to discuss a very important aspect of this legislation, I should be most grateful if my colleagues would withhold their questions until I have completed my formal presentation.

Mr. Chairman we are being asked today to enact legislation which would provide Federal assistance to the local communities of America in improving their educational facilities. The title of the legislation we are being urged to support is referred to as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1960."

The bill before us states that Congress finds that despite sustained and rigorous efforts by the States and local communities, which have increased current school construction to unprecedented levels, there is still a serious shortage of classrooms, which requires immediate action on the part of the Federal Government. This legislation further recognizes the fact that the "financial resources available to many communities are inadequate to support construction programs sufficient to eliminate their classroom shortages." The bill concludes that "this shortage of classrooms is seriously restricting the quality of the Nation's educational program."

I am in full agreement with the findings of the committee which has prepared this legislation.

The legislation before us would provide \$325 million in Federal aid during the first year to be distributed as outright grants for school construction to the individual States on a per capita basis of the recipient State's school-age population. The relief proposed in this legislation would be directed exclusively for solving the problems of our Nation's public schools.

But laudable as this legislation is, I am convinced that unless we recognize the problem with which the Nation's private schools are faced, and also make an effort to solve their problem, any action that this Congress may take on the question of Federal aid to education will indeed be inadequate.

In order to help the Nation's private schools, at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment which would provide an additional 15 percent of the amount now proposed for public school construction, that is, \$48,750,000, to be made available to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for the purpose of granting long-term loans to private, not-for-profit schools throughout the Nation for construction or renovation purposes.

I have selected the figure 15 percent because that is the percentage of American school-age children who are today attending nonpublic schools throughout the country. And I propose that these funds be made available in addition to the \$325 million because I do not want to in any way reduce the help proposed for our public schools.

These loans would be repaid to the U.S. Government over a period not to exceed 40 years and at an interest rate based on the average that the Federal Government is now paying on its outstanding obligations. My amendment

provides an additional one-quarter of 1 percent for the cost of administration.

I should like to emphasize that my amendment would provide loans and not direct grants to private schools. The money would be distributed to qualifying institutions in each State in an amount proportionate to the ratio which the private, nonprofit, elementary and secondary school population in any such State bears to such population nationally.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House of Representatives to seriously ponder the role of the private schools in America and the contribution they are making to our Nation's educational process.

According to statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education for 1957, one out of every seven pupils of grade school or high school age attended a nonpublic school in this country. These figures show that in 1957 there were 6,921,000 American youngsters attending public high schools and another 899,000 attending nonpublic high schools. At the grade school level, the enrollment in public schools for that year was 25,418,000, while an additional 4,293,000 youngsters attended nonpublic elementary schools.

Thus, we see that while roughly 32 million youngsters were being educated in public elementary and high schools, another 5 million were attending private elementary and secondary institutions. Excluding the cost of plant investment, the parents of these 5 million youngsters attending nonpublic schools were saving the taxpayers of this Nation an estimated \$1,800 million in operating costs alone.

In other words, if the parents of these children today attending nonpublic schools were to rebel against this contribution which they are making for the tuition payments of their youngsters to private institutions, the local school boards across the Nation would have to raise their taxes by at least \$1,800 million. This, of course, does not include the billions of dollars that would have to be found to either purchase the existing school plants of these private institutions or provide new facilities.

Bringing this whole picture down to an even simpler denominator, there was evidence presented to my committee when it discussed this particular amendment which indicated that in one school district in Pennsylvania, when there was a fear that a nonpublic school would have to close its doors and turn its 421 students over to the public school authorities, the tax rate in that community would have increased from \$0.31 per \$100 valuation on real estate to \$0.51 per \$100.

There is perhaps an even more compelling reason than the economics of this problem for the Congress of the United States to provide financial loans to private educational institutions. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this loan program is in the public interest for the very elemental reason that private schools serve a public purpose.

We Americans have no trouble accepting hospitals, orphanages, cemeteries as serving the public purpose—even to the point of giving them a great

deal of help. We should have no less trouble recognizing an identical role for private schools.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has properly recognized this fact. The Office of Education 3 years ago published a document entitled "The State and the Nonpublic School." The opening sentences of the first chapter emphasize the place of private, nonprofit schools in American life:

Nonpublic educational institutions are and have always been a significant part of the Nation's total educational resources. These institutions serve millions of American youth and adults each year.

They play an enormous role in transmitting our cultural heritage and enriching it. They make contributions to all levels of education and in all areas. They exert a tremendous influence in fashioning the American way of life.

It is rather interesting to note that this study, in its own words, "describes the legal framework under which the nonpublic schools are enabled to enjoy desirable freedom in their operation and are encouraged to provide educational programs in the public interest."

We, therefore, in this Congress are faced with a strange paradox indeed. On the one hand, we have a responsible agency of Government recognizing the fact that the private schools of America are making a significant contribution to our educational development. On the other hand, we here in Congress are being asked to relegate the students, and parents of these students, who are attending nonpublic schools to a status of second-class citizens by refusing to include assistance in the form of loans for their institutions.

I am in full sympathy with the parents of those students attending nonpublic schools who have protested that their children will be included in a State's school-age population for the purpose of determining the State's share of Federal assistance for public schools, on the one hand, while the students in nonpublic schools in no way will be permitted to benefit from this assistance, on the other hand.

Let me give you an example of what I mean.

In Illinois we have a total school-age population of some 1,900,000 youngsters attending elementary and secondary schools. This is the figure that will be used in determining my State's quota of the \$325 million which we are proposing today to give to the individual States for school construction. But in this figure of 1,900,000 youngsters are included 441,000 youngsters attending nonpublic schools, whose only benefits from this Federal aid could be measured in a possible ultimate reduction in their parents' local real estate taxes.

If it is true that the legislation which we are considering today is designed to meet the Nation's educational problems, then I believe it logically follows that the same problems exist in the Nation's nonpublic schools, and should be met with a workable solution within the framework of our Constitution. A determination that education needs Federal assistance must include an evaluation of the total

educational effort of our country. A partial solution will bring only partial results.

There are those who have said that they oppose this legislation on the grounds of principle. To them I would like to say that the system of government established by the Federal Constitution keeps alive the pluralism which has characterized our Nation. Neither the Founding Fathers nor Americans today have desired to embody any dedicated pattern of life, or to seek a least common denominator, or to marshal the people into any preconceived monolithic mold. The pluralistic nature of our society is one of the greatest bulwarks of freedom. An important element of that pluralism is represented in our multiple educational system. Such multiplicity is healthy for the Nation. My amendment to provide a loan program for these private schools will help to keep alive the pluralistic pattern in the field of education in conformity with the best of our traditions and heritage.

My amendment for providing loans to nonprofit schools has substantial legislative precedents.

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, provides for long-term, moderate interest rate loans to construct collegiate dormitories, social centers, and related facilities. The formula determining the interest rate on college housing loans is the formula in my amendment.

In 1958 Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act. Title III provides for loans to nonprofit schools of an elementary and secondary level for the purpose of securing scientific and foreign language equipment. Title V of the same act makes provision for Federal grants to nonprofit educational institutions to maintain a program of testing and guidance.

In the same year the Hill-Burton Act, which provides for grants to public and nonprofit hospitals, was amended so that loans could be made to hospitals, nursing homes, and related health care institutions. This was done at the request of the Baptists, who contended that a loan program would not involve a violation of separation of church and state.

These acts were adopted after mature deliberation. They have not been challenged in any court. Today they are well established precedents representing a pronounced legislative trend and constituting a consistent construction of the constitutionality of a loan program for nonprofit institutions.

This trend was initiated at the time that the Supreme Court of the United States decided the latest church case, *Zorach v. Clauson* (343 U.S. 306). In the case the broad generalizations of earlier church-state opinions—*McColum* against Board of Education and *Everson* against Board of Education—were brought within proper focus. The traditional norm of cooperation between church and state was reasserted and the Court declared that there must be a common-sense approach to the whole question for "otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other." The validity of my amendment rests on

a common-sense approach to a commanding problem—the problem of constitutionally utilizing the maximum potential of the children in nonprofit as well as public schools.

As early as 1930 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a Louisiana law providing free textbooks to children in church and other private schools. In 1947 the Supreme Court upheld a New Jersey law which authorized use of tax money to pay bus fares of children in nonpublic schools operated by a religious order.

In both these cases the Supreme Court held that such uses of public funds do not violate the Federal Constitution. With this Federal barrier removed, State after State in recent years has moved to extend public services to private school pupils. Free transportation to nonpublic schools is today being provided in at least some communities in 20 or more States.

The interest rate in my amendment is predicated in the last analysis on the average annual rate on all interest bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt, as computed at the end of the fiscal year plus one-fourth of 1 percent for the cost of administration. At the present time this interest rate is 3½ percent.

The question as to whether the college housing formula results in an interest rate which is in effect a subsidy was discussed before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency at the first session of the 86th Congress. These hearings took place after the President's message disapproving S. 57. Dr. John Hanna, president of Michigan State University, submitted a detailed study demonstrating that the interest rate did not constitute a subsidy. He pointed out that the loans to nonprofit institutions are combinations of loans of varying terms, some quite short, others ranging up to 50 years. He observed that in many respects college housing loans resemble mortgages in that portions of the principal are repaid at regular intervals before the final maturity date. Since college housing obligation consists of long- and short-term obligations, there is a logical justification for tying the interest rate to the average rate for all interest bearing obligations of the United States, short and long. Moreover, since the interest rate periodically fluctuates, a college may liquidate a portion of its indebtedness at a rate substantially higher than 3½ percent. On the other hand, another portion may be liquidated at a rate lower than 3½ percent.

The testimony before the subcommittee indicates that, in the long run, the colleges would not be paying less than the average interest rate for long- and short-term Government obligations. On page 389 of the said hearings, a table was introduced submitting the rates of interest paid by the Treasury on borrowings from various trust funds. The average interest rate on the Insurance Trust Fund was 2.5 percent; the Railroad Retirement Fund, 3 percent; the Civil Service Retirement Fund, 2½ percent; the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund, 2¾ percent. The grand total of the borrowing from said funds

was approximately \$40 billion at an average rate of less than 3 percent.

Similar testimony was presented to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on May 21, 1958, by Dr. Lewis Jones, representing the American Council on Education.

How can anyone who has supported the National Defense Education Act, who has supported the National School Lunch Act, who has supported the Housing Act of 1950, who has supported the Hill-Burton Act of 1958, today effectively argue against the amendment which I proposed to this legislation?

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is today faced with a tremendous crisis in our educational institutions. If we are to win the great technological struggle we are now waging against the Soviet Union, we Americans must make sure that our youngsters have unlimited educational opportunities from the first grade on. I am certain that the great scientists who are now helping America maintain a strong position in the world were not asked what grade schools or high schools they attended. I am confident that at all levels of intellectual and scientific pursuits in America today we have men and women who got their educational start in nonpublic schools.

I could list a long line of famous Americans who received their initial education in nonpublic schools operated by Catholics, Lutherans, Baptists, other Protestant denominations, the Jewish community, and nonsectarian private groups. We are dealing here today with the problem of providing education for the children of America. Let us not permit ourselves to be divided in a sincere effort toward finding an answer to the many problems of our Nation's educational facilities by the charge that we are in effect violating this Nation's traditional separation of church and State.

I wish to assure you with all the vigor in me that I, for one, firmly believe in the doctrine of separation of church and state and never want to do anything that would in any way weaken the doctrine which has made America the greatest Nation in the world. But the principle of separation is not involved in this amendment.

What we propose here are loans for the schools which are today making such profound contribution to our educational process—loans that are badly needed to bring many of the private schools up to modern safety standards.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, photographs of the tragic fire which destroyed the Our Lady of Angels Elementary School in Chicago in 1958. I show you here the grieving parents of the 87 young children who died in this fire. While, for the most part, the private schools of America can be proud of their modern standards, the loans which my amendment would make available would help every private school in this country install the necessary standards to prevent another such tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I witnessed this great tragedy in Chicago in 1958; and I determined at that time that if I ever had an

opportunity to do something about this problem, I would use every resource at my disposal to make sure that this would never happen again. I know of no other way that we can help these private schools, and I trust that my colleagues will judge this amendment in the real spirit in which it is being offered. That spirit is to give every youngster the right to attend the school of his choosing and to be able to receive his education in buildings that are safe, sound, and adequate. Since my amendment would provide long-term loans for these private schools which could be used for construction or renovation, adoption of this amendment would go a long way toward helping these private schools meet their building needs.

I urge the House to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I enclose herewith a copy of my amendment to H.R. 10128:

Amendment to the bill H.R. 10128 to authorize an emergency program of Federal assistance in school construction to the States, viz: On page 1 amend title by adding the following: "and to provide loans for the construction of private, nonprofit elementary and secondary school facilities."

On page 2, line 23, strike out "Sec. 3" and insert in lieu "Sec. 3(a)."

On page 3, line 5, add:

"(b) There is further authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the succeeding fiscal year (or years), such sum, not to exceed \$48,750,000 in any fiscal year which shall be equal to 15 per centum of such sums as may be appropriated by the Congress in accordance with section 3(a), for making loans to private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in each State for constructing school facilities. Such loans are hereby authorized to be granted by the Commissioner, and the total amount of such loans awarded for use by qualifying institutions in each State shall be in an amount proportionate to the ratio which the private, nonprofit elementary, and secondary school population in any such State bears to such population nationally. Any such loan—

"(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall, in allocating the loans to the respective States, distribute them on a basis of priority to those applicants demonstrating the greatest degree of need;

"(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, as determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be 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 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 permitted to be allocated within a given State remain unused at the end of the first fiscal year,

they shall be reallocated for use by institutions in other States at the discretion of the Commissioner. Such sums shall be over and above the sums duly appropriated in the succeeding fiscal year."

Renumber succeeding lines and pages as necessary.

On page 13, line 8, after "Sec. 3" add "(a)."

On page 25 add new line 4 and insert:

"(1) The term 'private, nonprofit elementary and secondary school' means an educational organization described in section 503(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is entitled to exemption from income tax under Section 501(a) of such Code. It further means, for the purpose of this Act, a school attendance at which meets the requirement of the compulsory attendance statutes of the State in which the applicant school is located."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand] is recognized.

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like very much to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] who just spoke in behalf of loans to private schools. In my judgment, he has presented a sound case, and I would support it most actively. I introduced an amendment in committee to that effect, and I was disappointed that it did not carry. During the debate on the rule I talked about the basis of need. These schools not tax supported have a justification—they have need and they are doing a tremendous job. There is quite a case for the private schools of this country that are doing so valuable work.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to H.R. 10128 in its present form primarily because it does not include the basis of need. We are proposing in this measure to accept an additional Federal burden at a time when our long-range financial requirements, as that matter was discussed when we were debating the rule, are very difficult to appraise.

In view of the tense international situation it is incumbent upon us, in my judgment, to make sure that every possible tax resource available to the Federal Government be wisely devoted to the national defense. Our States and local communities have long had ample resources for the construction of schools and other public facilities, without any general assistance from the Federal Government. There would be far more justification for this program if the record showed that our communities were falling behind in the important task of constructing school classrooms to meet the need of our expanding population. However, any objective examination of the record clearly shows that this is not the case. In fact, the minority views filed in this minority report, No. 1426, on this bill clearly shows the dramatic

progress that has been made in the construction of those facilities. The country has been building classrooms, as the saying goes, "like crazy."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a table from this report be printed in the Record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure that permission in the House.

Mr. Hiestand. The summary of the construction report reads as follows:

Average annual construction of school classrooms from the years 1950 to 1955 is 51,200 classrooms. The average from 1955 to 1959 is 67,400 per year.

In other words, we have stepped up the building of classrooms, and the population bulge of schoolchildren is about to decrease. According to the U.S. Office of Education and Bureau of Census, who have surveyed our prospective needs, the available annual increase in school enrollment during the period 1955 to 1959 was 1,200,000. In the 5 years 1960 to 1964 it will average 1 million annually. From 1965 through 1969 it will be only 600,000 per year. There has been a marked decline in the so-called backlog of needed classrooms, including those necessary to replace obsolescent facilities, and the trend continues. At this rate we'll be catching up in 1963, and will be caught up with total demand in 1967 all without Federal aid. Surely there will always be spots of shortages but the communities are and will be taking care of those.

Under the provisions of the pending measure, a major portion of the funds authorized will be given to those States which are financially in the best shape to meet their own classroom needs, if their taxing powers are not burdened with additional obligations to the Federal Government.

In fact, of the \$325 million in Federal funds available during the first year of this proposed bill, 42½ percent will be allocated to seven of our most populated and wealthy States. These funds will be distributed without regard to the rich districts which are well equipped, and to those districts which have done a magnificent job in taking care of their needs as well as to the poorer districts.

Any such program makes no economic sense, and merely imposes Federal controls instead of State supervision and financing, which has proved so effective in developing our educational processes.

There has been general agreement that this Nation over the years has done a magnificent educating job with the control in the districts. We say that with Federal money must come Federal control. Why should it not? Do we dare allot a thousand million dollars of the consumers' money to the States and to the districts without some kind of control on them to be sure that the money goes where it is intended? Is it not our duty as Members of Congress to do this? With Federal money must go a certain amount of Federal control despite the disclaimer in the bill.

When we were discussing the rule, I said that in my judgment this was not

a school bill. It was a bill to test further Federal aid to anybody or any particular community.

We have attacked the method of determining need. It can be further attacked when we quote the survey that was made by the Department of Education and the Department of the Budget in trying to find out what the needs were. Not having had any testimony for the past 2 years on the subject as to the basis of need, a check was required, and various figures have been quoted. It is reported from the areas of Atlanta, Dade County, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit that there is a wide difference in definition of a classroom. The investigation revealed:

1. Wide differences in definition of a "classroom" and variations in the pupils per classroom assumed as a standard.

2. Duplication of reporting within a single State, i.e., children were reported in the total of "excess enrollment" as well as in the total of "improperly housed."

3. Differences from year to year in the methods of defining classrooms. For example, one year Alabama used the so-called Strayer-Engleheart formula in identifying "the shortage" and the next year a State evaluation form was used. One method made the shortage appear several times as great as the other;

4. Complete lack of any estimate of a State's or local school system's ability to meet the reported shortage;

5. Some States shifted from estimates to more reliable reporting from one year to the next. However, Office of Education totals did not indicate these year-to-year variations in computing "national totals" from the State reports;

An illustration of this would be that the cities, such as New York and Philadelphia, were not included (except by estimation) in the 1958 report, but were included in the 1959 report, thus cutting down on the amount that the national shortage was "reduced" during the year 1958-59;

6. The conclusion that a man from the Bureau of the Budget should be designated to review all Office of Education statistical surveys.

How can we logically write a law based upon such sketchy material?

I was unable to find out either in the committee or here in the House what the real number of school districts that had exceeded or are within striking distance of their financial bonding limits.

They drew the conclusion that a man from the Bureau of the Budget should be designated to review all Office of Education statistical surveys.

Mr. Chairman, much more could be said on this proposition. This is not a temporary or an emergency measure; it is freely confessed that it is a permanent measure. It starts small, but it is going to grow big. They have not and cannot show an emergency.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be defeated. I suggest that if amendments are offered that would propose to include either measures such as salaries to teachers definitely we do then have to have more Federal control. That, in my judgment, would be fatal to the American formula for free enterprise or the protection of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the increased tension between the United States and Russia strongly points up the responsibility of Congress and the American people to strengthen the foundations of our democracy. No portion of that foundation contains greater strength than our educational system. This is our ultimate weapon. There is no more critical claim upon Congress, and upon every American citizen, than the improvement of educational opportunity for all.

As the House considers this important educational bill, it is well to remind ourselves of the historical legacy that has given the Federal Government a shared responsibility with State and local governments from the years predating the Constitution. As early as 1785, in the most lasting contributions of the Continental Congress, the American Government provided for the ceding of the 16th section of every township in the public domain for educational purposes. The great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

That the Founding Fathers agreed on the need for national support of the schools is readily seen from an examination of their words. President Washington stated:

In a country like this * * * if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power, which requires a steady regulating, and energetic hand to correct and control it.

Alexander Hamilton, the brilliant first Secretary of the Treasury, declared that—

Whatever concerns the general interest of learning * * * are within the sphere of the national councils, as far as regards an application of money.

Washington's successor, President John Adams, felt that—

The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and be willing to bear the expense of it.

Said Thomas Jefferson, in words that echo in our ears today:

A nation that expects to be ignorant and free expects that which never was and never will be.

Less than a century later, in the midst of the tragedy of Civil War, the Congress of the United States passed in 1862 the Morrill Act, signed by President Lincoln, setting up the first land-grant colleges with the use of Federal funds and Federal money. Under this act my own State has been buttressed in its educational endeavors down the years by a great educational institution—South Dakota State College at Brookings.

Historically, the strengthening of our educational effort has received strong bipartisan support. President Theodore Roosevelt declared that—

The share that the National Government should take in the broad work of education has not yet received the attention and care it rightly deserves.

The late Senator Robert Taft, chief sponsor of Federal assistance for education in the 80th Congress, said in 1948:

It does not have the glamour that other things have, but it seems to me we must go forward in the field of education for our people and I know of no way of going forward in that field to any substantial degree without providing some Federal financial assistance.

Although, as we have seen, our history disproves it, we sometimes give the impression that this is a recent issue on the American scene. It is significant that the Republican Party stated in its platform 72 years ago that—

The State or Nation, or both combined, should support free institutions of learning.

In 1920 the Democratic Party platform carried the plank:

Cooperative Federal assistance to the States is immediately required for * * * the increase of teachers' salaries.

In his special education message to Congress on January 27, 1958, President Eisenhower asked for Federal funds to be used to "employ additional qualified science and mathematics teachers."

SOUTH DAKOTA SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, in my own State of South Dakota some 81 percent of our local and State school revenue is derived from property taxes. We rank fourth in the Nation in this effort and first in the Nation in the percent of personal income going to State and local property taxes. We do not have to take a back seat to any State in our strivings to meet our educational needs. Yet I must also point out that in 1959 only 11.8 percent of our elementary-school teachers in South Dakota had the minimum of 4 years of college while 31 percent had less than 2 years of college. We also know that from 1957-63 our school-age population in South Dakota will increase 15 percent. There is no guesswork involved—the children are already here.

A MOBILE POPULATION

That this is a national problem is illustrated by the mobility of our population. We are a people on the go with over 35 million of us changing our addresses each year. Thus, the effect of education offered in a given school may be registered in a State far removed from where the education was acquired. For instance, 1950 census figures show that some 347,000 native-born South Dakotans are now living in other States while 181,000 of our citizens were born in other States and have since migrated to South Dakota.

TEACHER SALARY LEVELS

The continuing inability of State after State to keep up with teacher demand is understandable when we compare their

salaries to that of other professionally trained people. The average salary of classroom teachers in South Dakota for 1959-60 was \$3,600. The national average was \$5,025. It is little wonder that 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."

LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES

As a rural State with property taxes among the highest in the Nation, a classroom and teacher shortage, and a rising school-age population, South Dakota seemingly faces an insurmountable obstacle. It has been suggested that States like South Dakota enact tax laws on out-of-State corporations. It is true that a significant portion of our business is conducted by corporate-owned enterprises who pay taxes in other States at their home offices on corporate incomes earned in South Dakota. South Dakotans contribute to the earnings of these corporations, but only through a Federal support program can our share of these taxes be returned to benefit the State. Faced with staggering financial burdens States such as South Dakota may be forced into levying corporate taxes, with the rates varying from State to State, unless Federal assistance for education is increased.

It is obvious that local and State tax systems, relying heavily on the property tax, cannot raise taxes to the point of driving people out of homeownership or placing their communities in an unfavorable competitive economic position with other States in their desire to raise educational standards.

South Dakota, with a per capita income in 1957 of only \$1,531, was spending \$333 for every child in school. These expenditures among the individual States range from a high of \$535 a year to a low of \$164, with a national average of \$340 per pupil. This gross disparity in educational expenditure between our richest and our poorest States can be rectified only with Federal support.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE COST

Let me also clear up the myth regarding 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, according to Internal Revenue figures, was 44 cents per \$100 in 1959. 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 administered. This means that the cost of collecting the Federal tax dollar and the administration of Federal grant programs totals about 1.6 percent.

None of us is so naive as to believe that money alone will solve our educational ills. 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 to note that we spend slightly more on alcohol and cosmetics and more than twice as much on advertising as we do on education.

Federal support bills for school construction and teachers' salaries are an expression of the genius of our federalism. The Federal Government does what it can do best, namely, mobilize financial resources through taxation, and State and local governments do what they can do best, namely, make grassroots decisions and carry out functions under the direct control and close scrutiny of the local electorate.

NO FEDERAL STRINGS TO ASSISTANCE

I would favor a Federal support program for education that would enable each State to deal according to its own needs, with the shortage of qualified teachers and shortage of classrooms without dictation by the Federal Government.

We can make no more worthwhile investment in our Nation's future than to strengthen our most precious resource—the minds of our children. Let us move then to assure our children of a quality education sufficient for the demands of the space age.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, somehow I cannot reconcile the opposition to the legislation by Members of the Congress who vote subsidies to various groups, both domestic and foreign.

The question before us goes much deeper than the surface arguments presented here.

In our early formative days, education was more of a convenience than a necessity. Today my friends it is a necessity in every sense of the word. In our personal pursuit of health and happiness it is essential in making a living in our competitive economy. In our national life it has become a matter of life or death in our struggle for existence in a troubled world.

Need—not an extension of Federal aid just for the purpose of extending Federal aid.

The necessity for this legislation is based upon a plain, simple, economic fact.

The Federal Government has reached into every State, every subdivision of Government for more and more taxes. Revenues formerly available to school district are not longer available without jeopardizing the very existence of our local government.

My State, Pennsylvania, has State aid to education for the simple reason that many of the subdivisions could not maintain their educational standards with local taxations.

The fight for universal educational opportunities has been a long and hard fought battle.

It is not won yet, by any stretch of the imagination. When we place our opposition to this legislation on the basis of States rights many of us show the nimbleness of our minds and the flexibilities of our convictions.

The question came up on the restrictions in this bill which would deny any help to districts that have reached their bonded debt limit.

Of course this is true, however, under the Metcalf bill and behind the logical reasoning for allowing school districts to use this money for construction or teachers salaries.

The logic being that by giving aid for teachers salaries it will reduce the budgetary needs for this item which in turn will release funds to match Federal funds for construction needs.

We are rapidly approaching the final showdown on aid to education. All of us know or at least we are led to believe that there is something radically wrong with our education system. All of us are told that it is because of the lack of funds to properly house our education system and to pay our teaching staff a proper and reasonable salary scale. It does not take an expert to know that somewhere along the line we failed to keep abreast of our needs in both construction and salary schedules.

For 15 years since the end of World War II practically nothing has been done nationally to aid our local grade and high schools, except where the Federal Government itself created overcrowding by new or enlarged military posts or Government agencies. Yet the need for Federal aid is overwhelming. Take classrooms alone.

Every year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare dismally announces the continuing classroom shortage. This past year HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming sent his usual Christmas message to the schoolchildren of America. He said loftily:

I can come to only one conclusion. The Nation is not moving fast enough to reduce the classroom shortage.

Then Secretary Flemming added a few facts: Last year the number of classrooms needed for pupils rose again. We now need 66,400 classrooms where we needed 65,800 a year ago. Today we are told that 132,000 classrooms are needed.

Number of pupils above normal size classes rose. We now have almost 2 million children who cannot fit into our classrooms. At the same time, the number of classrooms built fell for the second straight year. We fell more than 10 percent behind the previous year and built less than we did in the school year 1955-56.

Bond issues for new classrooms dropped. Most bond issues were limited to seven States. "In short," he concluded, "we have made very little progress over the year in dealing with the huge backlog of need for classrooms which developed during the war years, when school construction was virtually at a standstill." But what did Secretary Flemming's Christmas message propose?

Nothing. He said nothing about what to do on this shortage. He left this matter open until after Christmas for President Eisenhower's state of the Union message to Congress. This brings us to the second scene of this little act in our current national tragedy. President Eisenhower went up to address the Congress. He took a very high level approach to Federal action helping our schools. In fact he left them high and dry:

We cannot be complacent about educating our youth—

He announced.

But—

He carefully added—

the educational process, essentially a local and personal responsibility, cannot be made to leap ahead by crash centralized government action.

The President then proposed "to stimulate classroom construction, not by substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds, but by incentives to extend and encourage State and local efforts." There is only one thing wrong with this proposal. It will not work.

Add to this the loss of good teachers to better paying jobs in other fields. This does not mean that teachers want to leave the schools, it means that their incomes in all cases are fixed by law, local and State, and in too many instances the level has been set by the ability of the school district with or without State aid to pay and not on the economic requirements of the teachers.

Even the school districts cannot be blamed universally because, in too many cases, the ability to raise more tax funds has been stretched to the breaking point. The Federal Government, over the years, has increased its tax take from local citizens leaving little for the local and States to draw from. There are many who believe that unless the Federal Government cuts down its take from States and local communities or gives some of it back to these entities the education system cannot meet its obligations for construction of new facilities and upgrading salary schedules.

These are the practical phases of the question of Federal aid to education. Overriding even the material and financial need is the political and philosophical approach. There is a great and distinguished group of well meaning Americans who are against Federal aid because of fear of interference by the Federal Government into State and local educational programs and institutions.

Then there is another group equally well meaning who say "we cannot afford it, we must balance the budget."

Finally we have the group which is fighting Federal aid because of the localized opposition in our Southern States who are fighting against any and all direct or indirect attempts to segregate education.

One thing that seems to escape all of these groups is that this Government is spending billions on aid to education, that is, in foreign countries under the guise of military and economic aid. Let

us look at just a few of the aids to education in the last foreign aid bill.

We all know the United States gives billions to foreign countries each year to strengthen them in their fight against communism. But did you know that last year we agreed to pay \$237,000 to improve teaching in Philippine schools? Did you know we earmarked over \$1.18 million that same year for better schools and vocational training for youngsters in Thailand, which is the modern name for Siam? And that the little country of Korea was slated to get more than \$2.1 million to improve its educational system? In varying amounts, every year we have assured Federal aid to education in Burma, Cambodia, Free China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and a host of other countries in Asia and Europe and Africa and South America. We even allotted \$112,000 to Yugoslavia, an admitted Communist but anti-Russian nation, to boost vocational training and teach English.

Year in and year out, we are tabbing between \$30 and \$53 millions for educating young people in nations throughout the world. For health, sanitation, and social welfare, we are yearly devoting even much greater amounts. We are told that this is a vital part of our continuing struggle. Every dollar we spend to educate and train and help our neighbors to stand on their own feet is a dollar well spent.

But what about education right here at home? Granted we are in a race with Russia, in which knowledge and know-how may be vital to our existence, what are we doing nationally to improve grade and high schools locally? The answer is almost nothing. The answer then, to those who oppose Federal moneys for education, to those who oppose Federal aid because "we cannot afford it," to those who want no interference with their local schools and finally to those who are against Federal aid to schools that are mixed by custom or law, is simple and plain. Can we afford to let our own internal school system deteriorate and still take tax moneys to build up external systems.

The majority of the Members, I am sure, want to help our educational system while at the same time keep the Federal Government out of our school system. There appears to be one answer and that is the direct approach by reducing Federal income taxes by a given percentage and allowing this amount to be collected by the State for educational purposes.

Even this approach can be argued against; but one thing remains sure. We must do something for our school system. Congress may be on the brink of a dilemma, but so are the parents of children seeking an education in a world where the proper education of our people is a requisite to survival. It appears certain that some legislation will pass this session.

The General Education Subcommittee has approved the following bill by a vote of 4 to 2. The subcommittee has

a membership of four Democrats and two Republicans. The vote was on party line.

The full committee has met and voted 18 for and 10 against. Again, I am sorry to report the vote was on party line.

The next action will be on the floor, when and if the Rules Committee gives the necessary rule. It appears to be a certainty that many amendments will be offered when brought on the floor. I shall make a further report after House action.

You will note that the sum of \$64,925,000 is the share allocated to our State. This means approximately \$1,000 per teaching unit. This entire amount may be used by the State department of education to increase teachers' salaries, or for school construction, or the Department can use any portion for one or the other.

H.R. 22, AS AMENDED AND REPORTED BY THE GENERAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE ON APRIL 16, 1959

The title of the bill is "to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools, appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries."

SUMMARY

Section 1, short title: The bill may be cited as the "School Support Act of 1959."

Section 2, findings and purpose of act: The Congress finds that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by States and local communities to build schools and to increase teachers' salaries, there are still serious shortages of classrooms and of teachers which require emergency action on the part of the Federal Government. The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal financial support to help meet both the immediate and the continuing problems of financing adequate school facilities and teachers' salaries and thereby to strengthen our Nation's educational system.

Section 3, authorization of appropriation: Authorizes appropriations to be made for each fiscal year of a 4-year period beginning July 1, 1959, of \$25 multiplied by school-age population. This subcommittee amendment establishes a terminal date where none existed, and it eliminates the escalator clause. For the 4 comparable years, the subcommittee amendment reduces the appropriation from \$11.4 billion to \$4.4 billion.

Section 4, allotments to States: The U.S. Commissioner of Education shall allot funds to each State on the basis of the State's school-age population, subject to such adjustments, if any, as result from the application of section 8.

The State education agency of each State which desires to receive an allotment under the provisions of this bill shall specify annually to the Commissioner the proportion of its State's allotment that will be expended for each of the two purposes: (a) School construction, and (b) teachers' salaries.

The subcommittee has added language making crystal clear that a State

educational agency may elect to use its allotment for construction, or teachers' salaries, or both.

Payments to the States must be made by the Commissioner of Education within 30 days after funds become available to him.

Section 5, school construction portion: The State education agency of a State which uses a portion of its allotment under this bill for construction of school facilities shall certify to the Commissioner that such funds allocated within the State will be: (a) Expended solely for the construction of school facilities in accordance with this bill, and (b) so distributed that priority is given to local educational agencies which have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which in terms of the economic resources available to them are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities.

Section 6, teachers' salary portion: The State education agency of a State which uses for teachers' salaries a portion of its allotment under this bill shall certify to the Commissioner that such funds allocated within the State will be: (a) Distributed among its school districts to be used solely for teachers' salaries, and (b) distributed so that one-half of the total portion of its allotment that it specifies for teachers' salaries will be allocated to school districts on a per-teacher basis, and the other one-half on an equalization basis.

Section 7, certification by States: Upon receipt by the State, funds allocated under this act shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds. The State education agency shall certify that funds have been distributed and expended according to provisions of this act.

Section 8, maintenance of State and local financial support of schools: This section of the bill sets forth a formula by which a State's allotment under section 4 would be reduced if its relative effort to support schools from State and local sources is less than the average effort for all the States. The section provides that the total sum resulting from the penalties involved would be reallocated among the States that made an effort at least equal to the national average.

The subcommittee's amendments to this section are technical rather than substantive. The formula is, with some minor exceptions, the stock effort index formula appearing in bills previously reported by this committee. An important clause in this section defers application of the maintenance of effort provision for the first two years that allotments are made under the bill.

Section 9, labor standards: This section provides that the State education agency shall give assurance to the Commissioner that workmen employed on school construction projects financed by allotments under the bill will be paid as determined by the U.S. Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act.

Section 10, appropriation for administration: Authorizes to be appropriated to the U.S. Department of Health, Educa-

tion, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this bill.

Section 11, assurance against Federal interference in schools: In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration and operation of any school or school system. The subcommittee has added the words "and operation" in order to add rigidity to this disclaimer. It is significant that, even without this disclaimer section, the opportunity for Federal control of educational policies simply does not exist. To obtain funds a State educational agency must inform the U.S. Commissioner in what manner the allotment is to be divided between construction and teachers' salaries, and then he must certify that allocations for either or both of the two purposes were made within the broad guidelines set forth by the Congress.

Section 12, definition: This section is self-explanatory. The definitions are stock definitions commonly used in legislation previously approved by this committee. "Teacher" is defined to be what each State educational agency deems a teacher to be; "teachers' salaries" is so defined that funds may be expended only as compensation for teaching.

The estimated allotment to Pennsylvania under H.R. 22, as amended, is \$64,925,000—approximately \$1,000 per teaching unit.

Education bills are moving slowly through our Committee on Education and should be ready for action sometime in June or early July.

One of the big drawbacks to Federal aid to education is the fear of Federal domination. Congress must first resolve this phase of Federal aid before any real answer can be written into law.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, for those who believe that improved education and expanded educational opportunities for all our people constitute perhaps our country's greatest single national need, there will be many reasons to look with favor on the pending legislation.

The most immediate and most practical reason, in my opinion, is the fact that this bill is undoubtedly the best that can be enacted into law this year. And in view of the urgency of catching up with the demand for adequate school and classroom space, action this year is essential.

As a compromise measure, the present bill cannot be expected to meet fully the varied and conflicting standards of many of our colleagues. For example, the bill's \$325 million annual authorization will be too little for many supporters of Federal aid and too much for others. The program's proposed 3-year lifetime will be too long for those who believe that "temporary" programs become permanent and much too brief for those

who believe the Federal Government has a continuing responsibility to help fill the gaps in educational needs.

Likewise, there will be some who will object that the assistance does not include teachers' salaries and other educational necessities, or who will urge that Federal standards should be eliminated, or who will propose that greater emphasis be given to helping the neediest States, or who will insist that any Federal aid should be limited to retirement of school construction bonds.

It is apparent, however, that no bill could possibly meet these diverse demands. In some respects, it does not meet the requirements which I believe should be met by Federal-aid legislation. But I believe that Congress can no longer afford to postpone accepting its responsibility in this vital field. For more than 10 years, virtually every responsible group, public and private, which has studied the educational needs of our country has recommended a program of Federal aid to help reduce the backlog of needed classroom space. This recommendation has always been a fundamental and integral part of any plan for lifting American educational standards and for improving the quality of American public education.

The situation described by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 28, 1957, is as pointed and pertinent today as it was then. The President said in part:

The need for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory but demonstrated fact. It cannot now be said—realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need. The classroom shortage has been apparent for a number of years, and the States and communities have notably increased their school building efforts. Each year, for several years, they have set a new record in school construction. And yet, in the face of a vast expansion in enrollments each year, many areas are making inadequate progress in reducing the shortage accumulated over many past years. The rate of State and local construction is spotty, with noticeable lags in areas where needs are expanding most rapidly.

The past 3½ years, Mr. Chairman, have not significantly altered a single one of the President's "demonstrated facts." Despite the bill's deficiencies, the need for legislation of this general kind is still most compelling.

The issue now before the House was described a few days ago by the education editor of the New York Times as "fairly simple." Either the pending bill passes in its present limited form, he said, or there is little hope for Federal aid. Any realistic person, I believe, must agree with this estimate.

Nevertheless, this point should also be stressed. However far it may fall short of the goals many of us share, this bill is on its own merits a good bill. It is an honest compromise in a most highly controversial area of public policy. It will provide for genuine progress to be made in meeting one of the most fundamental needs in education—sufficient classroom space to enable good teachers to obtain maximum results with a manageable group of students.

It is axiomatic, Mr. Chairman, that even the best teacher will find his or her effectiveness diminish in proportion to the overcrowded condition of the classroom. Yet, one of the most characteristic features of elementary and secondary education today is the harassed teacher facing a class of 40, 50, 60, and sometimes 70 or 80 restless and inattentive children.

This is not an atmosphere conducive to learning. This is not a situation in which even the brightest children led by the most talented teachers can hope to attain the levels of excellence to which we all subscribe.

The present bill will help improve this situation directly and, indirectly, can be a stimulus to States and localities to make greater efforts themselves toward this end. It has been estimated that the 3-year program will build directly about 25,000 classrooms and, by virtue of its provision for matching grants in the second and third years, will cause an additional 15,000 or so classrooms to be built which we otherwise would not obtain.

While this will not wipe out the present estimated classroom shortage of 132,400, it will represent definite progress at a time when progress is most important.

In my own State of New Jersey, the bill will provide funds to build about 250 classrooms a year with State matching funds adding an additional 250 classrooms for each of the last 2 years—making a total of about 1,250. At the beginning of the present academic year, New Jersey's estimated classroom shortage totaled about 1,800, after counting the number of classrooms already planned to be built this year.

Consequently, the present bill will play a significant part in helping to bring our State's educational facilities up to par, eliminate overcrowding, abolish double sessions and otherwise make possible a higher quality of instruction for our children.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these would be eminently worthy goals at any point in our Nation's life. At this critical juncture in world history, they have become essential.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, my views on this general legislation I think are quite clear from my minority report which is available to all of you on the floor.

I would like to take this time, however, to discuss an aspect of this Federal aid to education problem that has been a little bit confusing to most of us. That is the question of how much each of these areas are bearing themselves in taxes to support the schools that are necessary in the opinion of the experts here in Washington for our national security or for other purposes. How do the States compare? We get all fouled up when we start to talk about this because we get the accusation that New York State's figures are loaded, that they have large commercial, international enterprises, and that we have the big cities like New York City that are essentially national

in their scope and that these enterprises give us a great deal of tax income not available to other States. Why should a poor area that does not have these industrial giants have poorer schools than the wealthy areas, so-called? That is one of the major points that proponents keep stressing.

In order to clarify this situation I prepared a table which I put in the RECORD yesterday. It will be found on page 11009. This table compares the tax which will be paid by a family, call them the John Rover family, consisting of a wife and two children, if they live in New York State, Connecticut, Arkansas, or any other State in the Union.

The family has a total income of \$5,000 per year. I have assumed that this family will have an automobile and that they will drive the car 10,000 miles a year; that they will get 15 miles to a gallon; that between the man and the wife they will smoke a pack of cigarettes a day; that they will own the house in their own name which has a true value of \$10,000. This family owns \$1,000 worth of tangible property and they make \$800 worth of purchases subject to various State and local sales taxes.

Now, what do these figures come up with? Most of the States and localities rely for their revenue on a sales tax, a tobacco tax, a gasoline tax, a tangible property tax, a State income tax, and real property tax. These are the taxes which the average person pays to support his schools and his municipal and State operations. I have consulted the experts in the legislative and tax service of the Library of Congress and the Census Bureau and they have said that this table, in their opinion, is statistically valid. Now, an interesting thing was revealed when this table came in.

In Minnesota the total tax paid by the head of this family that makes \$5,000 is \$480.18. He makes \$5,000, and all these other facts mentioned above apply to the family, the John Rover that we have assumed in Minnesota. If he moves to West Virginia, with the same conditions, paying the same Federal tax exactly, his support of his local and State governments is \$139.03, \$341 less than it is in Minnesota. Now, running down the line, Minnesota is the first State in the country in State and local taxes, with \$480. Vermont second, \$457; Massachusetts with \$448; Maine with \$425. This is the tax paid by the head of this family who makes \$5,000 with two

children. It is his personal tax. It is a not loaded picture, with industrial or commercial properties. Now, New York you have heard mentioned before today, as to the amount or percentage of tax that they devote to school purposes. In New York this family would pay \$405.47 a year.

Now, I am going to put this table in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks so all of you can see how your State rates. This table will be put in to show the amount of money this family pays for their local and State taxes, starting with Minnesota and ending with the State of the chairman of the General Education Subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, at \$139.

Explanation of the method of arriving at the figures below:

Sales: This figure represents the State sales tax levied and collected by the States and does not include local sales taxes. It is presumed the individual spends \$800 per year on goods subject to this sales tax.

Tobacco: This represents the State tax on cigarettes. We presume the family consumes 1 pack of cigarettes per day.

Gasoline: This figure represents the State tax on gasoline gallonage. We presume the family drives 10,000 miles a year, getting 15 miles to the gallon, thus using 666 gallons of gasoline each year.

Tangible property: This figure represents the State tax on tangible personal property, which we presume to have a value of \$1,000.

State income tax: This is the income tax on a yearly salary of \$5,000, using the short form in each case of computation. The individual has a wife and two children whom he claims as dependents.

The rates for the above taxes were derived from a study made by the editors of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, as published in the November 1959 edition of NADA, published by the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Real property tax: This figure was arrived at by dividing the total property taxes collected in each State by the total assessed value in each State to reach the rate. We presume the individual's house has a sale value of \$10,000. The assessed value was reached by multiplying the sales value by the average sales based assessment ratio provided by the 1957 Census of Governments of the Bureau of the Census. The real property tax figure, therefore, represents real property taxes paid to State and local governments for the year 1957. Later figures are not now available.

Not included in the tax tables are local intangible taxes which are levied in some areas, Federal taxes, and special and temporary State taxes which might be levied from time to time in various States.

Comparative State and local tax table

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total	Amount less than Minnesota
1. Minnesota.....	None	\$20.07	\$33.30	-----	\$114.50	\$312.31	\$480.18	-----
2. Vermont.....	None	25.55	43.29	-----	100.00	288.32	457.16	\$23.02
3. Massachusetts.....	None	21.90	36.63	-----	Exempt	319.50	448.75	31.43
4. Maine.....	\$24	18.25	46.62	-----	None	336.17	425.04	55.14
5. New York.....	None	18.25	39.96	-----	88.00	259.26	405.47	74.71
6. New Jersey.....	None	18.25	33.30	-----	None	335.07	386.62	93.56
7. Wisconsin.....	None	18.25	39.96	-----	64.50	237.54	360.25	119.93
8. Oregon.....	None	None	39.96	-----	132.00	186.08	353.64	121.54
9. New Hampshire.....	None	10.95	46.62	-----	None	297.15	354.72	125.46
10. Montana.....	None	22.20	39.96	-----	48.00	231.45	345.61	131.57
11. Pennsylvania.....	32	21.90	33.30	-----	None	230.19	318.39	161.79
12. Maryland.....	24	10.95	39.96	-----	54.00	173.04	303.29	176.89
13. Idaho.....	None	18.25	39.96	-----	119.00	120.90	298.11	182.07
14. Iowa.....	16	14.60	39.96	-----	67.50	156.66	294.72	185.46
15. Rhode Island.....	24	18.25	39.96	-----	None	204.23	286.44	193.74
16. Indiana.....	None	10.95	39.96	-----	60.00	170.75	281.66	198.52

Comparative State and local tax table—Continued

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total	Amount less than Minnesota
17. South Dakota.....	\$16	\$18.25	\$39.96	None	\$199.80	\$274.01	\$206.17	
18. North Dakota.....	16	21.90	39.96	None	164.17	265.03	215.15	
19. Colorado.....	16	None	39.96	30.00	169.73	255.69	224.49	
20. Virginia.....	None	None	39.96	52.00	160.71	252.67	227.31	
21. Michigan.....	24	18.25	39.96	None	166.33	248.54	231.64	
22. Connecticut.....	24	10.95	39.96	None	172.07	246.98	233.20	
23. Kansas.....	20	14.60	33.30	45.00	131.58	244.48	235.70	
24. Tennessee.....	16	18.25	46.62	Exempt	161.83	242.70	237.48	
25. Georgia.....	24	18.25	43.29	\$2.50	8.00	151.07	239.94	240.34
26. Florida.....	24	18.25	46.62	None	149.14	238.01	242.17	
27. North Carolina.....	24	None	46.62	76.00	91.19	237.81	242.37	
28. California.....	24	10.95	20.96	8.00	153.02	235.93	244.25	
29. Nebraska.....	None	14.60	46.62	None	173.78	235.00	245.18	
30. Mississippi.....	24	21.90	46.62	Exempt	139.63	232.14	248.04	
31. Ohio.....	24	18.25	46.62	6.00	None	135.55	230.42	249.76
32. Arizona.....	24	7.30	33.30	22.00	142.60	229.20	250.98	
33. District of Columbia.....	16	7.30	39.96	40.00	116.72	219.98	260.20	
34. Illinois.....	24	14.60	33.30	None	144.65	216.55	263.63	
35. Oklahoma.....	16	18.25	43.32	25.00	104.43	207.50	272.68	
36. Kentucky.....	None	10.95	46.62	28.00	111.20	206.77	273.41	
37. Utah.....	16	14.60	39.96	48.00	85.02	203.58	276.60	
38. Louisiana.....	16	29.20	46.62	5.75	Exempt	105.51	203.08	277.10
39. Alabama.....	24	21.90	46.62	6.50	27.00	71.82	197.84	282.34
40. Washington.....	32	21.90	43.29	None	98.67	195.86	284.32	
41. Texas.....	None	29.20	33.30	None	381.59	194.09	286.09	
42. South Carolina.....	24	18.25	46.62	16.00	52.57	187.44	292.74	
43. Missouri.....	16	7.30	19.98	17.00	125.04	185.32	294.86	
44. Delaware.....	None	10.95	33.30	53.00	84.80	182.05	298.13	
45. New Mexico.....	16	21.90	39.96	21.00	72.22	171.08	309.10	
46. Arkansas.....	24	21.90	43.29	17.00	61.72	167.91	312.27	
47. Wyoming.....	16	14.60	33.30	None	94.92	158.82	321.36	
48. Nevada.....	15	10.95	39.96	None	90.13	157.04	323.14	
49. West Virginia.....	16	18.25	46.62	None	58.16	139.03	341.15	

Now, who can say that there is not room for any more local tax there in West Virginia. This man who makes \$5,000 and has a family, if he can pay \$405 in New York and if he can pay \$480 in Minnesota, he can certainly pay something higher than \$139 in West Virginia. We are not talking about people that cannot afford to pay. We are talking about a man that has \$5,000 income and has a family. I think the comparison is fair. The table is subject to refinement and elaboration, which I intend to accomplish as discrepancies are noted. But up to this point every refinement suggested by doubters has merely served to accentuate the sharp differences in tax burdens from State to State.

Now, this table illustrates another point which I think is rather critical. The present bill which we are considering will not require matching funds in the first year. The reason they did not require matching funds is because they said there were poor areas in this country where the States could not put in matching funds; that they had to get them started the first year. As a matter of fact, there was a compromise and this aspect of the administration bill was included in order, I think, to get the bill passed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman does not state precisely the reason. The reasoning principally was that there would be a long delay in starting if the funds were not granted directly for the first year; additionally that there would be the opportunity for the States to begin construction in their needy districts immediately, and this was the reason, and the gentleman is quite correct that the subcommittee compromised on a 2-year matching provision.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Now, I should like to mention one other aspect of this. The strongest proponents of this legislation seem to be the people from the States who are going to suffer the most, and who are going to get the least out of this. I wonder if they realize the disservice in terms of their own local interests that they are performing by advocating this bill? They may balance it by saying that the national need is great enough so that we will bypass our own personal interest and that of our constituents in this case. That is all right, if they evaluate the national need as being that critical. But let me give you an example of what they are doing. The Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, March 2, 1960, had this to say:

Mississippi trims its corporate and personal income tax rates, chiefly to lure new industry. Governor Barnett approves a new law gradually reducing the present 6-percent maximum rate on both to 3 percent over a 6-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you are aware how many of these States to which you are going to give massive aid now have tax exemptions to lure your industries away from you? I asked to have a special study made by the Library of Congress, the result of which I shall place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, showing States that do have such provisions.

Now, for example, the State of Alabama has an exemption from State ad valorem taxes for pulp, paper, paper bags, and other pulp-producing manufacturing companies; and companies whose business involves the spinning of threads and yarns, et cetera. Any companies engaged in these businesses have a tax exemption for 10 years if they come down there. An exemption from county and municipal taxes is also provided to certain industries. In addition,

in Alabama all factories and manufacturing plants, manufacturing calcium, cyanamid, aluminum or aluminum products—let me emphasize, aluminum or aluminum products—are exempt from State, county, and municipal taxes for 10 years. Do you want to send our tax dollars down there to support their schools so that they can take off more taxes and take more of your industries away from you? That is basically what this does. The money is there in those communities to support their own schools, if they will do it.

I am not criticizing these States who have these exemptions. It is their right to have them. I do criticize those who, in spite of these exemptions, want to give them more bonuses from the Federal Government on the grounds that these communities do not have the tax revenue to support proper schools.

Let me say in fairness about these States, that normally they are not the ones who are coming up here asking for such Federal aid. For the most part they are conscientious in standing up on this floor opposing the type of aid that is proposed in this bill. They are just as worried about where it is all going to end as some of us in the North are.

In Arkansas, capital invested in textile mills has a 7-year exemption from the tax to support schools. This is to get industries to move out of our areas to go down there. The Governor specifically is given the right in Arkansas under the constitution to give any new manufacturing or processing establishment to be located in the State of Arkansas an exemption from the State property tax for 10 years. Is that where you want to send your tax dollars from Massachusetts and Montana and New Jersey, where your people back home are paying real property and other taxes at such excessively high rates? I do not think so. I do not think your people back home want you to do that.

In Louisiana they have an exemption of 5 years from State property taxes for new manufacturing establishments, plus exemptions on a municipality or parish basis.

In Mississippi the county boards of supervisors and municipalities are given the authority to grant exemptions from ad valorem taxation for 10 years, with a long list of new enterprises that they can lure there through such tax exemption.

In Rhode Island, cities and towns are authorized to give a 10-year exemption to manufacturing property located there because of such exemption.

In South Carolina cities and towns, except for school purposes in South Carolina, are authorized to give 5 successive years of tax exemption to any type of manufactory.

And so forth, down the line. I shall not labor the point, but I shall include this report at the end of my remarks for the benefit of those who want to see it.

Aside from all the arguments about controls—I have presented those in my separate minority views in the report—and all the arguments about setting up a massive organization in Washington that eventually is going to control the distribution of so much of the funds that

they are going to control our educational system in this country—in addition to that argument, let us look at the practical approach to this question.

If we feel that there is not enough income at the local and State level to meet our educational problems and we have a critical need, why do we not just pass some of our Federal taxes back to these communities? I have introduced and been working very hard in favor of the proposal to give the telephone tax back to the States. Do you know the difference in the aid to the States for school and municipal purposes between the telephone tax going back to the States and this bill? This bill would grant \$325 million a year in aid. The telephone tax alone, the 10-percent general-purpose telephone tax of the Federal Government, would give back \$463 million to the States and localities. If there is such a need, and I do not grant that there is in most of these communities, then that is the sensible way of approaching the problem. Pass Federal taxes back and you have no problem of distribution of funds from Washington. Schools should be supported and controlled as they have been traditionally supported and controlled in this country, on a local basis. This is the genius of our system as it has been developed, that the local school boards control.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman have available the amount of money which his State of New York receives from the telephone tax?

Mr. GOODELL. New York would receive, I believe, \$70 million.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Seventy million dollars of the four hundred and sixty-three million dollars.

Some time ago a former member of the committee from New York, Mr. Gwinn, suggested a 1-percent income tax rebate. This raises an interesting question, because it developed that the Montana Power & Light Co., a New Jersey corporation, does not earn 5 percent of its money in New Jersey but pays its taxes through our State. We would have gotten our share of that money from Montana earnings.

Mr. GOODELL. These telephone taxes are taxes collected within our State. They are taxes paid, for the most part, by our people. I am not wedded, however, to any particular plan. If not the telephone tax, let us give them back the Federal cigarette tax, or the liquor tax. Any one of these will work out all right. If it works out better for New Jersey or Montana that way it is all right with me, but I think the money ought to go directly to the State governments rather than come here to Washington and then go back again well wasted by its round trip.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. The trouble with such a proposal is that it is just inverse equalization. The gentleman's pro-

posal for the telephone tax to go back provides that the wealthiest States get the most money.

Mr. GOODELL. In the so-called wealthiest State, suppose there is a family with a \$5,000 income. Take John Rover, the head of that family, living in Geneseo, N.Y., or Belmont, N.Y. He is paying \$405 a year on the average to support his local and State governments. Down in West Virginia, if he moved there, and was making \$5,000 and supporting two children and a wife, he would pay \$139. What is fair about that?

Mr. METCALF. I am in agreement that there should not be any needs basis, but a lot of people say this plan is faulty because it does not have a needs proposal. The gentleman's proposal would be an inverse needs proposal, and that could bring about just as many inequalities.

Mr. GOODELL. This shows how contradictory and involved arguments can get once we establish and accept the alleged fact that the Federal Government is a factor here. No longer can the State collect its own taxes within its State borders. You can carry your argument to the point where, for every single dollar a State collects in its own taxes, some portion of it is owed to other States that do not have as many industries or which by some other standard are not as wealthy. This is an extreme of centralized government which I certainly do not want. The average person living in a home with a market value of \$10,000, and with two children and a wife, and \$5,000 income in New York City, ends up not relying on the corporations to pay for his schools.

He is paying on the average, \$405 for his schools and local and State governments, while in these so-called needy areas, under all the same conditions of income and participation in community economic life, he would not pay anywhere near that amount. Why should the man in New York, in addition, pay Federal taxes to support schools in these so-called needy areas?

Mr. METCALF. The idea of Federal aid is to get away from the local property tax to finance the schools.

Mr. GOODELL. But the answer is that your localities of need that you are talking about are not localities of need. It is simply that the States set up a maximum for borrowing purposes and they can set it on the basis of a completely fallacious assessment roll, and they say that a certain percentage of this assessment roll is the maximum that you can borrow. If they want to be conservative about it, they can set the borrowing limit low and then borrow right up to the limit to which the States tell them they can borrow. That way they can come here as borrowed-up school districts. Take some of the borrowed-up districts in parts of the country, the so-called poor parts, and put them along side the borrowing at Buffalo, Jamestown, and Geneseo, N. Y., and see if the comparison does not show that New York communities are carrying our own load in a responsible fashion. We

are borrowing more than they have borrowed. It is just that our State has put the borrowing limit higher. And we are paying for our own schools with high taxes on individuals, as the table shows. These figures of the so-called borrowed-up districts are loaded and certainly it is a disservice to the country to talk about that factor as a basis for Federal aid to schools.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. What would your reaction be to the proposal that part of the first year's allocation of \$325 million be specifically earmarked to apply to those particular needy districts and leave that in the hands of the chief State school officer of the several States?

Mr. GOODELL. If I were convinced that there was a valid method being applied for finding the truly needy school districts in this country and we felt that the State could not help those needy districts, as many States do, recognizing an equalization factor within their own State borders, if we had that kind of a bill, I would favor Federal aid on a hypodermic basis to those truly needy districts, instead of spreading our fire all over the country as we do in this bill.

At this point, I will place in the RECORD the compilation made for me by the Legislative Reference Service as to various State property exemptions.

LAWS OF SELECTED STATES WHICH PROVIDE A PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR NEW ENTERPRISES OPERATING IN THE STATE

(By Harold A. Kohnen, analyst in taxation and fiscal policy, Economics Division, May 19, 1960)

ALABAMA

In Alabama an exemption from State ad valorem taxes is provided to certain industries and plants as follows:

"For the purpose of developing a market for Alabama pine and other trees and the products thereof, and of encouraging the construction, extension and operation of plants, industries and factories in the State of Alabama for the manufacture or production of pulp, paper, paper bags, and other pulp products; the spinning of thread and yarns the department of revenue is hereby authorized and empowered to exempt from all ad valorem taxes for State purposes, each such factory and plant, and extension thereof or addition thereto, including the works, machinery and all other equipment, for a period of not exceeding 10 years from the date of completion of such factory or plant, or extensions thereof, or additions thereto, but in no event the land on which such plant or factory shall be located" (sec. 6, title 51, code).

The list of industries enumerated in section 6 is considerably more lengthy than covered in the extract above. In order to obtain the benefits of the exemption, written application must be made to the proper authority of the jurisdiction in which the plants are to be located.

An exemption from county and municipal taxes to certain industries and plants is also provided as follows:

"For the purpose of encouraging the building, extending and operation of plants, industries and factories in this State for the spinning of thread and yarns, the knitting and weaving of cloth and other fabrics of cotton, wool, rayon and silk; the manufacture of garments and wearing apparel; the

building and manufacturing of ships, airplanes or airships, the court of county commissioners, or other court or board having like jurisdiction of any county, and the constituted authorities of any city or town in which it is proposed to locate, or add to, are authorized and empowered to remit the taxes assessed for all county and municipal purposes, except for any schools and school district purposes, on such plants, industries or factories, for a period of not exceeding 10 years from the date of the incorporation or organization of such plants, industries or factories, if incorporated and organized under the laws of the State of Alabama, or for a period not exceeding 10 years from the date of being granted permission to do business in the State of Alabama, if a foreign corporation, or from the date of completion of such plant, industry or factory, or from the date of the completion of such addition or extension thereof" (sec. 3, title 51, code).

The section above includes types of industries in addition to those enumerated. The benefit of the exemption requires written application to the proper authority of the jurisdiction in which the plants are to be located. Furthermore, the exemption does not apply to the land on which the plant is located.

Another section of the law provides an exemption specifically for manufacturers of calcium cyanamide, aluminum or aluminum products as follows:

"All factories and manufacture plants manufacturing calcium cyanamide (lime nitrogen) aluminum, or aluminum products shall be exempted from State, county and municipal taxation for 10 years after the beginning of the construction of such plant or factory. The exemption provided herein shall apply solely to the factory or plant and to the personal property used therein or connected therewith in the manufacture of said articles; but shall not apply to the land upon which such factory or plant is located" (sec. 10, title 51, code).

ARKANSAS

The constitution of Arkansas provides for the exemption of cotton mills as follows:

"All capital invested in a textile mill in this State for the manufacture of cotton and fiber goods in any manner shall be and is hereby declared to be exempt from taxation for a period of 7 years from the date of the location of said textile mills" (amendment No. 12, constitution).

This exemption is repeated (in somewhat more detailed language) in section 84-208 of the code.

The constitution also authorizes exemption for new manufacturing establishments as follows:

"The Governor and the agricultural and industrial commission (or the agency created by law to assist in the industrial development of Arkansas) may investigate and contract with the owners of any new manufacturing or processing establishment to be located in the State, or owners making additions or additions to any manufacturing or processing establishment already located in the State, for the exemption from State property taxation: *Provided*, That no exemption from taxes shall be granted under this amendment for a longer period than 10 calendar years succeeding the date of any such contract" (amendment No. 27, constitution).

LOUISIANA

An exemption from the Louisiana State property tax is provided as follows:

"The State board of commerce and industry with the approval of the Governor may contract with the owner of any new manufacturing establishment in the State or with the owner of an addition or additions to any manufacturing establishment already existing in the State for the exemption from tax-

ation of any such new manufacturing establishment or addition upon such terms and conditions as said Board with the approval of the Governor may deem to be the best interest of the State. No exemption from taxes shall be granted under the authority of this paragraph for a longer initial period than 5 calendar years succeeding the date of any such contract; provided that upon application within 90 days before the expiration of the initial period of 5 years any exemption granted under the authority of this paragraph shall be renewed for an additional period of 5 calendar years." (Sec. 4, art. X, constitution).

The exemption from local taxes is provided as follows:

"Any municipality and any parish, respectively, may exempt a new industry or industries hereafter established therein, or an addition hereafter established to any industry or industries already existing therein, from the payment of any or all general municipal, and any or all general parochial taxes and any or all special taxes levied by such municipality or by such parish, or by any political taxing authority or subdivision in either such municipality or parish: *Provided*, That no exemption whatever shall be granted from school taxes: *Provided further*, no exemption from such taxes shall be granted hereunder for a period longer than 10 years" (sec. 22, art. X, constitution).

The exemption must be approved by the electorate and the competing industries of the local area.

MISSISSIPPI

The law of Mississippi implements the authorization for exemption of new enterprises as provided in section 186 and section 192 of the constitution. Only the statutory law is extracted below.

"County boards of supervisors and municipal authorities are hereby authorized and empowered, in their discretion, to grant exemptions from ad valorem taxation, except State ad valorem taxation, on all tangible property used in, or necessary to the operation of the manufacturers and other new enterprises of public utility hereinafter enumerated by classes, but not upon the products thereof, in the case of county boards of supervisors, for a period not to exceed 5 years, and in the case of municipal authorities, for a period not to exceed 10 years" (sec. 9703, code).

A long list of the types of new enterprises which may qualify for exemption is listed in section 9703. Chapter 420, Laws, 1952, gives the county board of supervisors discretion in the matter of granting exemption, provided a certificate is issued by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board.

Similar authority for exemption is also provided to municipalities by section 9708 of the code as follows:

"All municipalities may grant like exemptions from municipal ad valorem taxation for a period not exceeding 10 years to all manufacturers and other new enterprises mentioned in section 1 [§ 9703]" (sec. 9708, code).

RHODE ISLAND

The cities and towns of Rhode Island are authorized, as follows, to exempt manufacturing property located in their jurisdictions for a period not to exceed 10 years:

"The electors of any town or city qualified to vote on a proposition to impose a tax, when legally assembled, may vote to exempt, or may authorize the town or city council of such town or city, for a period not exceeding 1 year, and for a period not exceeding 2 years in towns or cities where elections are held biennially to exempt from taxation for a period not exceeding 10 years, such manufacturing property as may hereafter be located in said town or city in consequence of such exemption, and the land on which such property is located" (sec. 44-3-9, G.L.).

SOUTH CAROLINA

The constitution of South Carolina provides authorization for a general exemption to manufactories as follows:

"Cities and towns may exempt from taxation, by general or special ordinance, except for school purposes, manufactories established within their limits for 5 successive years from the time of the establishment of such manufactories: *Provided*, That such ordinance shall be first ratified by a majority of such qualified electors of such city or town as shall vote at an election held for that purpose" (sec. 8, art. VIII, constitution).

In addition to the general exemption applicable to all counties, the above section (sec. 8, art. VIII, constitution), contains special provisions regarding specific counties. Also, various exemptions of manufactories are granted by special laws applicable to counties and cities. The laws are contained in the code sections 65-1525 through 65-1572, which begin as follows:

"Sec. 65-1524. New manufacturing establishments in certain counties: All new manufacturing establishments located in any of the counties named in this section shall be exempt from all county taxes, except for school purposes, for 5 years from the time of their establishment provided such establishments:

"(1) Have a capital of (a) \$15,000 in Abbeville County; (b) \$25,000 in Greenville County" (sec. 65-1524, code).

Some sections of the law make special provision for specific types of industries, such as:

"Sec. 65-1541. Textile and veneer plants in Berkeley County: Any textile manufacturing plant or enterprise located in Berkeley County and any such plant which is in process of construction and the capital investment in which is not less than \$50,000 and any veneer plant located in said county which shall have a capital investment of not less than \$25,000 shall be exempt from the payment of all county taxes, except for school purposes, for a period of 5 years from the date of the location of such plant or enterprise in said county" (sec. 65-1541, code).

VERMONT

Manufactories, quarries, and mines in Vermont are exempted from the property tax as follows:

"If the amount invested exceeds \$1,000, manufacturing establishments, quarries, mines, and such machinery, tramways, appliances and buildings as are necessary for use in the business, machinery placed in an unoccupied building to be used in business, and capital and personal property used in such business, may be exempted from taxation for a period not exceeding 10 years from the commencement of business, if the town so votes" (sec. 3834, title 32, V.S.).

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee that drafted this particular legislation, and I should like for a moment to attempt to lead this discussion out of the narrow channel in which it rests. The tenor of our discussion would lead one to believe that the only real problem facing American education is that we are short 140,000 classrooms. I think this is a serious problem, but American education faces much greater problems. All of these major studies of American education in the last 2 or 3 years—I refer to the Rockefeller report—and my colleagues will notice I use that name trippingly on my tongue—the Killian re-

port, the reports of Dr. Conant, and the White House Conference on Education have all concluded that if we are going to do the type of job we should be doing we must double our outlays for education in the sixties.

And Secretary Flemming last year stated that it was a reasonable goal for us as a people to double teachers' salaries in the next 10 years.

I want to discuss with you a moment these broad goals, because in focusing our attention on the classroom shortage, we are perhaps misleading ourselves as to the scope of the challenge we face.

One basic conclusion of the Rockefeller report was that in the years ahead education will have a strategic importance in our national performance and that what we do, or do not do, in the field of education may very well determine the posture of strength of our country and its capacity to perform great tasks in the years ahead.

Another of the basic conclusions of these reports is that the American people cannot meet these goals unless, in the words of the Rockefeller report, there is a "thorough, painful, and courageous overhaul of local and State taxing systems." This need for local tax overhaul was demonstrated just a moment ago by my colleague from New York, Mr. GOODSELL, who preceded me in the well of the House. So the time has come when we must face the total problems of American education.

There are, I know, some who feel we are doing a good job in education. I do not. Ours is the richest country in the world—and, whether we like it or not, we wear the mantle of world leadership. If we are to move toward these reasonable goals, it seems to me we must determine now that we are going to spend more for our teachers and our schools. I will confess that on education, I am a spender. I do not think we are spending enough. The best investment we can make is an investment in the minds of our young people.

The details of this bill are based on sound experience. They are based in part on our experience under the land-grant college program, and in part on the system of State aid to education which has worked so well over the years. I am not only against Federal control; I am in favor of maximum local control. This bill provides, for the first time, maximum local control. If an amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], is agreed to, we will say to each locality: "You decide what your needs and priorities are. If you want to build schools, fine—or if you prefer to raise the salaries of your teachers this also is satisfactory." The essential point is that these decisions should be made at the local level. This is the very essence of a sound system. It is based on our experience under State aid systems and puts the decision-making authority in the school boards where it belongs.

Every time the Congress passes a bill, like the National Defense Education Act, and we, in effect, say, "Spend it for this purpose and nothing else," we are not putting faith

and confidence in local school boards. Therefore I am one of those who will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], to broaden the scope of this legislation. Let us trust the judgment of the State and the local people. Let them come forward and decide where the money should be spent. I think this is a very basic issue, and whether we thresh it out or not today, it will be on our desks when we return next January. We must have an educational system worthy of our country—one that will enable us to develop to the full our human resources. We have voted a bill of nearly \$4 billion earlier today, a public works bill, to develop our natural resources. Our proposal is a modest one, a proposal that we make a further investment in human resources.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I wonder if the gentleman will take another minute that I may ask him a question relative to his amendment?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield me time for that purpose.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute to ask him if he will explain his variant so that we may be able to consider it before it comes up tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. UDALL. If the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], does not prevail, the amendment which I intend to propose, if the opportunity presents itself, will put the teachers' salary local option which is in the Senate bill into the committee bill. In other words, it is a narrow amendment and would merely give the State and local people the right to decide whether to use the money for construction or salaries.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an impelling need for enactment of this bill, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. I can think of no other piece of legislation that will have a greater and more beneficial effect upon our future success as a nation.

The educational finance problem of our country has been of special concern to me since the President's White House Conference on Education of 1955. It had seemed to me that this conference basically altered the country's sense of responsibility for our schools as a substantial group of educators and citizens swung over to favor Federal support for education.

In my own district, which is the north coast of California, our city and country school districts are making prodigious efforts to keep up with the fast-growing classroom populations. But too many of them are falling behind. Migration from other States and the high birth rate have caused the school population to increase faster than proper classrooms can be constructed.

In California, as in the Nation, we have two educational problems—the growth problem and the quality problem.

The school building financing problem in California staggers the imagination. More than 80 percent of the students in California schools are being educated in school districts that have already voted override taxes beyond the legal tax limits in order to continue to operate.

California now has more than 3 million pupils in the elementary and secondary schools. This is the largest school system in the United States. On conservative estimates, we shall have, by 1970, 5½ million children in the public schools.

Our State bonded indebtedness for schools alone, not counting local school district bonded indebtedness, exceeds \$900 million. We shall have on the ballot on June 7 a request for an additional \$300 million, which may last us for about 2 years.

In the system used in California much of this money is not repaid to the State by the local school districts. We will have accumulated in 2 more years \$1,200 million in State indebtedness for school buildings alone. This debt has accumulated only since 1950.

If we project what it will cost on State bonding, in addition to local bonding, we shall accumulate by 1960 some \$3 billion of State indebtedness for schools. This is an impossible situation. We cannot continue to pay high interest rates on State and local school bonds in amounts that will shortly equal the amount actually expended per year for actual construction of classrooms.

I am also concerned with increasing the quality of education, so that America may meet the great challenges of our time.

California now has 15,000 people teaching in the public schools who hold substandard teaching credentials. This is primarily because of our school districts' inability to compete with other job opportunities available to college graduates.

We have pushed our local property tax beyond reasonable limits already. And in the last general session of the California Legislature there were enacted a whole series of new taxes designed to produce about \$200 million in additional revenues. Of the \$200 million about \$25 million went for additional help to our hard-pressed schools—just enough to reduce the elementary class load by one student. One of our problems in California is that we have about the highest class load per teacher.

I would like to say to those who tell us there is no need in the State of California for this legislation that they have a responsibility to tell the people of California where we are going to get the money to educate 2½ million additional schoolchildren by 1970.

And where are we going to get the money to reduce the high school English teacher's average class load to 100 students, as recommended by Dr. Conant in his report on the American high school?

The heart of the quality problem is class size, and the quality of the teacher.

This is why I wish to identify myself with the amendment the gentlemen from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is about to offer concerning Federal support for teachers' salaries as well as construction.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with those who argue that primary responsibility for public education should be exercised by local authorities. Our public schools take much of their strength from the devotion of millions of private citizens who are involved directly in their affairs—the boards of trustees, the PTA's, and so forth. I have a very personal reason for having this respect for local control of public education inasmuch as I was secretary of the North Haven Board of Education for 5 years.

On this matter, I share the thinking of Adlai Stevenson who, in regard to schools, once said:

Local control keeps alive continuous debate and freedom to experiment. It insures a wholesome diversity in educational plans and practices. It helps to keep public education from becoming an instrument of stifling conformity and uniformity. Not sentimental attachment to tradition but hard-headed good sense demands that by keeping control of education in the local community we keep the spreading branches of an ever-enlarging democracy always close to its roots.

Our thinking regarding the financing of our schools must start with an insistence that it is first of all the responsibility of local and State governments; they must always make available the largest possible revenues to sustain our public educational system. But what happens when they fail?

I think we are beginning to see the consequences of insufficient funds being furnished for education. Across America millions of parents and children are putting up with overcrowded schools. On October 14, 1959, Secretary Arthur Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that a shortage of more than 130,000 classrooms now exists. On the basis of official reports to the U.S. Department of Education by the 50 States, it has been estimated that 1,883,000 children are now enrolled in public schools in excess of normal capacity. As you know, these 1,883,000 children are not the only ones to suffer from the classroom shortage when a classroom built to accommodate 30 pupils is forced to serve 40 students. It is not merely the excess 10 but all 40 of them who are overcrowded. On this basis Secretary Flemming, stated last August, "The number of pupils whose education is being impaired by the classroom shortage is about 10 million." These 10 million children are forced to attend schools that are too full and noisy for effective teaching.

Some people have argued that bigger and newer schools do not mean better education; I agree. Providing an adequate plant for learning is only half the battle. Without properly trained, efficient teachers our educational system will continue to decline. This, then, brings us to the problem of teachers' salaries. We cannot obtain the best brainpower to teach our children if we consistently offer bargain-basement wages and working conditions. School systems all over the country not only compete with each other for the good teachers but they also compete with our growing industries for the talented college grad-

uates. Private business is depending more and more upon professional people for research, administration, and so forth. Unless our school systems keep pace and compete, they will be able to attract only the least capable college graduate. I do not think we want the least—we want and should get the best for our children.

It has been argued that the States and localities, alone, in their individual ways can solve the problem and raise the necessary funds. The very first fact to cope with is that, by law, most schools must rely very largely for their support on property taxes. But property tax revenues do not necessarily go up as the population of a community increases. Another method of raising funds is by borrowing. However, today, 24 percent of the Nation's 50,000 school districts have reached their legal debt limit and, by law, are not permitted to float new bonds.

Assuming that the States received a greater ability to tax, I question whether sufficient revenue would be channeled into such needs as our schools. My reason for having doubts lies in a very practical, businesslike view of our 50 States—all competing with each other to attract industry. No State is willing to raise taxes when its neighbors might be lowering theirs.

For these reasons and many more, I fear that State and local government, while providing the bulk of the financial support for our schools, cannot, as a practical matter, sustain the entire burden.

And the problems being faced today will increase. There will be an increase of about 2 to 3 million children of school age every 2 years for the next 20 years. Since 1900 more youths have stayed in school longer and this trend will continue; by 1963 the school-age population of my own State of Connecticut will increase 26 percent over what it was in 1957.

The picture becomes bleaker when we study what the States and localities are doing about it. According to the U.S. Office of Education, the States and local communities plan to build 10 percent less classrooms this year than were built last year. The slackening of the school construction pace is further documented by a downtrend in bond issues. During the first 11 months of 1959 voters of all States approved \$1,230,736,000 worth of school bond issues, compared to \$1,364 million in the comparable period of the previous year. Many authorities look upon this drop in bond issues as evidence that many communities are nearing the saturation point in local tax sources.

I believe Federal assistance to our educational system is a necessity. Indeed there are ample precedents in our national history of Federal support of education. Support for specific purposes has been provided without Federal control, and the legislation now being considered will provide adequate safeguards against any Federal control in the future.

Nearly 2 centuries of American history and experience testify that the need for financial assistance can be met with-

out the slightest degree of control by the central Government. No such control followed Congress' grant in 1785 of a section of every township in the Federal domain for the maintenance of public schools. Nor has President Lincoln's approval of the land grant college system resulted in Federal control. The GI Bill of Rights has done great good, so has the National Defense Education Act, and the various research programs of the National Institutes of Health. And there has been no accompanying Federal domination.

We have been reminded of the cost involved. Permit me to remind you that bad education for our children is not cheap—it does not save us anything. Its high costs are paid for in other budgets—combating poverty, unemployment and juvenile delinquency. The question you should ask is, "Can we afford to continue wasting our resources by not providing adequately for our youth?" The real waste occurs when Government abdicates its function and refuses to serve the best interests of the people.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I joined with a majority of the committee in voting favorably on measures providing Federal funds for construction and teachers salaries. I continue to support this program. I do not believe that a responsible Government can afford to short-change the adults of tomorrow by refusing to provide them with the tools for a proper education today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments for and against this legislation. The principal argument of those who are against it is that many localities are not taxing themselves sufficiently to provide for proper schools for their children and this bill will be a burden on those who are already doing their share. Others have said education is purely a local matter and, consequently, school construction must be a local matter also. Both arguments have great weight with me.

The bill affirms and reaffirms local autonomy and states explicitly "that the control of the personnel, program of instruction, formulation of policy, and the administration of the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools resides in the States and local communities." I entirely agree with this and with the further statement that "the primary responsibility for financing the costs of public school facilities resides in the States and local communities."

In accordance with the purposes of the act, this bill aids the States and local communities in meeting this responsibility.

In these days of world competition for men's minds all our children must have superior educational facilities. In many parts of our country children are not receiving proper education because of inadequate facilities.

The needs of our children must be met and a proper method must be found to meet these needs. I believe that the bill before us meets the need without changing the concept of local autonomy. I intend to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time because it seems to me a great deal of this issue comes down to one of financing rather than one of education itself, because I think there is rather common agreement on both sides of the aisle and in this country for the need for more funds in the field of education. Certainly, I think we all agree that there are many areas where we can improve education. The question, then, is: How do we get those funds into the educational system in the best fashion?

The very fact the last speaker, the gentleman from Arizona, pointed out that all controls and methods of how the money should be spent should remain at the State and local level, is a demonstration that the only way in which we are trying to bring the Federal Government into this picture is as a tax collector. So the question really comes down to one of how efficient a tax collector is the Federal Government, and is there something peculiar about the Federal Government as a tax collector in this area that suggests to us that we should use it?

Before going into it and developing this point, because it is a point that I think the Committee on Ways and Means is particularly interested in and has studied a great deal, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] for his very scholarly presentation of one aspect of this financial problem and the taxing problem.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the point of tax collection?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will in just a minute. In fact, I would like to yield when I ask this one question. I was impressed with the fact that apparently the committee has not held hearing on this particular bill. I have been interested over a period of time in following the committee's activities to find out whether they have gone into this aspect of tax collecting, as to whether they have actually studied the situation of communities and of States and, I may say, of the Federal Government in trying to resolve this tax problem. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With respect first to the question of hearings I would like to point out that there is no new ground covered. We have had literally thousands of pages of testimony from hundreds of witnesses on this subject.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. On the subject of tax collection?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. On the subject of this legislation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I did not yield for that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And on the subject of tax collection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I wanted to direct attention to and that was why I was yielded time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will confine myself to that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What studies has this committee made of the problem of local tax collection by the school districts?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In the last Congress in considering the amendment of the gentleman from New York, our former colleague, Mr. Gwinn, we devoted a great deal of time to it.

We elicited some of the following information.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. From what sources?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. From all sources.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us not deal in generalities. By source, did you call before you some of the county assessors or people from the county assessor's association, people from municipal bond houses who know something about this problem of financing, people from State revenue offices, anyone from the Ways and Means Committee, or the staff of the Ways and Means Committee?

That is what I mean by information and study in this area.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am unable to recall specifically at the moment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I say that if the gentleman has anything to contribute he do so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have something to contribute.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Please deal with that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The cost to the Federal Government for collecting taxes was determined to be 44 cents per \$100, while the State cost for collecting \$100 ran from 95 cents to \$2.30.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who made those estimates, if the gentleman can supply that information?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from Montana can answer that question. He is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. METCALF. This was a survey made by our own Government Operations Committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who were the witnesses? Who made the study? I have seen some very poor studies, and I have seen some good studies. This figure does not sound right. That is why I am asking the question.

Mr. METCALF. The Government Operations Committee filed a report with the House, and it has a record of hearings. It had various people such as the gentleman suggested called before that committee, some people from bond houses that were called before that committee, some experts from States who had to handle special improvement bonds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Are we talking about taxes for education now or, generally, local taxes?

Mr. METCALF. Taxes for education.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me ask another question. Did you then have

someone from the Government Operations Committee testify before your committee with this information?

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman's committee is my committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg your pardon. Of course, I recognize that, but the gentleman was on the Committee on Education and Labor at the time supposedly some of these studies were being made.

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Was that information before your committee?

Mr. METCALF. The testimony presented to the Committee on Government Operations is a part of the official record of the House, it is a part of the committee records, and is before the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. A lot of information is before the House that is not utilized. I am trying to pinpoint whether the committee in presenting the matter to the House has gone into those areas. I do not want to yield any further at this time because I want to develop a few points in reference to some problems involved in this tax area. I am going to make a general statement, which is a matter of opinion. Possibly some studies may bring it up to date. In collecting money in a local community, and sending it back into a community, that money in going back will be clipped by about 25 percent. It will not go back the full dollar, it will be minus about 25 cents on the dollar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not referring to the cost of tax collections, I am talking about the bureaucracy.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The survey upon which the statistics I gave was based was the result of questionnaires sent out to 3,300 school districts throughout the United States.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What was the year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The year was 1958.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And the studies probably were based upon the situation existing in 1956 because the data they had would probably be about that time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This is 1958 I am referring to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I understand you collected them in 1958, but the data was based on probably 1956.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They were current.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is not current; 1956 is not current and 1958 is not current to 1960. This is an area of great dynamic advancement and I, as a Member of the House, expect a committee that is supposed to study these things to bring these matters up to date. They are the essence of this subject as to what the advancement has been in this area, and what are the problems. I would point out, as I did, that taking tax money out of a community and sending it back to a community results in a loss. As the gentleman from Arizona pointed out, how the money is spent in a community is to be decided by the community. Taking money out of a community to send it to

Washington, D.C., and thence back to the community is in itself an inefficient way, even though the Federal Government might be on some other basis a more efficient tax collector. It is going to have to go through the process of Federal bureaucracy, and I suggest it will be clipped by 25 cents on each dollar. One other reason for having our Federal Government used as a tax collector—and I am not confining this to education—is that it would be a very neat way of redistributing the wealth of the Nation. That was the plea in the thirties. But I suggest today that the wealth of this country is sufficiently redistributed so the Federal Government is no longer that convenient a method, even as demagogic a method, I might say, of redistributing the wealth. There is a third reason, and I think this reason deserves some real study, and it has been referred to from time to time. The Federal Government can be an equalizer among the States between the richer States and the poorer States. As in education, we rely on the States to be the equalizer for the various counties within the State or even school districts within the counties.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Just briefly.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I recognize the gentleman has a very orderly mind and wants to proceed in a chronological way. Now, you said that this money going back to the States will be clipped by 25 percent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Will the gentleman support that in the Record; by putting into the Record his basis for making that statement?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I would be glad to. I said it was an estimate.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I would like to see you support it, since you want us to support the position.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I suggest to the gentleman—and his experience is possibly as good as mine—that the money has to go through the Federal bureaucracy, and in this instance through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the overhead and everything else that goes with it, and that enters into the picture.

To revert back to the point I was trying to make, the Federal Government might be used as an equalizer between the rich and the poor States. This is often an argument advanced by those who urge that the Federal Government's services as a tax collector be utilized in the field of education. However, this cannot be a very serious argument on the part of the proponents of this particular legislation inasmuch as distribution of federally collected taxes is to be made on a per capita student basis rather than upon a need basis.

Furthermore, there seems to be no real data available on the subject of need. To obtain this data the committee will have to not only obtain the assessed valuations in the various school districts for which a need is alleged, but also the overall assessed valuations in the State

in which the county is located, plus the other bases the State may have for levying taxes. Although real estate taxes are the largest source of revenue for counties, municipalities, and school districts, there are other taxes available to them and certainly there are other taxes available to the States. If the States are to do their job of equalization between rich and poor school districts, perforce they must use other sources of revenue than the real estate tax for education purposes.

Actually, the only tax available to the Federal Government which is not available to the State governments is the tax on imported goods. The argument used as to why the States cannot use some kinds of taxes is that the States population and industry might shift if the States levied too heavy taxes. This theory is largely exploded. Certainly it is exploded as far as taxes for education are concerned. The States levying the heaviest taxes are the most populous and have the most industry. Conversely the States that do not seem to be doing so well are those that have been chary about levying taxes for basic needs such as education.

In studying the problems of local taxation, it is not sufficient to merely look at the assessed valuations. One must also look at the real valuations, particularly of real estate in relation to the assessed valuations. Certainly if there has been no recent reassessment of real estate in a county one can almost conclude that the assessed valuations have little relation to the real values involved.

All I am pointing out is that a real study must be made before we can conclude that certain States or certain counties are unable to levy the taxes necessary to support an adequate school system. I am satisfied that the case has not yet been made. Indeed, from a few spot checks of areas that are supposed not to have the wealth necessary to support an adequate school system, I am inclined to believe that it is lack of desire rather than wealth that lies at the bottom of the trouble.

One other factor constantly used to bolster the proposition that the States or counties or school boards cannot finance their own educational program is the bonded debt ceilings. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] made a point of the limit of the bonded indebtedness ceiling of Gary, Ind. This, of all arguments is the most specious, because any legislature can remove this obstacle. And what irony it is for the Federal Government to be constantly raising its debt ceiling because it is undertaking the financing the States and local communities are not undertaking.

There is a possible argument that might be advanced why the Federal Government has an obligation in the field of tax collecting in behalf of the States and local communities. After all, inflation resulted largely from the manner in which the Federal Government handled its fiscal affairs and inflation has been one of the greatest causes to aggravate the problems of tax collecting of the local communities.

For example, school districts derive most of their revenues from real estate taxes. Real estate taxes in turn are based upon real estate assessments which are placed on the assessor's books over a period of years. Most of the real estate in the counties of the United States was assessed in terms of the uninflated dollar of pre-1946. Nor can the counties and school districts correct this bias by simply raising the tax rates on real estate. When this method is followed all of the new real estate going on the assessor's books after 1946 is in terms of the inflated dollar. These new homes, incidentally are largely owned by the smaller income groups and the newly formed families. Only one real course has been left open to the local communities to correct for this damage resulting from inflation upon their basic tax system, that is to reassess all real estate on the books. This is a politically and mechanically difficult and costly step to take.

However, it would be foolish to use this as an argument for having the Federal Government move into the picture as a tax collector. Indeed, it is dangerous because the Federal Government unlike the States, local governments, and all private institutions and individuals does not have to match its expenditure side of the ledger with revenue. Unfortunately, from this standpoint the Federal Government has the power to print money and it can make up the difference between expenditures and tax collections by just printing more money. If the Federal Government does this then it merely compounds the difficulty the local communities have already found themselves in through past inflation by creating more inflation.

Incidentally, the bonded debt ceilings unless raised after the impact of inflation are just as unrealistic as the assessments of real estate unadjusted. How many States have raised the debt ceilings of the school districts to compensate for the impact of inflation on the fixed dollar figure?

There is a further problem the school districts and local communities in newly built-up suburban areas are finding in this business of taxation. Without fully realizing what they were doing they zoned themselves largely as bedroom areas. They did not want any industry around them, indeed many did not even want commerce around them. This is a fine luxury, if one can afford it. Unfortunately very few communities indeed can afford to have their tax base rest upon private residences. They must have industry and commerce to help bear a big share of the load for community services and for education.

There is only one way out of this dilemma and that is for the communities which have made this mistake to take new stock of themselves and their zoning laws and allow for industry and commerce to enter the community in accordance with good community planning.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman GOODELL, has pointed out another area of the State and communities own making, frequently the States and communities that

are alleged to have the need for help from the Federal Government as a tax collector. These communities in their desire to attract industry to their area forgave the industry the payment of local taxes for several years. This is possibly a wise move on their part, but the wisdom must be determined in balance. Certainly if the revenues obtained from the industry moving to the community do not offset the revenues forgiven there is no wisdom.

The question of marketability of school bonds should be a subject upon which this committee should be reporting to the House if we are to evaluate this proposed legislation intelligently. I doubt whether a great case can be made for the lack of market for municipal bonds exempt from Federal taxation as they are. Certainly, if we want to broaden the market, I suggest a few people get behind the legislation I have had before the House for several years which would broaden the municipal bond market by permitting investment trusts to invest in these securities and be able to pass on the tax-exempt feature of them to their holders.

I was going on to discuss some educational aspects of this problem which revolve around productivity in our educational system, but this has become an overly long discussion. I will simply mention a few possibilities. A four term year so that we use both the physical and administrative aspects of our educational plant 12 months of the year rather than 9. The 9-month school year is an inheritance we obtained from the days we were an agrarian society and is hardly necessary or applicable today. The 3-month vacation for pupils and possibly teachers might still remain, but surely there is no reason not to spread the overhead cost of physical plant and administration over the full year period. This would reduce our costs in this area, at any rate, by one-fourth. Use of teachers aids would save in salaries of the more highly trained teachers, or would permit money to be used to increase teachers salaries. The expansion of visual aids and educational TV probably could bring about a more efficient expenditure of the education dollar. Above all the NEA might devote more effort than they have to the problems involved in teacher training and teachers standards. It certainly is no advancement to education qualitywise or costwise to limit teaching jobs to graduates of schools under the domination of one select group of educators.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] has asked that I document my statement that 25 cents is clipped from each dollar collected by the Federal Government from the community and then sent back to the community for expenditure. I have reread my original statement on this and I wish to point out that I emphasized that this was a "general statement, which is a matter of opinion. Possibly some studies may bring it up to date." The opinion is based upon a general knowledge of the process through which a tax dollar once collected by the Federal Government must

go before it is sent back to the communities. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is primarily involved in this processing, but so is the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and many other bureaus in various though limited ways. Furthermore, the receiving community or State must set up machinery which become part of this "distributive process." Maybe a guess of 25 percent is too much—on the other hand it may be too little. One thing I do agree with the gentleman from California on, is that this is an area which needs some studying. This ought to be taken out of the realm of opinion as best we can do so. The point I make, however, stands—it is a costly procedure to take money out of a community simply to return it to that community for its own expenditure. The proponents of this legislation are making much of the fact that they want the expenditure of the moneys to be wholly within the discretion of the communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10128, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960.

As a member of the General Education Subcommittee, I have listened to the testimony presented by many witnesses concerning the need to invest more in the education of our young people and I am convinced that this legislation is essential if we are to begin to meet the shortage of classrooms in the United States today.

Moreover, I am convinced that the American people favor the use of their own Federal tax moneys to support State and local efforts to build more schoolrooms.

In this field, as in many other fields, the people are often far ahead of many of the politicians in their understanding of the problem. A few weeks ago I sent out questionnaires to the homes of nearly every registered voter in my district, the Third of Indiana.

Over 23,000 persons answered my questionnaire and I may say that this poll came within 1 percent of predicting the actual party vote in the May 3 presidential primary in Indiana, so I believe the poll a fairly reliable indicator of public opinion in my district.

Mr. Chairman, on the question, "Do you favor Federal funds for classroom construction?" 65 percent of the persons responding to this poll answered "Yes," only 30 percent "No," and 5 percent had no answer. Just as revealing is the fact that a majority of every voter group endorsed Federal support of education—Democrats by a margin of 5 to 1, Republicans by 5 to 4, and independents by 5 to 3.

These Hoosier citizens know that money for our schools must come from some source and they know, too, that if the State and local governments find it impossible to meet the needs of our rapidly expanding school population we must make use of our Federal funds.

The facts are that in 1958 the Federal Government collected 69 percent of all tax revenue, the States 15 percent, and the localities 16 percent. Yet local sources provide 56 percent of the revenue for elementary and secondary education, State governments 40 percent, and the Federal Government less than 4 percent.

Some persons may still say the way to meet the shortage of classrooms in the United States is a sharp increase in the local property tax.

This is not an exceedingly popular approach in my part of the country, and any Republican who wants to run against me on a "let's raise the property tax" platform will be a more-than-welcome opponent.

Yet, in fact, every Congressman who votes against this school support bill will in effect be voting to raise the property taxes of the people of his State.

I do not say that the States are in every case unwilling to do the job of providing adequate tax support for schools. In many cases it is simply fiscally impossible for them to do so. I refer Members to the Wall Street Journal article of May 20, 1960, which my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], inserted in the RECORD yesterday. In some cases, however, the apostles of States rights are clearly talking out of both sides of their mouths when they blandly assure us there is no need for Federal support for education because the States will do the job.

The State of Indiana, according to the latest figures I have seen, ranks 15th in the United States in per capita income; if the States righters were doing their job, we should be 15th in the Nation in per-pupil expenditures for public education, but we are 31st.

In addition, State constitutional limitations on the bonding power of school districts make it extremely difficult to meet needs at local level.

Since our State constitution limits the spending power of school districts to 2 percent of their assessed valuation, such considerations as these help explain why 65 percent of people of my Hoosier district favor Federal support to build more classrooms. They help explain why people like Eric Johnston, a leading business figure and former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, issues a ringing plea for Federal funds for education, why the Committee for Economic Development, an organization of top U.S. business and industrial leaders, endorses Federal assistance for education.

Mr. Chairman, others have discussed the shortage of classrooms. I want only to emphasize the significance of two statements made last year by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming.

In August of 1959 Secretary Flemming warned that the number of American students whose education was being impaired by the classroom shortage was 10 million.

In October of 1959 Secretary Flemming set the classroom shortage at between 130,000 and 140,000.

Yet he warned that the latest figures on school bond sales showed a drop of

fully 20 percent during the most recent 12-month period as compared with the previous such period, and then concluded, "Marked declines in school construction are to be expected."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have seen here today that one of the major issues surrounding any proposal for increasing our national investment in education is that of Federal control.

As a former teacher, I certainly want no Federal control of what is taught in our schools.

But, Mr. Chairman, we must look at the facts, and I would respectfully suggest that the best evidence that Federal funds can be used for education without Federal control is the fact that we have been doing so for some years now.

Under Public Laws 815 and 874, Federal funds have been used under the impacted area program not only to build classrooms, but also to pay teachers' salaries and even to buy textbooks.

With reference to the statement by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUINN] that there has been Federal control under Public Laws 815 and 874, I want to say that I asked the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Derthick, if the fact that this Federal aid was going to education had led to any Federal control under this program.

I want to read you his answer:

I am glad to say, Mr. BRADEMANS, that the question has not come up. On the contrary, there was a doctorate study done up at Teachers College, Columbia University, investigating to determine where there had been any semblance of Federal control in the administration of these laws throughout the United States. And the conclusion was impressive and complete, that there has not been any indication in any of these approximately 4,000 school districts.

And the Commissioner went on to assure the committee that his statement applied to the use of Federal funds both for school construction and for teachers' salaries.

For those persons, therefore, who are sincerely troubled about the issue of Federal control but who base their conclusions on facts, I urge a look not only at the express disclaimer of Federal control in the Thompson bill but at the actual record of administration of the Federal funds under present law.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my remarks in support of this legislation by commenting briefly on a Presidential veto of a Federal aid-to-education bill.

This Federal aid-to-education bill was vetoed by the President of the United States on the basis of several objections. Some of the objections to the bill made by the President are worth quoting here today:

I deem it to be both inexpedient and unconstitutional.

This bill has been passed at a period when we can with great difficulty raise sufficient revenue to sustain the expenses of the Government.

Should the time ever arrive when the State governments shall look to the Federal Treasury for the means of supporting themselves and maintaining their systems of education and internal policy, the character of both governments will be greatly deteriorated * * * what is obtained easily and without responsibility will be lavishly expended.

It is extremely doubtful, to say the least, whether this bill would contribute to the advancement of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

This bill will injuriously interfere with existing colleges in the different States * * *.

I presume the general proposition is undeniable, that Congress does not possess the power to appropriate money in the Treasury, raised by taxes on the people of the United States, for the purpose of educating the people of the respective States. * * * Should Congress exercise such a power, this would be to break down the barriers which have been so carefully constructed in the Constitution to separate Federal from State authority.

Mr. Chairman, I have not of course been reading from a veto message of President Eisenhower. The quotations I have just read are from a veto message, not in 1959, but in 1859. For on February 24, 1859, just over one century ago, one of the first Federal aid-to-education bills in our history was vetoed.

The author of the veto was President James Buchanan, a Democrat.

The bill he vetoed was the Land-Grant College Act.

President Buchanan's successor in the White House, a Republican, did however sign that early Federal aid-to-education bill.

President Buchanan's successor, Mr. Chairman, was Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the American people have learned a great deal during the last 100 years.

With Abraham Lincoln, we have had to learn, as he said, "To think anew, to act anew, to disenthral ourselves."

"The dogmas of the quiet past," said Lincoln, "are inadequate to the stormy present."

Mr. Chairman, I hope that Congress will this week pass this bill to increase our national investment in the most valuable natural resource we have, educated young men and women.

In this way, Congress will prove itself adequate to "the stormy present" of the modern world.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the most frequent argument against Federal assistance for school construction is that there is no need—that the States are able to handle the load alone. I have heard this argument ever since coming to Congress and yet this year we still have our schools operating under terrific handicaps with a shortage of over 132,000 classrooms.

As a former educator, I am intimately acquainted with the schools in my State of Utah and know that some of our districts are in desperate need of some temporary Federal assistance.

For instance, I would like to tell you about a particular district in our State, Granite, which is located on the outskirts of Salt Lake City.

Granite District has experienced a growth of approximately 21,000 students in 9 years—which is a growth of 150 percent.

Their school enrollment this year increased 3,655 over last year. During the next 2 years their school enrollment

is expected to increase each year about the same number, and then the increase should be approximately 4,000 students each year.

To meet this onslaught of students Granite District has levied by far the highest tax in Utah for schools—61.40 mills—and yet is unable to cope with the situation. They have had to resort to double sessions which really cheat the children out of adequate education by reducing the amount of learning time and efficiency of this time by compressing it into a single lengthy period without the normal kind of a lunch break that students usually have.

Their pressing needs for new buildings amount to a cost of more than \$17 million and yet they only have something over \$3 million for debt financing and construction.

Granite's situation has not been brought on by any slothfulness on the part of the district. It has been brought on by the population mobility which is a new social and economic factor with which past programs have been unable to cope. Let me illustrate the unmanageable problem which the population shifts impose:

The new census figures display that Utah's No. 1 city, Salt Lake City, has increased from 182,121 to 187,362 which is an increase of 5,241 over the past 10 years. In the same decade Salt Lake County has increased from 274,895 to 379,727—or an overwhelming 104,832. Other districts in Utah have similar problems to that of Granite.

I would like to quote briefly from a report on schoolbuilding needs in Utah that was made to our legislative council—consisting of members of the legislature and private citizens. It states far more concisely than I can the emergency situation that exists there:

By the opening of school in September 1961 it is estimated that the school districts will need 1,224 additional classrooms. The cost of such additional classrooms has been computed at \$42.6 million. Exhausting full bonding authority and applying a 10 mill local property levy, as estimated, will not cover the cost of additional classrooms in 6 of the 40 school districts. The six districts will require an estimated \$14.5 million to provide the necessary classrooms. This estimate covers enrollment increases, present overcrowding conditions and replacement of intolerable classrooms.

These are the discouraging findings despite the fact that Utah has made an effort greater than most States, spending 5.51 percent of our income for education.

I urge every Member of Congress who thinks there is no need for a school construction bill to take a tour of the school districts in his State.

Mr. Chairman, my discussion has centered upon just one question, namely, "Is there a need in my home State for H.R. 10128?" Definitely there is. Furthermore if part of the building cost burden for further building be removed from the States and school districts by Federal help, these States and districts could divert some funds to teachers salaries that would otherwise need to go into buildings.

It must be admitted that this House bill, H.R. 10128, which I favor, will entail some Federal control over wages, costs, and construction of the buildings involved but when those buildings are once completed and turned over to the States all possibility of further control will be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I favor H.R. 10128 as reported out by the House Committee on Education and Labor and I hope it will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in yielding this time to me.

I have taken this time to state to the committee that when we are under the 5-minute rule and the bill is open to amendment I will offer an amendment which will provide for the transfer of funds from the taxes collected on cigarettes to the States. Under the present law 8 cents is collected on every pack of cigarettes sold in the United States. My amendment will provide that 2 cents out of the 8 will be returned to the States for the purpose of school construction. By returning this 2 cents from the 8 cents collected you will have a fund larger than that contemplated in the Thompson bill. Many of the States will receive a little more than under the Thompson bill and some a little less.

However, it seems to me that this is an opportunity to return to the States a portion of their own tax money and by doing it this way there is absolutely no control by the Federal Government. The States get the money back. They use it. The provisions in the present bill which gives some semblance of control will be eliminated and in the future it will be only a matter of payment of this tax money back to the States.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Listening to the gentleman's proposal on the refunding of the cigarette tax money, I was wondering if we would not get involved with the Committee on Ways and Means on any such amendment.

Mr. BOW. No. The bill I introduced and the amendment I will offer provide for an authorization for an appropriation based upon a particular formula. It does not change the tax structure. You still collect the same amount of tax, but a certain portion of it is allocated to the States for educational purposes.

Mr. WIER. I was merely thinking of the jurisdictional question, that a point of order might be raised against the amendment.

Mr. BOW. I quite understand that. I have studied it very carefully. In 1957 the same question was raised and the point of order was overruled by our late distinguished colleague, Jere Cooper, who was in the chair at the time. The amendment has been drafted so that it does not come under that rule and will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Minnesota would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if his amendment would also include chewing tobacco.

Mr. BOW. No; this relates to cigarettes. It comes from the cigarette tax. It is a sufficient amount to take care of the school-construction problem in any State, and it takes away completely any control. It is a matter of local taxation.

If you really want to go back to the question of no Federal control and go back to the States taking care of their own, here is the chance to do it without any problems at all. I will offer the amendment tomorrow.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to ask a question merely for information. Under the amendment to be offered by the gentleman, would the funds be administered by or channeled through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. BOW. No; the funds would be paid by the Treasury of the United States back to the States and there would be no clipping of the 25 percent. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that you clip 25 percent when it comes down here. This would not happen. It would go directly back to the States by payment by the Treasury based upon the number of cigarettes that are sold in a particular State. It is amazing when you look at it and see the number of packs of cigarettes sold in these States, and when you take only 2 cents on each one and still take care of the construction of schools, it seems to me that it is a logical way to meet this problem.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering legislation to provide Federal aid to education. This aid has a twofold purpose. First, it is supposed to improve educational facilities and opportunities for children attending elementary and secondary schools; and secondly, by fulfilling that purpose, it is supposed to strengthen our national educational system in order to help the United States of America successfully meet the challenge of communism.

These, Mr. Chairman, are our declared objectives. To meet these objectives, I believe our schools, public and private, should in some instances be improved. Therefore, I introduced H.R. 12269, which proposed to provide grants to public as well as to private and sectarian schools. I have learned, however, that this proposal could give rise to some question of constitutionality under a recent interpretation of article I of the Bill of Rights by the Supreme Court. Therefore, I prepared an alternate amendment that is embodied in H.R. 12349.

Mr. Chairman, despite what a certain columnist in the Washington Post says about my intentions to torpedo the school-construction bill, I strongly favor needed and nondiscriminatory Federal assistance to education. He classified me as "puller-back No. 3," who wants a school bill passed but wants to provide funds for Catholic schools. Evidently this columnist did not bother to read my substitute amendment, and, if he read it, he does not understand it. His statement is erroneous. My proposal would provide funds to all needy schools without discrimination and without regard to the religious convictions of students attending them.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time during our consideration of this legislation, I shall offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for H.R. 10128. I should like to take this opportunity to explain its purpose and the need for it.

AMENDMENT EMBODIED IN H.R. 12349

My amendment is embodied in H.R. 12349 which I introduced in the House a few days ago. It does not in any way alter the purpose of the bill before us, nor its scope. The amount of Federal assistance to be authorized—\$325 million a year for 3 years—would remain unchanged.

The purpose for which this assistance is to be used, school construction, would remain the same; even the formula to be used in determining the size of the allotments to be given to each of the States would remain unaltered. The change which I shall propose will relate solely to the distribution of Federal assistance within each State. It will remove the objectionable and discriminatory provisions of H.R. 10128 which proposed to bar approximately 7 million American children from receiving any benefit from Federal aid to education.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to my friend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There is no discrimination in H.R. 10128. Every American child would benefit from it. Those who attend nonpublic school do so entirely voluntarily. This is their right for which they choose to pay. I can agree with the gentleman except for the definition of school facilities set forth on page 24 of the bill, in which it says:

(e) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related incidental facilities (including initial furniture, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for education which is provided by a local educational agency as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadiums, and does not include 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.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman is not reading from my amendment?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No; I am reading from the bill H.R. 10128, which is designed for public schools and public supported, controlled and operated, by the definition.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am very happy the gentleman asked me to yield. The gentleman will recall, yesterday I asked him whether the funds allocated to the States under his proposal could be available to private schools. I inquired of him whether in those States in which the State educational agency is authorized to make payments to private nonprofit institutions, such institutions would be in a position to benefit under H.R. 10128, and the gentleman told me they would.

I wish to remind the gentleman that he called my attention to section 4(b), lines 19-22, which provide that:

Upon receipt by the State, funds allotted under this Act shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds to be distributed and expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

The gentleman, in doing so, indicated that in certain States private nonprofit schools could receive payments under his bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Following the discussion with my distinguished colleague yesterday, I made extensive examination of the legislation, and I regret to report that in my conversation yesterday I spoke out of context. I had not considered carefully enough the definitions in the bill which are quite specific in that they say "public" and in the definition states "at public expense and under public supervision and direction."

I apologize to the gentleman for my horseback opinion yesterday, which was in error.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I was under the impression that the gentleman, being thoroughly familiar with the provisions of his bill, gave me his opinion in all sincerity. I can assure him that I was just as sincere in asking my questions.

I would like to point out, however, that H.R. 10128 is not consistent with its own definitions. In many of the sections school facilities are not identified as public school facilities except, as the gentleman has pointed out, in the last section of the bill dealing with definitions. Further, the bill repeatedly refers to our Nation's education system. I am certain the gentleman will agree that when we refer to the American educational system, we know precisely what the term means. I should like to elaborate on this point.

THE DECLARED PURPOSE OF H.R. 10128

The title of the bill before us is "School Construction Assistance Act of 1960."

Section 2, paragraph 1, of the bill states that this legislation is intended to improve the quality of the Nation's educational program by providing assistance to eliminate the shortage of classrooms.

Paragraph 3 of that section refers again to the quality of American education. It states clearly that the purpose of this bill, and I quote, "is to provide Federal financial assistance to help meet the immediate problem of financing the construction of adequate school facilities and thereby to strengthen our Nation's educational system."

It is made perfectly clear, therefore, in section 1 and in section 2 of this legislation that it relates to education in the United States. Further, the bill states, and repeats, that its purpose is to strengthen our Nation's educational system—not any particular part of that system, but the system as a whole.

WEBSTER'S DEFINITION OF A "SYSTEM"

Now what precisely do we mean by the phrase, "our Nation's educational system?"

Webster's Dictionary defines the word "system" as "an assemblage of objects united by some form of regular interaction or interdependence;" further, as "an organic or organized whole."

The terms "unit," "whole" and "coherent whole" appear in Webster's definition of the word "system."

DEFINITION OF "AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM"

Relying on Webster's Dictionary, it would appear, therefore, that such phrases as "the American educational system" and, again, "our Nation's educational system," refer to and include the sum total of institutions engaged in the task of educating the youth of our Nation in compliance with local ordinances and State laws on this subject.

Let us go a step further and see what is included in this sum total of institutions engaged in the task of educating our youth.

Does our entire educational system consist of public, tax-supported schools only?

It certainly does not. In the State of Wisconsin, for instance, approximately one-fourth of the school-age population is receiving its education in other than public educational institutions.

Does our system, then, consist of only private educational institutions which meet local and State school requirements?

The answer again is "No."

The American educational system consists of—and has long consisted of—both private and public schools.

Both the private and the public sectors of our educational system serve a common purpose. They have an identical objective: The education of our children. They both fulfill this responsibility. They are both recognized and accepted by American custom, by American tradition, and by American law.

DOES H.R. 10128 PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM?

Now let us take a closer look at H.R. 10128.

Does it really do what it says? Does it really provide Federal assistance for the strengthening of the American educational system?

The bill states that this is its purpose. It states it more than once. The bill includes all of the children being taught

in the American educational system in determining the amount of Federal aid allocated to each of the States.

The bill departs from its objective, however, when it comes to the distribution of Federal assistance within the respective States.

According to the formula provided in H.R. 10128, Federal aid is to go only to the public sector of our Nation's educational system. The private sector is ignored entirely in the distribution of aid.

To use the example of the State of Wisconsin once more: 100 percent of our school-age population is being counted under H.R. 10128 in determining the amount of Federal assistance which Wisconsin should get. But, under this bill, only approximately 75 percent of our school population would derive any benefit from this legislation. The remaining 25 percent is left out in the cold. They are ignored and they are discriminated against.

My amendment would change this—it would provide that 100 percent of our school population should be counted in the determination and in the distribution of Federal aid.

This, I believe, is a fair proposal. It does not discriminate against anyone. It provides Federal aid, on the basis of need, to all the children in our Nation's educational system. It is fully in accord with the American tradition of freedom and equality for all of our citizens.

ARE CHILDREN ATTENDING PRIVATE SCHOOLS SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS?

After all, are the children being taught in the private sector of our educational system second-class citizens?

Do not their parents pay taxes—not only Federal taxes, the revenue from which we propose to distribute through this legislation—but also local and State taxes which are used, in part, to pay for the construction and support of public schools?

Will not these children, when they grow up, be expected and required to share the responsibility for defending our Nation, and for preserving its principles and institutions?

Are not these children, and their families, guaranteed the same rights and privileges by our Constitution as are the children attending public schools?

WHAT DOES OUR CONSTITUTION SAY?

Mr. Chairman, I ask nothing for any church, for any particular school, or for any special group.

I ask only for justice and equality for American children, for the rights which are guaranteed them by the Constitution.

Let me recall a few things about our Constitution and the rights it guarantees to all American citizens.

Article XIV guarantees every American citizen equal protection of the law; and article I of the Bill of Rights guarantees every individual the free exercise of his religion as a personal civil right.

Those two articles have a direct bearing on the legislation before us.

Throughout our history, many of our people have exercised their right to the free exercise of their religion by pro-

viding their children with religious education. They have done this as a matter of conscience, and as a matter of right. Their freedom of choice in this regard has been safeguarded by our Constitution, and acknowledged by our society. Their constitutional rights in this respect are as valid today as they were 50, or 100, or 150 years ago.

May I remind this body that freedom of religion cannot be equated with, or brushed aside by, a reference to the availability of publicly financed schools. Or by saying that those of our citizens who believe in religious education for their children are free to build their own schools.

All of our citizens have to pay local and State taxes for the support of public schools. Many of them assume a further burden by building and maintaining private and religious schools. They do this as a matter of conscience, but the financial burden upon them is not lessened by the fact that they do this in pursuance of their religious convictions. Many of them may be forced eventually by this double financial burden to abandon religious education of their children. And I ask you, what kind of religious freedom is there when a family is effectively denied even a reasonable economic opportunity to pursue its conscience?

WHAT DOES OUR CONSTITUTION PROHIBIT?

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to the rights which the 1st and 14th amendments guarantee all of our citizens. Some people, however, only stress the prohibitive features of the first amendment. They contend that it prohibits our Government from taking any action, or enacting any legislation which can offer assistance or recognition to any or all sectarian institutions. The proponents of this view will contend that the substitute which I propose to offer to H.R. 10128 is unconstitutional, on the grounds that it violates the first amendment to our Constitution.

What does the pertinent clause of the first amendment prohibit—and how has the Congress viewed this prohibition in the past?

Clause 1 of the first amendment states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." The original proposal leading to this amendment was introduced in the House of Representatives by James Madison. When the first amendment was pending in Congress in substantially its present form, "Mr. Madison said, he apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience."

This, according to the original records available to us, is what the Congress intended in approving the first amendment. And the Supreme Court, in a series of cases, has stated that the first amendment to our Constitution does not proscribe the use of public funds to assist children attending private and sectarian schools.

In *Quick Bear v. Leupp* (210 U.S. 50 (1908)), the Supreme Court sustained a

contract made at the request of Indians to whom money was due under a treaty, providing for the payment of such money by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the support of Indian Catholic schools.

In *Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education* (281 U.S. 370 (1930)), the Supreme Court sustained the use of public funds to furnish nonsectarian textbooks to pupils attending sectarian schools of Louisiana.

In *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1 (1947)), the Supreme Court sustained the use of public funds for the transportation of pupils attending sectarian schools in New Jersey.

NO DISCRIMINATION IN EARLIER FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Neither has the Congress, in the past, considered it necessary under our Constitution to prohibit the use of public funds to assist students attending non-public schools.

The GI bill of rights did not discriminate against our veterans because of their religious beliefs. Educational grants were given to all on equal terms. There was nothing in that legislation to prevent thousands of fine young men and women from using their GI benefits to study for ministry in the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths, or to stop millions of other citizens from studying in colleges and universities of all leading religious groups.

There was nothing in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to restrict Federal assistance to the public sector of our educational system. Individual and institutional grants have been and are being made under that legislation without regard to the religious affiliation of students or of schools. The individual's constitutional right to pursue his religious convictions was not abridged by that legislation.

NO TIME TO BEGIN DISCRIMINATING NOW

This is no time for the Congress to start discriminating against our school-age youth because of an individual's conscience. If the Congress is to provide assistance for school construction to our Nation's educational system, let us do it fairly and without discrimination.

The Congress has done it before, and it can do it again.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, this is all that my amendment proposes to do. We have full justification and authority for this action in our Constitution, and we have precedent for it in earlier Federal legislation. Let us not depart from these principles now. I appeal to every Member to support my amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have no reason to question the sincerity of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has raised a challenging and interesting argument. I must remind him, however, that as the author of the bill under consideration—H.R. 10128—I intended it to relate only to public schools and public school facilities as defined in the legislation. I leave to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the final decision as to the points raised by the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10128. I am opposed to this legislation and I find it to be another vehicle to enable the States to avoid their responsibility in the field of school construction rather than a measure to encourage the States to assume their constitutional responsibility in the field of education. I realize that we have heretofore, in the Congress, invaded the education field with such legislation as the impacted area legislation, giving assistance to those areas where Federal installations were the cause of crowded schools. Impacted area legislation can be justified on the part of the Federal Government because the Federal Government is directly responsible for the situation in those schools. This legislation cannot be so justified.

EDUCATION IS A STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Looking at the school-construction picture in the United States we find certain of the States have engaged upon their own construction programs, and the people of those States have been brave enough, American enough and responsible enough to build their own schools and pay for them. I have in mind not only my own great State but the great State of Georgia, and in previous debate on legislation of this kind we have pointed out to those who will not see and stated to those who do not want to hear that this is a State responsibility and that any State, whose present financial potential has not been jeopardized by socialism on a State level, can issue its bonds and have some sort of tax to pay for school construction.

If a State cannot assume its responsibility in paying for school construction, how can it assume its responsibility in matching the funds of the Federal Government?

Where are the States going to get the matching funds? If a State is too poor now to build the schools, is it not too poor to get up the matching funds? I was told the other day that the State of Illinois is having a special session of its legislature to try to get a deficit of \$22 million in welfare funds. Should the State of Illinois then have to be taxed to support a school in California, in New Jersey, or even in South Carolina if school construction is needed in those States? Is education the responsibility of the State as the Constitution says it is, or is it the responsibility of the United States?

DO NOT BE FOOLED THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL NOT TAKE OVER

Now I know that there will be a high cry that section 10 of this bill provides that in the administration of the act the United States shall not exercise any direction, supervision or control. Why is this included? If school construction is the responsibility of the States and is a State function, why is it necessary to include section 10? The inclusion of section 10 is not only a "come on" for those who still believe in States rights, and I am one of those believers, but can be used for reasoning, by some court of the future, that the Congress recognized by this legislation the duty and responsibility of the Federal Government, as

opposed to or imposed on the State government, in the field of education. Section 10 looks good on its face, but when you read section 2 of this legislation and find the wording, "there is still a serious shortage of classrooms which requires immediate action on the part of the Federal Government," and "this shortage of classrooms is seriously restricting the quality of the Nation's educational program," we find that we are paving the way for a judicial decision that the Federal Government shall take over the education in this country to "promote the general welfare," or "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The welfare clause of the Constitution has previously been used to justify ridiculous departures from sound courses and the Constitution. Now the proposal to secure the blessings of liberty will be blazoned on the pages of some newspapers as a new idea, grabbed at by some justice or some court, who or which are socialistic in their thinking and political in their design, and see a greatness by the route of departure from the Constitution rather than the greatness obtained by others in efforts toward its preservation.

THE OLD RUSSIAN SCARE

We are told that the Russians surpass us in the education field. If this is true, why do not the Russians have more automobiles, better clothes, more tourists come into this country, and more natural wealth? What evidence do we have? The fact is that the American tourists who do not speak Russian but seek to become an expert on Russia by virtue of one visit, having visited Russian schools which the Russians wanted visited, come back and tell us of the marvelous education. At the same time, they tell us of a Russian people who are not clothed as well and who suffer other deprivations. I wonder how we would pass any socialistic legislation if it were not for the Russian menace. It, therefore, appears that the menace in Russia is used as a stepping stone toward socialism rather than showing the deficiencies of socialism.

Let me pause here to say that I did not go to school in one of these ultra-modern classrooms. I have no objection to them, and I have no particular impression about the classrooms I was privileged to sit in. What has impressed me and what has been a part of such success as I have had have been those fine men and women who led me in the right direction. They taught reading and writing and arithmetic, and they taught a man to spell and something about phonetics. We had to write a lot of themes and letters and we knew something about language punctuation and the construction of a sentence. I remember a beloved English teacher, and who still teaches, but who supervised dramatics in order that she might teach her students the ultimate in expression and inflection and the like. I remember a French teacher who insisted that French be spoken in her classroom for every question and answer after the first 6 weeks, except where English interpretation of French was necessary.

These are the sort of things that make for good education. We were not raised in fear of Russia nor any other country. Nobody loved to sell us on the foolish idea that the situation in another part of the world had anything to do with our classrooms.

Today I received a telegram supposed to be from a Class Room Teachers Association. Nobody signed the telegram and it was not in the form of a resolution. I do not know that it came from a teacher, but it stated:

The schools of South Carolina need Federal aid. Please support a good education bill.

The teachers of this country are being told that Federal aid to education is the answer to all their problems, and surely they are many. Many hope to gain the support of the teachers, for this sort of legislation, by promising the teachers a pay raise. I do not believe the telegram I received reflects the true thinking of the teachers of my State and I do not believe they are willing to sacrifice their independence and the control of the State over education for a raise in their salaries. Our teachers are too fine to be led down such a road.

All of us recognize the fact that the teachers are not paid enough. We in South Carolina have strained our economy and we will continue to do so to pay our teachers. I am proud to be associated with the dedicated men and women who teach in South Carolina, and as much as I want them to have adequate salaries, I do not believe the Federal Government has that responsibility.

The housing of the pupil, the quality of the classroom, the curriculum of the student, and the pay and the qualification of the teachers all are the responsibility and prerogative of the State. If we put the Federal Government in the school construction business this year, within the next 5 years the Federal Government will have charge of the schools and curriculum, the certification of the teachers, and the education in the elementary and high schools of this Nation will suffer the blight the Federal bureaucracy always brings with its interference or regulations. They can cry all they want to that this legislation is needed, and that this program will not put the Federal Government in the school business, but it will.

I remember that the same elements which push this particular legislation and the same that proposed the civil rights bill are for votes only.

I read in the legislation that the Commissioner of Education shall have the authority to make the payments. One of the sops is the fact that only \$325 million is allowed the first year and each of the 2 succeeding years. If this legislation is passed the bill will be a billion dollars a year within 5 years, and the school boards of this country will be encouraged toward dissatisfaction with their plant equipment in order to get more and more Federal money, bigger and better plans and different forms of equipment which they have been getting along without.

OUR PROBLEM IS CURRICULUM

This legislation offers no panacea for any educational program that we have. Our problem is curriculum. In too many schools today the curriculum is not stiff enough and I know this from the experience we in Congress have in attempting to nominate young men to the various academies. We feel a personal interest in these young men and most of the time I know the parents. We find a young man who has had a marvelous high school record, and we place his name for nomination, thinking of the pride we will have here in the office, and that his family and friends will have back home, in the fact that he will make the grade. Then the tests are given and the boy fails because he does not have the proper background. It is not his fault. He has assimilated the curriculum prepared for him and he has made, comparatively, the high marks that justify his being considered, hopefully, as a candidate for one of the academies. His curriculum has been too easy. The three "R's" have not been drilled into him. He has not had enough foreign language to compare or appreciate his own. This is not true particularly in South Carolina, but of the Nation as a whole. We find most of the trouble to be in English composition, spelling and lack of ability to read something intelligently and absorb it.

If we want to do something about our educational position in comparison with other countries of the world, let us suggest a study and advise the various departments of education of the various States and the respective counties, first, of the educational needs of our country, and its people in the future; second, the deficiencies in the present and proposed curriculums; third, a manner or means by which incentives could be given to persons to enter the teaching profession; and fourth, funds for pure research and development in the education field. A federally sponsored classroom is not the answer to the fact that we are not teaching foreign languages early enough in our schools, that our mathematics and science programs are not being sufficiently emphasized in a modern age, and that we are not stressing English composition which represents the ability of expression, and a must in an enlightened world.

Television has made a necessity of the desire that American leaders and the American people know when, where, and how to express their beliefs, their ideas, their desire for peace, and their freedoms.

FEDERAL AID IS NOT THE ANSWER

Some people have been fooled into thinking Federal aid to education is the answer. It is not. I want to go on record as thanking the Florence, S.C., Farm Bureau, and the farmers in general who have expressed to me their opposition to Federal aid to education. I want to thank those teachers who have written me who have not been beguiled into thinking that Federal aid to education is the answer because it promises some raise in the teachers' salaries.

On my desk is an article from the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont of November 18, 1959. Yale and Harvard withdrew from the Federal student loan program because they do not want to insist that a student who takes the taxpayers' money should have any loyalty to the taxpayers' country. In other words, a man or woman could be a Communist, Socialist, an enemy of the country, and take your and my tax money to get an education to use against us. Those who are willing or unwilling by the Communist line in this country yell to the high level that you have to have freedom in your educational program. They want freedom of access to the taxpayers' pocket, freedom of access to the educational schools, and reject loyalty to freedom as expressed by the purposes of this great Nation. So far, I thank heaven, we have not been diverted from our purposes of freedom despite all that the misguided, the "do gooders," the so-called internationalists, and those who secretly wish our subjugation have been able to do.

If Alabama is to get about \$12 million over a period of 3 years for school construction, where will Alabama get the funds to match the Federal funds? Alaska, a struggling new State is to receive over a half million dollars—Alaska is suffering growing pains now and is not able to balance its own budget. Alaska could well use a million dollars for roads because the schools would follow the roads and the schools would follow the development of natural wealth of the State.

I see that the District of Columbia will get over \$2 million. If that money is matched the taxpayers will have to put up that \$2 million so that the District of Columbia is being discriminated in favor of. I have heard so much about the District of Columbia being discriminated against here and I want to point out this discriminating favor. And, if a mistake were made and they were given home rule, the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, who are not voting on the bill today, unless most of the present taxpayers would not live here because of home rule, would have to get up the \$2 million. This is how ridiculous this proposition is in its present form.

I see where South Carolina would receive about \$10 million or better. The taxpayers of South Carolina would have to get up \$10 million and make arrangements to match the funds by payments. By their own bond program the people of South Carolina have had the guts, and the assured responsibility in order to give the children fine classrooms.

One of the troubles in education today is the fact that the spotlight and attention is focused always on the wrong thing. Instead of focusing on the preparation of the child's mind for his life's work and letting everything else be secondary or incidental, we are focusing on some comparison with Russia—as an excuse—school construction, whether or not the Federal Government should pay the teacher and many other facets of our education, deserving though they may be.

WHAT ARE THE LESSONS OF HISTORY?

Shall we neglect the lessons of our history? In the past we have compared the Americans with the students in Great Britain and in France, and at times, the ability of America to compete has been questioned. And yet we have sent these generations out to wars which they have won; into machine jobs in which they have produced better than any other peoples of this world; into Government which has benefited its people more than any other Government; into banking that has produced us the title of the world bankers of today; into education that has produced such fame to our great institutions and I include misguided Yale and Harvard in that category. We have sent them into the ministry and this Nation has become a symbol and bulwark of Christianity. And why? Because we have prepared the minds and not because the Federal Government has or has not helped build a pretty schoolhouse. Now these people have been educated by the State, and some of them in one-room schoolhouses. I would not have us revert for one minute to the one-room schoolhouse, but if our Nation can produce from one-room schoolhouses it can certainly produce if the people are of a mind from the modern schoolhouses of today.

THE SOUTH IS DOING ITS JOB

One of the things that concerns me is the hue and cry that our Southern States are not doing the educational job they should. I am only familiar with South Carolina directly, the others indirectly. I am familiar with the fact, and proud of it, that everywhere I go I find people educated in South Carolina who have made their way in other parts of the country. Just yesterday I got a letter from a friend who is a success in the Foreign Service; a day or two ago I talked with another contemporary who has made a success in New York. Every day I meet or hear of someone, raised and educated in the South, who has gone to other parts of this country, or other parts of the world and made good. I am proud of them. They speak louder than any testimony before a committee. They are proof of what I say here.

WHAT IS LEFT OUT OF THE BILL

Let us take the formula set out in this bill. There is no formula which requires the State to certify, first, that it needs Federal assistance; second, that it has exhausted the means at its command to provide the school facilities that it needs; third, that no revenue or source of revenue is necessary to provide this need; fourth, that, based on experience, the increase in pupils will be such as to demand a school construction program over and above what the State is presently engaged in.

These are just a few of the things that should be required. Otherwise, the inclusion of every State, in writing this legislation, must be classified as solely for the purpose of getting votes, and a handout to those States who will not shoulder their responsibilities.

A GIMMICK

Section 7 of this bill has what we call a "gimmick." We find that we have a formula for "State school effort index." We take care of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia by saying their index is deemed equal to the national school effort index, but for South Carolina and other States, not rich States, we obtain their index by dividing (a) the expenditure for schools per public school child for the State by (b) the personal income per child of school age for the State. Now on its face that looks good for a State which has at the present time a low income per child of school age. This low income is due to the fact that South Carolina once had its agricultural wealth practically wiped out.

Not until the past two decades have we industrialized and our national income begun to rise. Our per capita income is still below the national average, but has risen 319 percent since 1929. In 1956, the average income in South Carolina was reported at \$1,133, as compared with a national average of \$1,940, but we expect to make progress, and if we make progress, are we going to be penalized for making that progress because of the index which is included?

Some might answer and say this is only a 3-year program. I know better than that, once the foot is in the trough, it is pretty hard to break the habit of depending on the Federal Government to take care of everything.

WE HAVE DONE IT—WHAT ABOUT YOU?

Over 50 percent of the students in South Carolina attend schools in buildings less than 5 years old. They are modern school buildings and we have done it. To those of you who make so much hay out of castigating the South and talk about discrimination, can you match that in your own State and have you any reasonable explanation for the failure of your State to do what South Carolina has done? Do you dare accuse your people of being unwilling to make the sacrifices the people of South Carolina have been willing to make to further education?

I question not only the need for this legislation but the sanity of the approach to it. There is no proof here that the program is sufficient, if there is a need. There is no proof here that in 3 years the situation will be cured. There is no certification from the State boards of education, who best know their needs, that this is necessary. I understand there were no public hearings on this bill this year, and there is no evidence, pro or con, whether testimony of another year would or would not be varied because of changes which have taken place and progress which has been made.

We have been told in the debate that this bill may be used in the integration fight, that funds would be withheld if the schools were not integrated. How far will they go in this legislation? If the States are to control, as section 10 says, how does this come about? This reveals the purposes of this bill. It is

the first of a design for the Federal Government to take over the schools, build them, control them, and integrate them. I might add that Federal aid to education will ruin the schools of this country.

Look at the mess the Federal Government has made of the agriculture program and the cost to the taxpayer. Look at the debt management. Look at the way it has handled its espionage, its intelligence. Let us keep the Federal Government off the back of our educational system.

I am opposed to this legislation and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, Federal aid to education ought to be just that. It ought not be restricted to construction only, or to construction and teachers salaries. It is my intention tomorrow to offer a suitable amendment to give the aid provided in this bill to construction and operation.

No person who has served in State or local government, as I have, wants the Federal Government to take over and administer education, any more than we would have the Federal Government administer the public health or public welfare functions. These services must necessarily be local in their administration; they must be kept close to the people in order that they may best serve the communities for which they are conducted.

And yet everyone knows the Federal Government has played a very significant role in strengthening and improving each of these functions through the technique of Federal grants-in-aid. It used to be popular to say the Federal Government did not have any resources that State and local governments did not also have. But any person familiar with the realities of public finance knows this argument cannot stand examination. The Federal Government has far greater freedom in raising its revenue than any State, and infinitely more freedom than local governments. The Federal Government can draw revenues equitably from the entire Nation and the entire national economy without worry about questions of interstate or inter-county tax comparisons and tax competition. Moreover, there are great differences in fiscal resources as between States. The richest State has a per capita income which is more than 2½ times the per capita income of the lowest income State. But if you move to the level of property assessments per child of school age, the differences between the richest school district and the poorest school district within the same State may reflect differences in fiscal ability as high as 100 to 1.

Every thoughtful student of school finances knows these facts and, therefore, supports within his own State some kind of basic school foundation finance act to provide a significant degree of equalizations between rich and poor districts. The richest district has a very real interest in the level of education in the poorest district, because it may very well be drawing its labor supply from these districts, and we want a literate, edu-

cated, productive labor force. Similarly, our richest States have an interest in the quality of education in our poorest States, because migration from low-income and depressed areas provides the new citizens and workers in the expanding metropolitan centers, where job opportunities are greater.

Mr. Chairman, it is regularly suggested that the increased school costs should be met at the State and local level, because of the heavy burdens on the Federal Government. What are the actual facts? Here is what has happened to State and local finance as against what has happened to Federal finance since the end of World War II. It provides a better perspective as to the relative burdens on the various levels of government.

We are accustomed to comparing budgets, both expenditures and revenues, merely from one year to the next. The June 1959 issue of *Fortune* magazine in an article on the "Taxes Closest to Home" gives us a little different perspective on State and local budgets. *Fortune* points out that the total of State and local expenditures and revenue in 1946 were a mere \$12 billion. Today their outlays approach \$50 billion, or practically a fourfold increase in that time. Total State and local debt has similarly increased, from \$13 billion to \$55 billion between 1946 and 1959.

Looking ahead, State and local expenditures in 1970 are expected to surpass \$85 billion. Against this phenomenal growth of State and local expenditures, it is worth noting that the Federal budget has shown a much more modest growth over the past decade and indeed is even today less than the Federal budget outlays of 1945 or 1946. The Federal Government has been able, during the same period, to indulge itself in two major and several minor tax cuts and we look forward to a further reduction next year.

Meanwhile, State and local governments are straining at the revenue leash in trying to meet the immense demands for public capital and public services that arise out of the twin forces of rapid population growth and rising standard of living. We can look forward to the possibility of State and local budgets exceeding in size the entire Federal budget, within another 10 years. And in another 10 years, the Committee for Economic Development estimates public school costs will rise from \$15 billion to \$21 billion.

In the face of the fact that the Federal Government has far greater flexibility in revenue opportunities open to it—in face of the fact that it has a far greater interest in a high level of educational attainment throughout the Nation—not simply because of national defense demands but because of the obligation to promote the general welfare—it seems to me the Federal Government can no longer escape its obligation to carry a larger share of the growing load of financing an adequate educational program throughout the Nation. There is no more significant public outlay than the investment we make in educating our children.

WHAT KIND OF AID

Many systems are now doing an excellent job of public education, albeit at a very high level of local taxation. But these are usually the more prosperous districts. Our poorest districts may be making an even greater effort, but because of inadequate resources are unable to provide even a decent minimum of educational opportunity for their children.

As I look ahead to the demands of the next decade and the next generation, it seems to me our obligation is not to be met by a temporary or emergency program, but rather our obligation is to provide a formula which underwrites continuing Federal support for education. Remember that the taxpayer is going to pay for some kind of education one way or the other. In face of the great demands upon our local property taxes to provide water-supply systems, secondary streets and roads and other necessary public facilities of primarily local concern, we must recognize the limits to the capacity of local governments to bond themselves, which affect schools as well. These limits may help explain the failure of many recent local bond-issue elections.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is written so as to pay for construction only. Is this wise? It has been popular, especially in Presidential messages, to talk about confining Federal aid to classroom construction to overcome the classroom deficit. I have served on the education committee of the Colorado Legislature, and I served on the legislative council's interim committee on education, and I want to tell you that this principle is much easier to state in a hearing than it is to convert into legal formulas.

Much the same point could be made about the other favorite for Federal aid, namely, teachers' salaries. I cannot recall a year in which the proposal for Federal aid to education was not couched in terms of teachers' salaries. Indeed, even in our State legislature it is popular to talk about State aid being for teachers' salaries.

But, realistically do we not want the classrooms to be heated and lighted? Do we not want them furnished? Do we not want textbooks? Visual aids? Related services? Do we not need some money for overhead administration? Is not a bus fleet part of the school system in many communities? All these things cost money. A local school board has to finance its entire program, both its operating and capital program, and they only have one local source of funds—a property tax mill levy.

When we say we will give them aid for one kind of outlay and not for another, are we not merely playing games? Do we not merely say "Let's pretend"? Would it not be much simpler and much more sensible to admit that education costs money—that education requires a capital plant that must be operated and maintained? It requires both teaching and nonteaching personnel. It requires goods and services. Do we not want to see to it that there are adequate funds available to provide a balanced educa-

tional program? Would we not make the job of the school board member, the school superintendent, the budget analyst and the treasurer much simpler and more sensible if we simply said at the State level we are going to give money to local schools based on a formula which relates the grant directly to need and inversely to financial ability? Those who have school experience know that the answer is, of course, a simple "Yes."

Would we not simplify the problem of the State legislator and the State department of education in passing a Federal grant-in-aid forward to the schools if we took the same approach? Why do we not just recognize that schools cost money? We know local units are doing the best they can. We want to help. Let us give Federal aid to the States on a basis directly proportional to our estimate of need and inversely proportional to fiscal ability, and then ask the States to do the same in passing this aid forward to local districts.

I have spent a good many years laboring in the vineyard of Federal-State-local fiscal relations. I have worked at and with every level of government. I am especially conscious of the operating problem of the poor fellow at the bottom of the heap—the school board member and school superintendent who has to meet the bills and keep school open. Too frequently we say to him, "Here is specific money for this purpose, and here is money for that purpose, but for the remaining educational purposes you are on your own." He has got to pay all the bills when they come due regardless of the amount he holds in any given fiscal aid envelope. Why do we not seek to avoid further proliferation of special accounts and special purposes?

We are very fond of saying we do not intend Federal grants to involve Federal control. Indeed, we are equally fond of saying we do not want State grants to involve State control. Yet every effort to earmark a grant-in-aid says it is for one class of outlay only, and not for the whole program.

Every such effort is a subtle, indirect, unwanted and usually unwarranted Federal or State intrusion into local freedom of operations. If we really trust our local citizens to operate their own school programs effectively, why do we not simply talk about a grant-in-aid-to-education program? I know it is politically more popular to want to earmark aid for some special, appealing purpose or special outlay believed to have great vote-winning value. But in the long run, are we not merely making work for ourselves and burdening the administrator, who has a whole job to do, by taking this limited view of our obligations?

BUDGETING FOR CAPITAL PLANT

I think it would be very helpful if we could do the financial accounting for school capital plants on a historic basis. We have tended also to think that once we have built a capital plant, then all we would have to meet are operating expenses. In a static society with no population growth, no obsolescence, no depreciation, no decay, this would be a

reasonable assumption. But you know full well that school buildings wear out and lose their utility, and population shifts and grows.

Why, then, do we not provide for a capital consumption allowance in our public budgets, just as every businessman does in his own business budgets? He sets aside out of his annual receipts a depreciation fund which can be used to pay off his debt on existing structures, or used to provide funds for the expansion of the plant, or for replacement of existing plant. In face of our growing population, it seems to me perfectly reasonable to suggest that even those school districts which may have adequate school plant built and paid for are entitled to budget for capital consumption allowance because their buildings will also need to be replaced one day. Now if we take this attitude in our financial planning, then the task of the States in passing forward any Federal aid becomes much simpler and much more equitable.

I foresee great difficulty in securing equitable allocation of funds which are earmarked by Federal law to meet classroom deficits only. Let us take two districts. One has a stable population; its buildings are 50 years old; and it is a poor district. Has it a classroom deficit? It has space to spare. Or take a rapidly growing, rich suburban district; it has rapid population growth; it needs new classrooms; with its rich resources it probably can pay for them fairly easily.

If you were the administrator, how would you think the funds should be allocated? If you were the administrator, would you want this as discretionary power? Would you want to have to face across the table these rival claimants for replacement versus supplementary facilities? If you were the legislator, what formula could you write into law which could give guidance to the administrator?

Mr. Chairman, on the basis of this experience and analysis, I firmly believe that grants should be given for the broad purpose of education itself, both construction and operation. We should recognize that capital costs are part of annual expense of schools. This would be simpler, and fairer. It would be consistent with our stated intent to permit no Federal interference in local school operation.

We should look to the years ahead. The decisions we make here will influence our course of action for many years to come.

I invite the Members to support the amendment I will offer to broaden the purpose of this act to include not only "construction" but also "operation," and to define "operation" as the costs of all necessary personnel, utilities, materials and supplies, and maintenance.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure at this time in giving my full support to H.R. 10128, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960.

There is no doubt that the whole question of the adequacy of our educational system has been recently brought into sharp review, and that this review

has been provoked in part, at least, by the phenomenal educational progress of the U.S.S.R. One writer recently stated that the emergence of Russia from the wheelbarrow age to the atomic age in one generation is the greatest miracle of modern times. This miracle was largely the result of a stepped-up educational system, whose scope and tempo possibly have not been matched in the history of the world.

The U.S. Office of Education, after recently sending some of its top educators to Russia to investigate the latter's educational system, made an official report to this Nation in a pamphlet entitled "Soviet Commitment to Education." They there pointed out that, while our people were spending less than 4 percent of their gross national product for education, the Russians were spending from 10 percent to 15 percent. The American educators deplored the large number of inferior and neglected American schools, and contrasted them with their Russian counterparts, which were receiving the very best that Russia could provide. One portion of the report concluded with the words:

Clearly the Soviet Union is bent on overtaking and surpassing us as a world power, and it proposes to use education as one of the primary means of obtaining this objective.

It would be unfortunate, however, if we were to regard this healthy self-examination on the part of the United States as nothing more than a spontaneous reaction to the goading and prodding of our rivals, prompted by injured pride or humiliation.

I, personally, am interested in strengthening our educational system, not because it is a prerequisite to our outstripping the Russians, but because education is the heart and soul of the democratic process. As someone said: "Among the uneducated, democracy is nothing more than the consensus of ignorance."

Moreover, it would be unfortunate if the publicity which we have recently given to the Russian system were to result in our changing our own basic philosophy of education. There is nothing miraculous about the Russian educational system, as such. Ours is far superior, as a system, and it is far more compatible with the democratic processes, while theirs is not. What makes Russian education so effective is that the Russians take it so seriously, and are willing to sacrifice so generously and persistently for its improvement.

In discussing our system of education, therefore, I am not prompted by any spirit of self-disparagement. After all, I am a product of the American public school system, and am myself a former teacher. Moreover, I am particularly proud of the academic tradition of my own State, Utah, and of the heroism and self-sacrifice of its teachers who, in many instances, have declined positions of greater emolument to stay at their post of duty. I believe it to be beyond dispute that our educational system has been one of the chief contributors to America's becoming the foremost industrial power of the world, and the

foremost spokesman of free nations everywhere. The very excellence of our academic record, however—which, I might add, has been immeasurably improved by an infusion of brains imported from foreign countries—has tended to blind us to some serious blemishes and deficiencies, which are becoming more apparent with every passing day.

I have been a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics since the committee was formed 16 months ago, during which time I have heard much testimony about the startling Russian advances. Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the hydrogen bomb, recently stated that the Russians now had so much momentum, educationally speaking, and that the sands of time had run so far, that there was nothing we could now do to prevent their becoming, within the near future, the unchallenged world leaders in all major scientific disciplines.

According to the National Science Foundation, the following tabulation shows the estimated numbers of scientists and engineers in the United States of America and in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

	United States	U.S.S.R.
1. Number of professional engineers (1959).....	850,000	894,000
2. Annual number of engineering graduates (1959).....	38,000	106,000
3. Holders of advanced degrees (1959) (Ph. D. in the United States, kandidat or doctor rank in the U.S.S.R.):		
Engineering.....	8,000	25,932
Physical and mathematical sciences.....	35,000	17,406
Life sciences (other than medical practitioners).....	24,000	32,341
4. Number of advanced degrees in science and engineering (1950-55).....	27,237	32,022

As good as our system may be, I am sorry to say that the naked, indisputable facts are that many of our students are not now receiving what may be considered a minimum educational entitlement for an enlightened democracy, and that many millions more are achieving far, far less than the full realization of their academic potential.

Better education should not be considered a partisan issue. On May 24, 1959, President Eisenhower's own Science Advisory Committee formally reported to the Nation the results of its exhaustive research into the educational problem confronting this Nation. Among other things it stated the following:

It is right and it is necessary that we should expend great effort and resources in order that every American child shall have the opportunity for the 10, 15, or even the 20 years of formal educational experience required to give him full command of his intellectual powers and enable him to live a rich and fruitful life. * * * There is much more to learn than there was 100 years ago, and hence the learning process must be made more efficient at every level. * * * But at this point we face the distressing fact that good teachers are now in short supply in all fields and at all levels and that they are going to be in shorter supply in the future. At the college and university level, teachers with Ph. D. degrees are important because of

their more extended training in scholarship and research. In the recent past some 40 percent of such faculties have held Ph. D.'s, but the prospects for the future are that there will be a further decline. The National Science Foundation, in 1956, estimated that we must have 300,000 or more new college teachers by 1970 if we are to keep pace with our needs. Prospects for filling even 40 percent of these positions with Ph. D. recipients are very slim.

The report then points out that this Nation is spending approximately \$15 billion on education, which represents slightly more than 3 percent of our gross national product. Its discussion of this aspect of the problem concludes with the words:

If we wisely spend twice that much to achieve higher quality it would be more than worth the cost. Doubling our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal.

If we are to fulfill the administration's own recommendation that we double our educational effort, then the \$325 million a year for 3 years, provided for by the present bill, must be considered as only a modest start. It amounts to about 2 percent of the recommended minimum increase in school appropriations.

It is sincerely argued by some that the responsibility for education resides exclusively with the States and local school districts, and that the Federal Government should not enter into this realm of governmental activity.

Permit me to deal briefly with this argument. I approach it with respect, and even with reverence, because its advocates are motivated by a lofty political ideology which I share. From my youth I, too, have been taught to deplore the need for excessively centralized governmental authority, and for the armies of faceless, anonymous Federal functionaries whose position too often renders them insensitive to the individualities of local communities and to the feelings and the needs of the individual citizens of this land.

I have often said that a country that knows no academic freedom is a country in which no lover of truth would care to live.

If I felt that the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960 would impinge even slightly upon the rights of each State and community to determine what its schools should teach, and how they should teach it, I would now oppose the measure as, I am sure, the great majority of the teachers in my district would want me to do.

I have examined this bill carefully. I have studied the history of Federal assistance to education. I am convinced that restriction upon academic freedom is not here an issue. I join my friends who raise and defend the banner of academic freedom. I pledge myself to fight that fight wherever it is waged, but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that that occasion is not now.

Let me repeat, this should not be considered a partisan issue. There was no man in our time, or any time, for that matter, who was more honestly and intelligently devoted to the preservation of American principles of intellectual freedom than was the late Senator Rob-

ert A. Taft. This great American in 1948, on the floor of the Senate, acknowledged that the original position that he had previously taken opposing Federal aid to education had been incorrect, and endorsed the Federal aid to education measure then pending before Congress. In the course of his remarks, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he stated:

Four years ago I opposed the then pending bill on this subject (Federal assistance to education), but in the course of that debate it became so apparent that many children in the United States were left without education, and then it became apparent, upon further study, that that was not the fault apparently of the States where they lived, but rather of the financial abilities of the States, that I could see no way to meet the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without Federal assistance * * *. I feel strongly that in the fields of education, health, housing, and relief the Federal Government has a secondary obligation.

I agree with the sentiments of this distinguished leader of the Senate. I agree that it is the primary duty of the local communities to educate their children. The citizens' sense of local responsibility should not be dulled by Federal largesse in the form of unneeded subsidies and grants. But where it becomes apparent, as it now does, that many local communities literally do not have the resources to support a first-class educational system, and where it is also apparent that the resulting intellectual poverty inevitably tends to spread itself across the land, trailing after it a wake of physical poverty, crime, and social unrest, and when it can be seen as clearly as the rising sun that the Nation as a whole must ultimately pay, in a thousand ways, the price of ignorance, wherever it is found, then I realize that we must invoke some kind of an equalizing principle by which all American children may be assured a good sound education. The Federal Government is the only agency equipped to apply this equalization principle on a national scale. Most States are well familiar with the practice of utilizing State funds to partially equalize differences among counties within the State. Why, then, should we not utilize the Federal Government to bring about at least a partial and very beneficial equalization on a national scale?

Incidentally, the State of Utah is a particularly good example of the successful operation of this equalization principle, on a statewide basis. We have school districts in our State which have been blessed with a certain amount of wealth in the form of mines, factories, mills, smelters, and industrial complexes. The assessed value of these installations is substantial. All too frequently, however, many, and sometimes most, of the thousands of men who operate these installations live in other districts, or even other counties. The latter may find themselves with many modest homes, but with little else by way of taxable real estate. Through the application of the equalization principle all school districts in the State have been able to share, in part, the wealth of the few affluent districts, and have

been able to provide for all the children of our State a high general level of education.

It must be emphasized that the purpose of the equalization plan is not to achieve absolute uniformity throughout the State. That would discourage individual districts from putting forth more than that effort necessary to attain the minimum. The purpose of the equalization plan is to make certain that no child in the State of Utah will be deprived of a sound education merely because he happens to be born in a school district which has no valuable taxable real estate. This basic principle of equalization has been one of the glories of Utah's school system. I can see no reason why it should not be equally valid when applied nationwide.

We are not talking about a system to effectuate complete uniformity throughout the Nation. That would be going too far. We are talking only about a system to raise the national standards generally, and to raise those of the poorer States particularly up to an acceptable national minimum.

According to the formula developed by the National Education Association, we should be spending annually an average of \$540 per pupil for education. The facts are that the Nation is now spending an average of \$310 per pupil. The figures for our individual States range from \$540 per pupil, for New York, down to the incredibly low figure of \$132 for Mississippi.

The State of Mississippi, however, simply does not have the financial capability of bringing its per capita expenditure up to the recommended minimum, or even to the national average. And yet it must be noted that Mississippi is currently putting forth a much greater relative educational effort than is New York. Mississippi's per capita residual income—that is, income left to individuals after deducting taxes and cost of necessities—averages \$418 for each school-age child, an income smaller than New York's annual expenditure per child for education. Of this income, Mississippians spend \$132 per child for education, or almost 30 percent. By comparison, per capita residual income in New York is \$5,956, for each school-age child, of which amount only 6 percent is spent for education.

It is demonstrable that in many local communities, particularly the so-called bedroom communities, where many families, particularly young families, live, but in which no large industrial installations are located, it would be an absolute financial impossibility to raise enough money to meet the minimum educational needs of that community. If they attempted to do so, through increasing local property tax levies, the inhabitants would simply move out. They could not carry the load.

The State of Utah offers an interesting case study. Utah's traditional love for academic excellence, even during early pioneer days when cultural refinements were achieved only through prodigious effort and sacrifice, has been noted by contemporary educational historians. Utah is proud of the fact that

it ranks third among the sisterhood of States in the relative effort put forth for education. Yet irrefutable statistics show that Utah is now spending \$60 a year less per pupil than the average which is spent nationally. This is due to the fact that while Utah has one of the highest birth rates, perhaps the highest birth rate, among the 50 States, it does not have the heavy concentrations of industry and capital that the wealthier States have. And so, notwithstanding the fact that Utah is spending \$24 million a year for school construction, and notwithstanding the further fact that Utah school districts have increased their bonded indebtedness 800 percent since 1946, we are still faced with a serious classroom shortage. Many of Utah's schools are on double shifts. Granite School District, for example has had a total of 31 double shift schedules at various schools since 1952. Its kindergartens have been limited to 6 weeks during the summer, and every first grade has been placed on a double shift, each limited to 3 hours per day. The operation and maintenance budgets, out of which Utah teachers are paid, have been eroded by construction demands in the faster growing districts, and our teachers are consequently the poorest paid professional persons in the State.

Many other Utah school districts have their troubles. I want to read, for example, a letter from J. Easton Parratt, superintendent of Utah's Murray City Schools, which I believe strikingly describes the financial difficulties which many of the urban and suburban districts of Utah and other States face, and will continue to face as our population doubles over the next 40 years. Superintendent Parratt's letter observes:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: We have not made it a practice to go to Washington with all of our problems. Inasmuch as you have asked for our financial status, we will be pleased to briefly present it to you.

As you know we are in a rapidly growing area. As a result, we have resorted to various means to try to keep up with our school construction needs. All of our first grades are presently on double sessions. So far, by using every nook and corner we have been able to get by without further double sessions. We have classes on the stage, in the halls, entrance vestibules, and so forth. Even with this, we expect to have to go to additional classes on double session before next year is over.

Fortunately for us, we have received considerable State help. We are bonded to the constitutional limit of 10 percent of the assessed valuation. We have had no trouble selling our bonds. Our trouble comes in not being able to meet the payments of the bonds already sold and still keep building for the ever increasing number of children. Even with our heavy local effort and the help from the State, we are falling further and further behind. More unsatisfactory spaces are being used and more students are placed in each classroom. We often have 40 students in a classroom. We must receive more State or Federal help if we are to provide schools for our children. I have participated in several studies of the school building needs in Utah. Every study comes up with such a large figure it surprises our people. I am convinced the accumulated need in Utah is now so great that the State cannot meet these needs. Each year the needs become accumulatively greater even

with our State bonds. Thus, I sincerely hope the Federal Government will join a partnership with the local and the States in providing the buildings we desperately need on a grant basis without strings attached as provided in H.R. 10128. This is the only basis that will be of any help to us.

We surely appreciate your interest in this serious problem and hope Congress will take some steps to start helping to correct it. The amount provided in the bill is relatively small compared to our needs. We could use the whole allotment for Utah in Murray alone. Nevertheless, it is a start and we will be grateful for even this small amount.

I want to emphasize that this bill does not pose a threat to academic freedom. Those who suggest that it does talk as though Federal assistance were some brand new principle. They overlook the fact that we have had Federal aid to education ever since the Constitution was ratified, and even before. The Northwest Ordinance of 1785 specified the manner in which the western lands should be surveyed, and stipulated that "there shall be reserved the lot number 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township." Even that far back it was recognized that the Federal Government had every right and, in fact, a responsibility to give encouragement to local school construction and maintenance through grants in aid. The above enabling act became the pattern for all States, and territories subsequently admitted into the Union.

Have we forgotten the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862, signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln—the act which established Federal support for land-grant colleges? Can anyone validly argue that our many splendid agricultural colleges are straitjacketed in their academic pursuits? Have we forgotten the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, creating federally sponsored vocational schools, which act has been revamped and brought up to date no less than five times since its original enactment?

Certainly no one can overlook our GI educational bills, through which millions of deserving veterans have received an education. Has anyone seriously argued that these federally granted GI benefits encroached upon academic freedom? May I add that for 10 years I taught commercial law in an institution which received GI benefit payments. I can categorically deny, from my own experience, that the Federal Government ever sought to influence me directly or indirectly in what I taught. The Federal Government was interested only in seeing that the money was spent in the manner provided by law. The law itself contained no provision which could be construed as a threat to academic freedom, and anyone who intimates that it did either is intentionally misleading the public or is tragically uninformed.

Some of the most important scientific research in our country is carried out today under research contracts between the Federal Government and our various universities. In fact, more than 60 percent of all research and development done in this country today is accomplished under Federal sponsorship, in one form or another. This sponsorship

unquestionably has helped to make us the greatest scientific nation in the world. If the Federal Government were to withdraw from this field, including Federal grants for university research, the backbone of our scientific pioneering effort would be broken, and we would quickly sink to second-class status in science and technology.

Under the program designed to aid federally impacted areas, hundreds of millions of dollars have been paid out throughout the United States to local school districts. There are eight federally impacted districts in Utah. I took occasion last year to write to the superintendents of these eight districts, to ascertain whether or not the Federal grants they received infringed in any degree upon their control of the local schools. Their letters to me indicated that there was absolutely no infringement.

The 5,000 delegates to the recent NEA Representative Assembly approved the following proposition:

Although control of education should remain in the hands of State and local authorities, the association believes that the Federal Government should share with these authorities a greater responsibility for financial support of education.

I concur with this statement. I agree that the initiative in education must always originate with the local communities. I agree that we do not want a national department of education whose purpose it is to prescribe national curricula for all local communities. This would be stultifying, and repugnant to the principle of unlimited academic freedom which has given both strength and sparkle to the American way of life.

But this is not going to happen. The very nature of the school-community relationship will not let it happen. Federal participation in school financing will not lead to Federal usurpation of school management in the future, any more than it has led to it in the past. Communities will never yield this right to administer their schools. Local interest in educating is not waning, and will not wane, and the communities themselves will never yield the initiative in education. This is because the schools serve what all communities hold to be their greatest and dearest asset—their children. Because the great majority of our citizens are parents, the schools will always command more deep citizen interest than will any other institutions of government.

But the closeness of the school-community relationship does not mean that the quality of American education is purely a local concern. Many of our problems are both local and national in character, and education has clearly become this kind of a problem.

It must be remembered, for example, that our national security in the long view rests firmly upon the quality of our education. Rapid changes in transportation and military science have shrunk the world until the geographic barriers which have shielded this country from invasion and annihilation in the past have disappeared almost entirely. We have also passed the day when we could

depend upon the sheer weight of our natural and industrial resources to guarantee our ultimate victory. Our security today rests primarily upon the human resource. It rests upon our people, and upon the quality of the institutions we establish to develop to their limits the spiritual and intellectual qualities of our people.

In the instance of our schools, then, local weaknesses become national weaknesses. Poorly equipped and poorly staffed schools in any communities, in any of the 50 States, become chinks in the national armor.

The issue before us is not to resolve the contest between Federal Government and State or local government. The issue is whether the Federal Government should join hands with State and local government in a cooperative effort to solve a problem which is both local and national in character. No one wants local governments to be extinguished or crushed. They are still expected to exercise their initiative and leadership. The basic principle of this bill is to provide incentives for States to put forth greater effort. Where this incentive pattern has been employed in other programs of governmental activity—for example, construction of sewage-disposal facilities—it has been shown that the States and local communities have been stimulated into exerting initiative and effort which, in many cases, they did not exert prior to the creation of these programs. And so, instead of its being true that Federal grants-in-aid on an incentive basis stultify and enfeeble the States and local communities, the facts are exactly the reverse: They encourage and strengthen local activity.

May I propound the challenge voiced by Adlai E. Stevenson in a recent magazine article:

The worry of thinkers today is whether Americans, undereducated and overentertained, tossing carelessly but restlessly in what Reinhold Niebuhr calls a state of sophisticated vulgarity are still capable of discharging their moral duty as citizens to their country and to the world they live in.

This bill before us is extremely modest, and will accomplish no educational miracle. But it will help. Instead of raising ideological arguments which have no application to the facts of the case, let us get on with the job which we all know has to be done: to infuse a new strength and vitality into our educational system, to the end that we might be able to honestly tell our children that we have given them the best education of which we are capable.

I conclude with the thoughtful words of Alfred North Whitehead, who said:

In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] and to concur in much of what he has said. Tomorrow, when the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] will offer as a substitute H.R. 22. I like this measure particular for two reasons: First, because of the fact I think it does a more thorough job in the field of education; and second, because it includes the very vital part which would allow the States to decide what portion of the funds which they receive should be spent for construction or for teachers' salaries. I understand if this substitute is not in order there will then be an amendment offered to the present bill which would give the opportunity to include in Mr. Thompson's bill the teachers' salary part of H.R. 22.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman remembers well that in committee the gentleman from New Jersey supported the provisions of H.R. 22, and I believe the gentleman recognizes that I still am in support of the principle involved in the Metcalf proposal.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do, and I commend the gentleman for the very practical way in which he has been able to bring this matter of school construction before the House. Without his effort it would not be here today.

I would like to point out that both in the so-called Metcalf bill and in the Thompson bill there is stress laid, in the purposes of both bills, on the quality of education.

Now, quality of education cannot be achieved by any possible definition without including the type of teaching which is being given to the young people of this country. It cannot be gainsaid, I believe, that on the whole, while we know we must rectify the shortage of classrooms, at the same time we know that even in the State of California, which may not have as serious a classroom shortage as many other States, we do have a tremendous number of so-called substandard teachers actually teaching our young people. Therefore, it would seem to me that any common-sense yardstick would certainly give any State of the Union the option of deciding what their greatest need was and what the ratio was so that they could apply this amount of dollars or percentage to classrooms and another or the remaining percentage to teachers' salaries.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. As the gentleman knows, I am opposed to both the school construction and the teachers' salary aspect of this legislation. But, this argument has always left me a little befuddled. If we give the aid to States for school construction, is that not going to release comparable funds for teachers' salaries?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not want to let the gentleman remain befuddled, so I will try to briefly explain that obviously what we are doing is supplementing what the States are now doing. We are not replacing any of the funds which the States now are spending for education. They will need everything they now have plus what they will be able to get from the Federal Government, so it is not a question of releasing funds in any manner whatsoever. I hope I have cleared up the matter a little.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. In 10 years it is estimated, even at the present rate, we must double the expenditure for education by \$30 billion. The real property tax takes \$10 billion at the present time, and under the best estimate that will only give an additional \$5 billion. Where is the other \$10 billion to \$15 billion to come from? It must come from some Federal source. This seems to be irrefutable in connection with our projected needs in the next 10 years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is quite right. I simply want to ask that the Members give consideration to the equally important need regarding teachers' salaries, because a good teacher, it seems to me, can raise the quality of the youth of this Nation even though he might not have the best facilities. On the other hand, the best facilities alone, without good teachers, will not provide the quality which I think everyone recognizes is so badly needed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement, and I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation authorizing \$975 million to the States for construction of school facilities. I have supported this legislation for a long time and last year introduced a companion to the proposed School Support Act of 1959 which was H.R. 22.

Our first proposal called for some \$1.1 billion in assistance per year, while the legislation now before us has been trimmed down to \$325 million per year for 3 years. That is the bill which was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor in June of 1959. In addition, that first bill would have allowed the States to use Federal grants for teachers salaries, as well as construction.

It is hard to believe that such trimming down is based on a study of the actual needs of our schools. Public school enrollment increased 50 percent between 1948 and 1960—from 24 million to 36 million. Not only do we have a classroom deficit now, but our national birth rate indicates that we must anticipate a new tidal wave of public school enrollment that will make the experi-

ence of the past dozen years seem modest indeed.

To meet the need, local district and State taxes and expenditures have gone up and up. In general, the total amount of money raised and spent on the State and local levels for all purposes has jumped from \$12 billion in 1946 to almost \$50 billion today. What is more, by 1970 State and local expenditures throughout the Nation are expected to surpass \$85 billion.

In contrast, the Federal budget has shown a much more modest growth over the past decade. In simple fact, the Federal budget today is actually less than it was in 1945 or 1946. Furthermore, to pile fact on top of fact, the Federal Government has, in this same period of time, put into effect two major and several minor tax cuts.

Then State taxes and expenditures are ballooning. Federal taxes and expenditures are increasing at only a modest rate, by comparison. And all the while school needs grow and grow.

The case for Federal aid to education is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also say at this time that I fully support authorization of Federal aid to be used for teachers' salaries as well, for, when all else is said and done, we must have teaching personnel to man the classrooms we intend to construct through this legislation. I intend to support the amendment which I understand will be offered to enlarge the bill's purpose to give the States the alternative of using funds for teacher salaries.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this legislation with such amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact that we do have very many fine schools in our country in many parts of our Nation where they have plant facilities but they cannot attract sufficient competent teachers because of the inability to pay, and the testimony before the committee showed that there was an urgent need in this regard?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There certainly was, and I hope tomorrow in committee we can consider it well.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, the most critical domestic problem before the United States is education. I doubt that there is a Member of this body who would deny the importance of proper public education for our children, and yet in the Congress few issues have provoked such controversy. We agree as to the problem, but we battle over its solution.

I have examined report after report, studies of private and public groups, statements of educators and school administrators, and to me there remains the inescapable conclusion that we face a critical need for adequate educational facilities. It cannot be done without Federal support.

Federal assistance to education is not novel. For years it has existed. True, it has largely existed on the higher education level. And yet why do we so fear Federal assistance at elementary and secondary levels?

Technological changes demand greater skill. Population growth, increasing interdependence of community life, and a war-threatened society on the edge of space presents a challenge to our educational needs never before experienced. Grow we must. And with growth comes change. Let us face up to it and remember that the Nation goes forward together or not at all.

A Federal response to national educational needs should not be regarded as a substitute for local responsibility. The effort of States and local communities is paramount. The Federal Government seeks only to pull together the crevices and the chinks in the walls of this great country. That is an important function of the Federal Government.

Classroom shortages are foremost. The phenomenal increase in school-age population and the growing difficulty of local communities to cope with these demands cannot be ignored. These shortages deeply involve the national welfare. The number of pupils in excess of normal capacity in public elementary and secondary schools has reached the astounding figure of 1,883,000. This can be easily translated to mean that these pupils are denied adequate educational opportunities. In every community we are witnessing half-day sessions and crowded classrooms. This results in the downgrading of the educational standards of all. What is more critical, though, is the long-term results of this kind of inadequacy. Twenty years from now we could feel it in the most horrifying ways. We could find ourselves outstripped in every intellectual endeavor. Be on guard lest this occur.

In his state of the Union message this year the President urged prompt action to help localities build schools. The rate of construction continues to lag behind enrollments. The committee bill now before us is a sound approach and I shall vote for it. I would not feel otherwise that I was acting in the best interests of the Nation.

The committee bill, entitled "The School Construction Assistance Act of 1960," establishes a vital premise which we should be ever mindful of, namely, that there is no nefarious scheme here, as some seem to contend, that our actions here will reap a shift in control of school policies and programs from State and local authorities to a Federal bureaucracy. If I believed this to be true I would vote against such a proposal. Our efforts are designed to utilize a portion of our national resources to assist States and local communities in their efforts to bridge the gap between the school-age population and the critical classroom shortages.

The preamble of this bill clearly designates in strong and affirmative language that:

The formulation of policy, and the administration of the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools resides in the States and local communities.

Such enunciation of our purposes should annihilate any superficial conception of migration of control from States and local communities to the Federal Government.

The enactment of this bill will unquestionably bring to bear a new Federal influence on public elementary and secondary education—an influence for adequate school facilities in needy communities.

The failure of enactment of this bill would also have an influence on our elementary and secondary schools—an influence for continued crowding and double sessions.

Neither enactment nor failure can result in any change in the traditional locus of control of our schools.

I support enactment of the bill because of the obviously preferable Federal influence which will result. The Federal purpose is to provide financial assistance to help meet the immediate problem. This bill calls for a Federal expenditure of \$975 million over a span of 3 years. It can stimulate a total Federal-State expenditure of \$1.625 billion; \$325 million in capital grants would be made to the State education agencies for school construction in the first year and in the second and third years the States will match the Federal grants on a 50-50 basis. Another feature incorporated in the committee bill will allow the States, at their discretion, to elect to accept and match the capital grants, or to receive and match commitments to make interest and principal payments on an equivalent amount of bonds or a combination of both.

In order to receive assistance sole administration must reside in the State educational agency. Payments must be distributed by the States to local educational agencies under State established procedures whereby priority will be given to local agencies which have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which, in terms of available economic resources, are least able to finance the cost of facilities.

Adequate and equitable safeguards are provided to insure proper State and local efforts in diminishing their own critical needs by means of a "State school effort index" which will be the State expenditure for schools per school child divided by the personal income per school age child for the State. To the extent that this State index falls below the national index, an equivalent percentage will be reduced from the annual allotment.

The amounts in Federal assistance allotted from appropriated funds to each State will bear the same ratio to such total as the State school age population bears to the total national school age population. The State's allotment, if unpaid, will remain available to it for 3 years.

The long-standing impasse over Federal assistance to school construction is no longer a contest confined to the niceties of academic debate. In the face of compelling and critical need it is time to act and we must do so swiftly. With an admixture of politics, group pressures,

ideological debates, sectional wrangles, and parliamentary delay we continue to preclude a constructive approach.

The fact remains that in the 1959-60 school year the Nation was short 132,400 public elementary and secondary classrooms needed to house the 1,883,000 students enrolled in excess of normal capacity and to replace obsolete facilities. Despite construction of 63,000 to 72,000 new classrooms per year since the 1955-56 school year the overall shortage declined only slightly. Despite a stepped-up construction effort the overall shortage dropped a mere 27,000, from 159,000 to 132,400. In my own State of New York there are some 2,735,000 students enrolled, 266,000 of which are in excess of normal capacity. As of September of last year New York had a need for 13,000 additional classrooms. These figures do not include the replacement factor in New York City, which can be safely estimated to be an additional 4,000—for a total shortage of at least 14,000.

This urgent necessity for prompt action constrains me to prefer the committee bill over the administration's debt service proposal which will pay half of the principal and interest annually becoming due on bonds issued by school districts to finance construction. Equivalent commitments must be made by the States. The difficulty in this proposal is that many communities have reached their constitutional bond limits and accordingly, their participation would be prevented for some time to come.

The committee bill can provide more than 40,000 classrooms in the next 3 years. Under this bill States would have the option to use the debt service plan, as proposed by the administration bill, if they should prefer it.

The time for action on school construction is long past. Let us stop being dilatory and do what we must do for the good of our country. A well educated youth is our strongest national resource. Let us go forward with the soundest investment that we can make.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] in his constructive and interesting remarks in Monday's Record, made reference to a questionnaire sent to the Governors of the States last year by the House Education Subcommittee.

The response from the Governor of Nebraska evidently indicated a strong desire for Federal aid to education.

In order to set the record straight, I wish to point out that the Governor of Nebraska replied to a poll taken by the Omaha World-Herald just prior to the Nebraska primary election earlier this month. To the question, "Do you favor expanding Federal aid to education?" the Governor replied, "No."

In addition, a 1959 survey by the U.S. Office of Education indicated Nebraska schools had a backlog need of 521 classrooms. A recent report of the Nebraska Department of Education shows that

570 classrooms were built in our State in 1959 and twice that number are scheduled for completion in 1960.

Nebraska does not need or want Federal aid to education, as the votes of the delegation from Nebraska on this bill will show.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support for this legislation to the views already expressed by so many of my able colleagues.

I feel that the time has come—in fact past due—when it is crucial for us to take action. It has been mentioned many times since this debate began that we currently have a backlog need for 132,400 additional classrooms in our elementary and secondary schools. This is an alarming figure but I do not feel that it adequately portrays the situation that actually exists. It is easy to shrug off the problem when you merely look at an abstract number of missing classrooms.

What I feel we should concern ourselves with for a moment is what this shortage actually means in terms of the effects on our children. The Office of Education has estimated from the State reports submitted to it that there are currently 1.88 million children in excess of normal classroom capacity. It has been further estimated that 10 million students are actually being penalized by this shortage. When there are 45 students in a classroom only 15 are listed as "in excess of normal classroom capacity" but all 45 are receiving inferior education due to the overcrowding and to the consequent lessening of the effectiveness of the teacher. This overcrowding means that thousands of children can attend school for only half of the day, and as much as 180 school hours can be lost to the child through such split sessions—almost 2 full months of schooling that the child was entitled to have. Or it means overcrowded classrooms with insufficient individual attention and assistance from an overburdened teacher. Finally, it means that thousands of children are attending classes in makeshift or obsolescent facilities. To be even more specific it was reported last fall that in one city the high school students were attending classes in tents and 30,000 of the more than a million public school pupils in the county were attending classes in double shift. This is just one example of the situation that exists in some parts of every State in the Union.

I wonder if my colleagues realize that 10 million students represent almost one-third of the entire public school enrollment. Certainly, when the problem is considered from this point of view—that one-third of all our schoolchildren are being handicapped by this shortage—we cannot dismiss the matter lightly and just say that the State and local governments will eventually take care of the problem. Eventually is not soon enough.

It seems abundantly clear to me that the States and local areas will not be able to erase this deficit. Although they have been making record-breaking school construction efforts for the last few years they are barely able to meet each year's new enrollment and replacement needs. And all indications are that the State and local governments will not be able to continue these record-breaking efforts. In 1957-58 they were able to build 72,100 new classrooms. In 1958-59 the figure dropped to 70,000. For this year, 1959-60, the figure is expected to drop to 62,700. Many States cannot spend the funds requisite for an adequate educational system because many school districts have no source of taxation by which needed revenue can be raised.

An infusion of Federal Government funds to assist our schools in catching up with this backlog is fully in keeping with our tradition and our spirit as a Nation. The President himself explained the philosophy behind this approach in his special message to the Congress on education on January 12, 1956:

The responsibility for public education rests with the States and the local communities. Federal action which infringes upon this principle is alien to our system. But our history has demonstrated that the Federal Government, in the interest of the whole people, can and should help with certain problems of nationwide scope and concern when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough.

Clearly, this is the kind of situation we face today in considering the school classroom shortage.

Our State and local governments have demonstrated their inability to meet the classroom needs that arise each year due to increased enrollment and the need for replacement of obsolete facilities. If the Federal Government will help them to erase this backlog, they may then be able to meet the yearly problem alone.

I would also like to voice my approval for extending this bill to include funds for teachers' salaries as did the measure passed by the Senate. There is an indisputable shortage of qualified teachers across our country. Within the next 5 years 3,300 additional teachers will be needed in the State of Kansas, alone. We cannot hope to attract more qualified individuals into the teaching profession unless the salary level is raised; and the State and local governments cannot concentrate on raising teachers' salaries when they are forced to devote a substantial amount of their budgets to attempting to provide enough classrooms to house their students. I feel that we must assist both with construction and with teachers' salaries at least until the backlog of construction needs are erased.

The primary objection raised to any proposal for Federal funds for classroom construction and teachers' salaries is that such a measure would lead to Federal control of education. I would like to take a moment to consider this proposition. For over 10 years we have been allocating funds for classroom construction and for operating expenses—which includes teachers' salaries—under Public Laws 815 and 874. Surely these

should be good test cases for whether this type of assistance does indeed lead to Federal control. Prior to serving in the Congress I worked as regional attorney approving applications under these laws, and I never saw any evidence of the "creeping Federal control" which the opponents of this bill would have us believe must necessarily follow. Furthermore, it has come to my attention that the University of Alabama's College of Education recently conducted a survey by means of a questionnaire submitted to a cross-section of school superintendents in more than 3,000 school districts receiving assistance under these two laws. Ninety-three percent of the superintendents felt that this aid had not constituted a threat to State and local control; 5 percent termed the threat "little"; and 2 percent were undecided. None of the superintendents considered the threat great.

The interests of national defense, the danger of the Communist threat, of the need for an expanding economy, and of the need for maximum development of each individual citizen demand that we strive to give each of our students the best possible educational opportunity. They certainly are not receiving this opportunity when they must be taught in overcrowded, obsolete classrooms, on double shifts, or by overworked teachers. No better investment can be made than in the education of American youth. It is an investment in the future to preserve our democratic way of life. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge passage of this legislation as in the best interest both of the Nation as a whole and of each individual citizen. It is vital and it is necessary.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today, in my opinion, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before us during this session of Congress.

H.R. 10128 provides for Federal assistance in the construction of new schools, and is a long-awaited answer to the need for more classrooms and other school facilities. Numerous individuals and organizations in this country, representing all segments of our society, have espoused the cause of Federal aid to education. This is not a new concept. The Federal Government over the years has entered into various fields in an effort to provide financial support, and in fact has extended financial assistance for education in the past in the form of school lunches, vocational education programs, research and fellowship grants, et cetera—all without resultant Federal control.

Here in our great country we are enjoying a standard of living never before reached, and if we are to develop our most valuable commodity—our human resources—we must devote our time and efforts to the establishment of more and better educational facilities. The price will be high, but we cannot be content to sit back and tolerate a substandard second-rate program for education. Certainly the wealthiest nation on earth cannot afford to provide less than the best education for its children.

With the tremendous growth in our population in the last few decades we are faced with a critical shortage of school facilities. Many of our school buildings were built early in the century, and while new construction has tried to keep pace with our growing student population it has been impossible to do so through the State and local level. It has been proven beyond a doubt that proper classroom facilities, with the proper space and equipment, increase the quality of a child's education and permit a student to absorb more knowledge. Overcrowded conditions, poor equipment, inadequate facilities—all these tend to affect adversely the education of our millions of children. By the end of 1959 there was a shortage of about 130,000 classrooms, and I am afraid that the situation has not improved since that time. In fact, latest indications are that we will need some 41,000 new classrooms this fall just to take care of the ordinary increase in annual enrollments. We must increase the financial support for schools if we are to continue our progress in the field of human endeavors as we have in the fields of industry and science. Our children are our greatest assets and are the future citizens and leaders of this country. We cannot and must not economize on education if we are to retain our position of leadership in the world of the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill now before us, and I only regret that the pending legislation does not contain any provision which would bring about an increase in teacher salaries. However, it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered to the bill which would make it conform more closely to the bill passed in February of this year by the Senate—providing Federal aid for school construction or teachers' salaries—and I hope the amendment will be carried. The critical teacher shortage has a serious and damaging effect on our educational system, and under the present circumstances, with private industry offering much more lucrative returns, we do not seem to be able to attract and retain teachers with the highest qualifications to instruct our children. This major gap in our educational system must be closed, and I trust that we will have an opportunity to act on legislation which will enable the Federal Government to work along with the local and State agencies in an effort to alleviate these shortcomings in construction and qualified teacher personnel.

The President has indicated his opposition to direct Federal aid in this field, but as the distinguished senior Senator from Montana pointed out in a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star several months ago, Federal financial assistance for teacher salaries is not a new idea. To quote from the Senator's letter:

During that period (fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1959) the Federal Government administered \$231,572,000 under the vocational education acts, of which approximately 90 percent went for teachers' salaries. For the same period,

the Federal Government administered \$688,500,000 under Public Law 874 (for current operating and maintenance expenses), of which approximately 65 percent went for teachers' salaries. This totals about \$655,940,000 for teachers' salaries between fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1959.

In view of the fact that these programs have been in existence for a number of years, and in view of the fact that the Federal tax funds have been utilized for many years to help meet the salaries of many local officials where there is Federal-State cooperation, I might suggest that the President do a little homework on the subject, which would reveal that such Federal financial assistance is not a reprehensible new idea, but would be a continued step forward in the discharge of our responsibilities to our citizens, to provide our children with the best possible educational advantages.

Under article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution the Congress is empowered to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Under that provision the Federal Government has the right to enter the field of education, just as it has taken an interest in the past in public health programs, highway programs, reclamation and irrigation projects, and in providing subsidies to industry and agriculture. We have an obligation to meet in the field of education and we must discharge that obligation to the best of our abilities.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities, had come to no resolution thereon.

CEREMONY AT EAST FRONT OF CAPITOL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the ceremony in connection with the raising of the first marble column of the east front of the Capitol will be held at 10:15 a.m. instead of 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

REV. JOHN F. MCGLINCHY, WHO LIVED FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to turn aside from the news of accidents, crimes, and "the Khrushchev war of nerves," and draw inspiration from the life of a good man.

As graduation time approaches, we recall with belated gratitude and wisdom, the debt we owe to the teachers of our formative years.

There is widespread concern among thinking Americans, that our country has lost its sense of direction and purpose.

That for the sake of material gain and convenience, we have traded away the ideals that were nurtured in us by devoted teachers. To the extent that this is so, we have failed them and ourselves. But we can recover our heritage by living up to the eternal truths that they taught us.

Such a teacher was the late Rev. John F. McGlinchey, who was curate for 26 years at St. Mary's Church in Lynn, Mass. Father McGlinchey taught the youth of St. Mary's Boys High School the love of their country, based upon knowledge of its history and traditions, that prepared them to serve it with honor as citizens and as soldiers.

Father McGlinchey was proud of our country and its respect for the brotherhood of man.

Although he has gone to his heavenly reward, he has left an indelible impression upon the youngsters he taught who have since grown to manhood.

The eulogy delivered by Msgr. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock at the funeral mass for Father McGlinchey was repeated by him at a special mass in Father McGlinchey's memory, at the request of parishioners.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD this moving tribute from the May 15, 1960, issue of the Lynn Sunday Post:

SAW FATHER MCGLINCHY AS PRIESTLY SCHOLAR—MONSIGNOR SHERLOCK PAYS TRIBUTE TO HIM IN EULOGY

Lynners who attended the recent funeral Mass for Rev. John F. McGlinchey, a curate at St. Mary's Church for 26 years until his transfer in 1951, were touched by the eulogy of Msgr. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock, pastor of St. Mary's and a former fellow curate of the late beloved priest.

SPECIAL MASS

Because of the great interest in the eulogy, Monsignor Sherlock repeated it last Monday morning at a special Mass conducted here for the former boys' high school instructor and counselor.

For persons who knew Father McGlinchey but were unable to attend either Mass, the Sunday Post, with the permission of Monsignor Sherlock, today presents the complete eulogy.

Father McGlinchey died 2 weeks ago after a long illness. He had been the pastor of St. Julia's Church, Weston, for the last 9 years.

The tribute follows:

"Thou shalt forget thy misery and remember it only as waters that have passed away. And brightness, like the noonday sun, shall rise to thee at evening; and when thou shalt think thyself consumed, thou shalt rise as the star of morning. (Job 11: 16, 17.)

"I do not see my mission here this morning as reviewing the biography of a great priest. I see it rather as the expression of true sympathy with you in the loss of an old and valued friend. It is natural and good that, as we greet each other, we express the sorrow we feel and pray that this bereavement rest not too heavy on very human hearts. To Father McGlinchey's relatives and those intimates of his, those who watched him through his many trials, who day after day, were faithful in the expression of their devotion and love, we promise prayers that God may lighten their burden of sorrow. To the priests and sisters whom he

served through 35 years of priestly life we hesitate to pronounce the sorrow that we feel but promise the suffrage of our prayers. To all those men and women who were fortunate to know him, and especially to the youth he served so skillfully and well, whose lives took on new dimensions because of the disciplined zeal of this priestly teacher, we extend condolences on the loss of their more than generous benefactor. We, the companions of his priestly service, we who worked and talked, who planned and prayed together, tell each other how hard it is to lose one we loved so much.

"But if sympathy and sorrow seem to be uppermost in our minds, they are far from the more important truths of which we should be conscious. The church, still mindful of the sadness of deserted friends, reminds us that death is but the vestibule of Heaven, that, after all, Catholics spend their lives preparing for that last day on earth when the cares and heartaches, the trials and disappointments of life are finally put aside and the most recent triumph and the last success take on their true proportions of littleness compared with God's eternal reward for those who love Him. She would drive home to our minds the unchanging truth that death is the gateway through which those who have served God well move on to an eternity of supernal happiness.

"PASSING INSTANT

"The truth is that Father McGlinchey, deep as was his love for us, would not return from the joys of Heaven. He would tell us that life at most is but a passing instant, and that if we would but follow the command to love God and love our neighbor, with all that this command implies, we should join him in his happiness in God's good time.

"Laughter and tears have a strange way of being mixed together in this uneven life of ours. For Catholics, even in such deep sadness as this, the fact of our eternal destiny transcends our sorrow and makes the day rich in the reality of a priest's ineffable reward, prepared for him before the beginning of time by an Almighty and all-loving Father. Today must be for us, as it is for Father McGlinchey, a day of splendid joy, seen though it is, through the evanescent mists of temporal loss and passing sorrow. After all, a priest has realized the destiny for which he was created, unbounded joy in the Lord.

"It is the way of priests to characterize their fellows by short descriptive words that catalog them by their salient traits. Describing a companion consumed with a desire to change the world, articulate beyond his fellow priests, a master of words and afire with zeal, one who takes his place in the pulpit or upon the platform, a veritable mouthpiece of God, with laconic swiftness they christen him 'the orator.' To indicate the priest who is gifted with a superior understanding of the structure of society and its activities, the organizer of men to carry on God's work with speed and efficiency, they forego descriptive phrases and call him simply 'the administrator.' The priest whose life is thoughtful and whose interests profound, who burns the midnight oil in his quest for knowledge to answer the whys and wherefores of this uncertain life, who with a deep Christian philosophy weighs the problems of the day and, with careful steps, appraises the course of the world, he, with telegraphic brevity, becomes 'the scholar.'

"SLAVE TO TRUTH

"It was to this third category that Father McGlinchey belonged. Rhetorical competence he had. He loved to savor the spoken word, to plumb its meaning and taste its beauty, but he distinguished between oratory and precise expression. He was a slave to the truth and despised the tricks of flamboyant speech as a debasement of the truth it was meant to serve. He was primarily a

teacher, and in conveying learning or in stimulating the learning activities of young men he preached in telling tones, day in and day out, reverence for one thing—the truth. He was a profound man with short patience with the superficial. He was easily upset by bluff and cant. He thought primarily of God as all true and searched the realm of truth with religious zeal. To him all truth was God's truth and he found God everywhere. His quest for truth was wide and deep. In this was his claim to greatness, the sublime greatness of simplicity.

"One evening 30 years ago we sat together in his room. He was refining his plan to teach high school boys the best he could give them. He said that to his mind the greatest area in the broad field of a liberal education was history. In history, he said, were to be found the thoughts and deeds that moved the world upward. (He was basically an optimist.)

"The vitality of these thoughts came from the vision of historic persons who said the words and performed the deeds that helped the world's progress. These he would present to the boys of his school. The application of the subject was to be the fact that all his students would become characters in history, broadly or narrowly conceived, and hence by teaching history he hoped to contribute at least a little toward a better world. The history he chose was that of the church and the biography of our Lord. He had the gift of great teachers in mentally projecting his students into adult activities. He saw this one as a doctor and that one as a lawyer. He waxed eloquent about one who would become great in the high vocation of politics and another who would be a priest like himself. His sanguine nature pictured them all as good, working at the problem of making a better world, extending God's kingdom into the marketplace, the courts, the operating room, and the public assembly. His concept of religion was dynamic and he hoped that through teaching he would have a causal part in it.

"LOYALTY"

"Not every student of his justified his hopes but many did, and when sickness and sorrow dogged his path in later life his mind roamed through the fields of vicarious accomplishment and he took delight in the competent goodness of his old pupils.

"Loyalty was a great word with him. His loyalties were constant. His country was important. In his more intimate moods he would recount his father's flight from political harassment to this land of ours and felt that this country had been quite literally for him the land of opportunity. He worried about the best way to teach patriotism. He felt that patriotism, as a virtue, was going into partial eclipse. He saw the church in all its extension in time and space and in its local detail. He yearned for the most efficient way to bring the history of the church to his students, moving from the parish which claimed their immediate allegiance to the grand concept of the universal church and envisioned his students growing in a loyalty to the church that would consume them.

"MADE WORLD BETTER"

"He served the multitude in his priestly way but gave himself in friendship to a few. To these his loyalty burned fiercely under the cover of a quiet manner and restrained and disciplined speech. He loved his friends as an outcome of his nature but philosophized that his real friends were an extension of himself and, since their ideals were the same as his, their behavior in the world always be such that it would extend his priestly influence among men. When he left Lynn some 10 years ago, he said he felt he was old enough to make a judgment. He told me at that time that he felt that his

friends had justified his theory, that they had made the world better by the goodness of their lives and that he felt he had some part at least in their goodness.

"Sometimes, as we read the history of our times, we become disturbed by the inequities of the record. We find that men, who by their deeds, should be eternally great, are slighted in the pages of history while temporarily obtrusive men are enshrined in the recounting of their exploits. One writer has accepted this injustice and says, 'It came to pass that after a while the artist was forgotten but the work lived on' (Olive Shreiner, *Dream*). However, if you seek Father McGlinchey's name on the published page, it may not be carried in heavy type or with elaborate footnotes but you will find it engraved deeply in the hearts of those who knew him, those who drew strength from his teaching and grace from his priesthood, those who, having seen him, smiled once again in the grace of God. But you knew him. Maybe his best eulogy is written in your own hearts.

"Much of his life was beset by sickness, but that is over. The trials and suffering are ended and the prize is already won. So with the writer of old we say to him, 'Thou shalt forget the misery and remember it only as waters that have passed away. And brightness, like the noonday sun, shall arise to thee at evening and when thou shalt think thyself consumed, thou shalt rise as the star of morning. (Job 11: 16, 17).'"

RADIO STATION WBT, OF CHARLOTTE, IS DOING A GREAT WORK FOR OUR COUNTRY

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I had intended asking for leave to address the House, but because of pressing business today did not take that time. I asked for this permission in order to salute and call attention to a marvelous and patriotic endeavor on the part of radio station WBT, of Charlotte, N.C., owned by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. This station and its employees, under the able guidance of Mr. Charles H. Crutchfield, its vice president, have engaged in a program of education so necessary to the survival of America. It is a program to inform the American people of the true character of the Russian Government, and alert our citizens to its danger. I quote from part of his letter to me, which I received today:

America does not suffer so much from a lack of dedication and concern on the part of its leaders as from a lack of informed interest and activity on the part of its citizens. For the past year, WBT has been using its 50,000 watts of "power for the people" to help in informing and activating American citizens in the free world's struggle against Communist dictatorship.

A year ago, WBT began the presentation of an editorial series called "Radio Moscow." Three times each week, our foreign affairs department selects tape-recorded material from Radio Moscow's English shortwave broadcasts and adds its own explanatory commentary in a 15-minute program that has attracted wide attention. The program

has two purposes: to expose Communist propaganda techniques, and thereby counteract the distortions of truth that play so clever a part in these Soviet broadcasts; and to present legitimate counter-propaganda based on the American ideology of freedom in speech, enterprise, and belief.

We are pleased to acknowledge the frequent cooperation of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberation in keeping us supplied with information on their own activities, and occasionally with material for our own broadcast use. The foreign affairs editor here at WBT, Mr. Rupert Gillett, has had 40 years of experience as a newspaper editor on some of the Nation's leading dailies, and much of our success is due to his wide background and keen analytical mind.

WBT's "Radio Moscow" is currently being broadcast by other stations in Little Rock, Shreveport, Evansville, Hartford, Rochester, and Chapel Hill. We now feel seasoned enough to begin a campaign of expansion. In our travels and your contacts, it would be of immeasurable help if you were sufficiently interested to mention the availability and unique character of this program to other broadcast media, or to patriotic citizens who might initiate inquiries as to its being broadcast in their own areas. Any more detailed information will be supplied on request. I have no favor to ask, other than this help in making known the existence of an available means of informing the public as to Communist propaganda techniques and motives in the world today. As a fit postscript, I will include two quotations that are worth your reading time:

Nikita Khrushchev: "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

Charles H. Malik, President of the General Assembly of the U.N.: "I submit the following irreducible facts: That for 42 years, communism has never been pushed back nor dislodged one inch from where it gained political power; it monolithically controls about one-third of mankind today; it has penetrated in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds, so that the field of struggle with communism is actually in these two-thirds rather than in the realm of communism itself; its basic objective of communizing the world, and destroying the values of freedom is absolutely unchanged. * * * When one fully grasps these facts, one is bound to conclude that the free world has not yet demonstrated that the Communist onslaught is not irresistible, and that communism is not after all the irreversible wave of the future * * * this is not the age of war in the classical sense, but of infiltration and indirect aggression; of espionage and counter-espionage; of the softening up of the will and the resolve; or the undermining of character and morale; of slander and character assassination; of bribery and demoralization; of the manipulation of the press and radio in the most vicious manner * * * in short, this is the age of the cold war, and those who keep on talking about aggression and territorial integrity and political independence, as though these were the real worries, are either naive or hypocrites or not living in this age. * * * Western civilization today is beleaguered. It is called upon to justify itself. Its fundamental values are not only denied and opposed by international communism and questioned by the awakened old cultures of Asia and Africa, but within its own ranks, skepticism and unbelief are working havoc. So far as the Western world is concerned, the deepest thing at stake is its faith in its values and its ability to justify and defend them."

I salute this magnificent effort. I urge any of you who will to ask your local radio stations to get into the program.

I am sure WBT will be glad to be of help. For the people of my district, which WBT serves, and for the people of my Nation, I thank this station, and those responsible, for these programs. I am gratified to hear they will be continued and expanded.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SANITARY SEWER, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday of next week it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia or any member thereof to consider as under District of Columbia Day, one bill, H.R. 12063, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport to the District of Columbia system.

This has been cleared with the ranking member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the minority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 102 I am listed as not voting. I did not vote due to an emergency situation which called me out of the Chamber. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF JAMES N. KEEFE AS LEADER OF MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to congratulate Jim Keefe on his 25th anniversary as a leader of the Massachusetts Highway Users Conference.

We, in his home city of Lawrence, Mass., remember him as one of the pioneers in working for harmony on the highways, back in the days of dirt roads, traffic signs or lights, when every driver was a rugged and somewhat reckless individualist. With their goggles and their dusters and their unpredictable

steering skills they scared every horse that they met along the way.

With his faith in this new mode of transportation, Jim Keefe knew that it would revolutionize the appearance of city and countryside, become an indispensable ally of industry and commerce, and alter the habits and customs of every living American. He foresaw the rapid improvement that would come in the design and mechanical efficiency of automobiles, but he was not so sure that the human beings at the controls would measure up to their responsibilities. He knew they would need help, and it was here that he came to their assistance.

Jim Keefe formed the first automobile club in our community; a group effort to help in such emergencies as engine failure or flat tires, to provide maps giving route directions and accommodations for motorists who otherwise might stray off course, and encouraging them to observe the rules of safe driving. The motorists showed their appreciation of his devotion to their welfare by promoting him through the AAA of the Merrimack Valley to State and regional recognition, and finally to membership in the board of governors of the National Highway Users Conference.

Jim Keefe had the vision to see that better cars, better roads, and better drivers must work together in promoting economic progress and the pursuit of happiness. He deserves our heartfelt thanks for his work of a lifetime in advancing the cause of highway convenience and safety.

DIVIDEND RECEIVED CREDIT AND EXCLUSION

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, double taxation of dividends by the Federal Government results from the tax imposed on corporate incomes plus the subsequent tax on the share owners when they receive dividends paid out of these same corporate incomes. This double taxation in the opinion of many is one of the most glaring inequities in our Federal tax policy and until the 1954 Internal Revenue Code granted share owners a small measure of relief, through the dividend received credit and exclusion, all dividends to individuals were taxed at least twice.

The dividend received credit and exclusion have undoubtedly been among the incentives which have encouraged the low and middle income groups to invest their modest savings in America's business. One can readily realize the impact of these tax relief measures by noting that the number of share owners in this country has increased from 6,500,000 in 1952 to about 12,500,000 today—"Share Ownership in America, 1959," New York Stock Exchange, page 6.

Who are these share owners? Certainly not the wealthy, for the median income of this group as reported in 1959 was \$7,000 per year—"Share Ownership in America, 1959," New York Stock Exchange, page 3—including dividends. With progressive taxation limiting the available investment capital of the higher income groups, business has had to rely more and more on the ever-increasing number of small investors for its equity capital, and this will in all probability hold true for the future.

Other relevant facts are available from a look at the share owners of one of our large corporations, namely the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. During 1959 nearly half of that company's 1,750,000 share owners received annual dividends of less than \$100—according to a letter, April 6, 1960, by A. L. Stott to Colin F. Stam, chief of staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—the maximum allowable exclusion. In addition, some 400,000 of A.T. & T. Co.'s share owners are over age 65 and many are dependent on their modest dividend income to supplement their pensions and social security. It is perfectly clear from these facts that the dividend credit and exclusion primarily benefit the small investor—the investor who can least afford double taxation.

A healthy financial atmosphere is necessary to keep the country economically strong, an atmosphere in which the investor, and particularly the small potential investor, will feel free to invest in our traditional free enterprise system. To do this, business must be able to return to the investor a fair dividend—a dividend that will not be unjustly taxed a second time. If we are to forestall the eroding economic effects of high taxes, inflation, and the like, we must provide added incentives for investment in America's privately owned industries.

Taxation is recognized by everyone as a necessity and with the tendency for the structure and programs of the Federal Government to become more extensive in filling the needs and desires of the citizens, the outlook is for increased taxes in the future. A fair distribution of this tax burden is an immediate need, not just a goal for some future date.

The dividend received credit and exclusion as presently provided by law are only a beginning toward correcting the discriminatory condition of double taxation of dividends. In the interest of tax equity and to promote continued economic growth of this country, double taxation of dividends should be completely eliminated. Toward this end the dividend credit and exclusion provisions should be expanded whenever the financial condition of the country is such that it can be done.

This discussion is entirely apart from another basic reason for avoiding double taxation of dividends. This other basic reason is that corporations should be financing their growth to a larger extent from new equity issues rather than retained earnings or debt financing which they have been doing in the past. Debt financing, of course, escapes the 52 percent corporate income tax and

retained earnings escapes the higher bracket individual income tax payment and has as a minimum a zero percent rate and as a maximum 25 percent capital gain rate. For many economic reasons, it is important that the American corporations have a strong base in equity investment and this equity investment should be widespread. This results from offering new equity stock from time to time to finance growth rather than through the device of retained earnings which generally keeps the existing stockholder group. Furthermore, the low income tax bracket stockholder generally needs the annual earnings from his equity investment for his personal budget. It is the higher income tax bracket stockholder who benefits, indeed, encourages the retention of earnings by the corporation because these earnings are taxed at the lower capital gains rates, if indeed they are ever taxed.

EAST FRONT EXTENSION PROJECT

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 26, 1960, may certainly be considered one of the most historic in the illustrious story of the U.S. Capitol Building. On that day, as the Speaker has already noted, the first of the new massive marble columns will be set in place on the east front. I hope all of you will find it convenient to be present tomorrow morning when a brief ceremony will be held noting this significant event. These new columns will replace the original sandstone shafts which came from the Aquia Creek quarry in Virginia, the first of which was set in place on May 19, 1824, according to the National Intelligencer, the newspaper of the day. That was sixscore, 16 years, and 6 days ago.

I think it would be worthwhile and in the public interest to pause and to take stock of the east front extension project, and review briefly the events which have led to this important occasion.

These are the members or former members of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol who have contributed to the development and success of this program for the extension and renovating of the Capitol Building of the United States of America:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States.

Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, minority floor leader of the House.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, minority floor leader of the Senate.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., former member of the Commission.

Hon. William F. Knowland, former member of the Commission.

Hon. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol.

But of all the men closely associated with every phase of the extension project, none deserves more unqualified appreciation from the Congress and the American people than the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

This work has been close to the Speaker's heart. Its completion will reflect great credit on Mr. RAYBURN as an individual, and the office he occupies. Acting within the prescribed orbit of his office and the normal train of our constitutional legislative process, Mr. RAYBURN has done his utmost to assure that the great traditions in architecture left to us by the founders of the Republic have been carried on. Under his leadership the preservation of the work of the three early Architects of the Capitol, Thornton, Latrobe, and Bulfinch, has been brought about. He has fulfilled the dream of Architect Walter, the designer of the Senate and House wings, the present dome, and the originator of the present east front extension.

Through his works and leadership in this regard the Honorable Speaker of the House has stimulated pride in the dignity of our architectural heritage and encouraged that elevation of thought and character which comes from great architecture.

No proper consideration of the east front extension could be made without calling attention to the work being carried on with such extraordinary diligence by the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable J. George Stewart. A former Member of Congress, an engineer, and a builder. Mr. Stewart came to the Capitol well qualified for this demanding task.

For more than a hundred years, plans for the east front extension lay dormant. The distinguished Architect of the Capitol, Thomas U. Walter, first prepared plans for the extension, and officially pleaded in 1863 for the project to be undertaken. Indeed, every succeeding Architect of the Capitol has urged that the work be done. It was merely a matter of the economics of the moment rather than a departure from perceptive design that prevented the work from being started under Mr. Walter and those who succeeded him.

We were fortunate to have been living during the time when the extension began and to have had an intimate and important part in the progress of this long-sought and needed improvement.

The Congress and the Nation are fortunate in having as Architect of the Capitol during this historic period in the building of the Capitol, a person with the particular ability of Mr. Stewart. He will keep the architectural historians busy in setting down the record of his work, and will go down in history as a truly great, if not the greatest, Architect of the Capitol. The monument to his ingenuity and imagination will be the most meaningful and beautiful Capitol building in the world.

Mr. Stewart has been a strong believer in the necessity of carrying forward this great work in an expeditious, yet orderly and systematic manner, and I am confident that in so doing he will merit the

thanks and approbation of future generations who will come here to view the handiwork we, with him, have assisted in bringing into being.

The execution of so vast a project has required remarkable vision and perception. It has also required a complete devotion to duty and boundless patience to withstand the rebuffs and misrepresentations of motives which are an inherent part of any such undertaking. I am certain, however, the Architect will agree that it has been worth the sacrifice.

As for myself, it is well known that at the outset of the project, because of my interest in history and therefore being a sort of a traditionalist, I was opposed to any sort of alteration of this building. I even sponsored a bill which would prevent the proposed extension and my position in this regard is a matter of record.

Then, because of my abiding interest in the building and its historical significance, I made some rather thorough research and an exhaustive investigation of the structure and its history. I discovered that the extension was planned as far back as the 1860's. The more I looked into the proposed changes, and observed the advanced deterioration of the old stone, the more I became convinced that instead of opposing the project I should actually support it.

Accordingly, I appeared before the House and announced that I had reconsidered the matter, and explained why I had changed my position.

It seems obvious to me that any thinking person who has taken the time to investigate for himself, and become thoroughly familiar with the facts in the case, will reach the conclusions I did on the matter of the east front extension program.

The need for the extension has been discussed widely by the Congress and in the press. I need only mention here the three main reasons for the work.

First, to bring to an immediate end the deterioration of the old sandstone walls.

Second, to correct the architectural defect of the overhang of the dome.

Third, to provide approximately 65 much-needed additional offices and committee rooms, 2 reception rooms, improved restaurant accommodations, and storage and service facilities for the Congress.

The work on the east front officially began with the erection of the scaffolding. The removal of the portico and steps followed soon thereafter.

Since then the work to extend the east front 32½ feet has progressed without interruption, and the exterior work will be completed, I am assured, by the first of October 1960.

The Architect reports that the inaugural stands will get under construction in mid-September. The main lobby and the entrance corridor will also be complete by the time of the inauguration of the next President of the United States. The interior and final construction will be finished in September 1961.

Today most of the exterior marble has been set, the principal steps are being returned to their accustomed place, and

the beautiful sculpture for the pediment is being faithfully reproduced and is almost ready for lifting onto the tympanum. The Statue of Peace, located to the south of the main door, has been reproduced in Vermont marble and was set in place on May 10. The companion Statue of War is being similarly reproduced and will be erected within the next few weeks.

The beautiful bronze doors, which have recently been put into their place at the new principal entrance of the building, are properly called the Columbus Doors. The panels of these doors depict scenes from the life of that great admiral.

They were designed and modeled in Rome in 1858 by a young American artist, Randolph Rogers, and were cast in Germany in 1860.

These magnificent doors were first located in the arch leading from Statuary Hall to the House of Representatives. They were moved to the principal entrance of the rotunda in 1870, by the Architect of the Capitol, Edward Clark.

It is interesting to note that the removal and preservation of these doors presented something of a problem to the architects and engineers when the present work began. It was not until a small, handwritten book was discovered in the research files of the Architect's Office that the question of the proper methods of removal and maintenance of the doors was resolved.

This little book was written in 1863 by the man who cast the doors for the Senate wing. In 1911 his son realized the similarity in the Senate doors and those executed by Rogers. He presented the book which contained detailed sketches of the inner workings of the doors to the Architect "to be available at future need as someday the costly bronzes in and around the Capitol will receive the expert attention needed to make their beauty effective."

The use of this obscure, but invaluable, document illustrates the care and exactness which has characterized the entire work program of the east front extension.

The prosecution of the work on the extension necessitated exposing a considerable part of the exterior of the foundation walls, most of it for the first time since the structure was built. The exposure of these walls afforded an opportunity to locate the original cornerstone, and it was considered desirable to do so. Records of the nature and location of the stone were vague, but it was generally believed to have been placed in the southeast corner of the old Senate wing.

It should be made quite clear, however, that the southeast portion of the original north wing as constructed, did not consist of a single corner. It has been found that there were three locations which could be considered to be the southeast corner. One is where the main east wall returns to the west, a second is where the setback position of the east wall meets the south wall of this wing as built, and a third is the southeast corner of the foundation of the original steps. The foundation of the

steps was found to have been built integral with the setback wall and the return to the north.

Extensive excavations were carried on at all of the three locations using the most advanced methods at the disposal of the Government, yet no stone matching the one described in the early records was discovered. It may be assumed, therefore, that work carried on subsequent to the original construction made it necessary to remove or relocate the stone.

One of the most complex and important areas of construction is the work being carried forth on the dome, and much comment has appeared concerning the brilliant red color which now adorns the structure. One irreverent wag felt emboldened to say that it look like "the world's largest Howard Johnson's." I am happy to report that this color will soon be covered by the final coat of white, and once again at night, batteries of searchlights will trace the building's glowing dome on the vault of the sky; and by day, sunlight and drifting clouds will make picture-postcard scenes of the silhouette that symbolized American freedom, liberty, and greatness around the country and around the world.

From 1829, when the central section of the Capitol was completed, the U.S. Capitol was surmounted by a low wooden dome. This wooden dome was replaced by the present cast iron dome during the period 1856 to 1865.

The base of the dome as it now exists is many feet wider than the drum which originally supported the old dome and which is now the foundation upon which it rests. Upon this drum a very ingenious scheme of iron supports and brackets of sufficient projection to carry the base of the dome is placed, so that, though its inner wall appears to be supported directly on the existing masonry, the entire colonnade of the dome, with its bases and cornices, is in fact suspended and overhangs its real support. The dome, therefore, pretends to be supported directly from the ground, which is not the case, and seems to be of masonry, while it is really of iron. The seams of all this iron work are constantly parting, owing to expansion and contraction. The aggregate weight of material used in the construction of the dome is 8,909,200 pounds.

The immensity and strength of the dome is the amazement and admiration of all visitors. Above the outer colonnade, and resting directly over and bearing upon the strong foundations, 36 immense ribs of iron ascend, of a semi-ellipsoidal shape. These are the skeleton of the huge creation. Hundreds upon hundreds of iron panels, with clamps and bolts innumerable, riveted into one circuit of architectural symmetry around these metal ribs, constitute the dome.

The influence of the sun upon this vast iron structure is great. The sun causes the dome to oscillate a distance of between 3 and 4 inches daily. The motion is south, southwest, then west, and as the retiring sun declines and finally disappears, north, northeast, and east, returning to its original position.

Ever since its construction and completion in 1865, the present cast iron dome has been painted for purposes of preservation and to cause it to simulate a masonry dome and to harmonize with the House and Senate wings which are constructed of marble. It was painted every 4 years and at the time the present renovations were commenced in 1959, it is estimated that it had on it about 32 coats of paint.

As a part of the extension of the Capitol project, this dome has been subjected to a thorough, intensive inspection and necessary repairs and replacements have been made. In order to make this inspection and effect these repairs, it was necessary to erect a huge scaffold about the exterior of the dome. It was also necessary to erect scaffolding within the rotunda in order to inspect, clean and do minor restoration work on the large fresco painting in the canopy of the dome. The painting was found in generally good condition and the necessary cleaning and restoration work has been done. All scaffolding was removed from the rotunda upon completion of this portion of the work.

The scaffolding used on the exterior of the dome consisted of exterior pipe and tube scaffolding, with a vertical tower, support towers, rampways at various levels, lower ramp, guys and hoisting equipment.

The principal repairs and replacements accomplished have included:

The rib covers at quadrant points of the dome have been removed and inspected, and necessary repairs made, and the rib covers reinstalled.

The interior bracing of the Statue of Freedom, which is located atop the dome, has been repaired and strengthened.

Corroded and cracked metal, including butt straps, has been repaired and replaced where necessary.

Existing bolts have been tightened, and short and defective bolts have been removed and replaced, and missing bolts supplied.

Brackets, skin plates, and angle loop at the top of the cupola have been reinforced.

A portion of the exterior plates at the main tholus columns have been replaced.

New tholus framing and ceiling and 12 bronze windows have been provided.

The top flange of skirt needle beams have been braced, using tie rods and angle struts; skirt needle beams and bracing at the top of skirt frames have been strengthened. This work included temporary underpinning and replacement of masonry at skirt needle beams, as necessary.

Masonry bearing plates were removed, and self-lubricating expansion plates were provided.

The deck plates at boiler plate level, the exterior platform at the peristyle level, and the trough and gutter section at the peristyle level were removed, repaired, and reset.

Temporary protective covering and steel cable and chain link fabric construction over metal and wood covering for the top surface of the canopy of the rotunda were provided.

Leaders and gutters of the drainage system at the cupola, peristyle, boiler plate, and roof levels of the dome were repaired and replaced where necessary.

The sheetmetal cover over the top surface of the canopy of the rotunda was removed, inspected, and reinstalled.

The glass at the cupola windows was replaced, and the second tier and peristyle windows were reglazed where necessary.

Stainless steel screening was installed at the trough of the peristyle platform at the backside of the lower skirt of the dome and along the inner edge of the boiler plate balustrade.

Repairs were made at the boiler plate level, including the installation of sheet metal flashing and stainless steel moldings and sills at the base of the drum; cable ties, boxes, and tensioning devices were added at the boiler plate girder, with necessary modifications in the panels of the drum and access doors.

The balustrade at the boiler plate level is being repaired, and expansion joints are being provided in the top rail.

The outside cornice at the base of the boilerplate balustrade is also being repaired.

The rib bolts at the boilerplate level are being removed and replaced.

Structural and other repairs have been made to ornamentations and connections, including those at the peristyle beams, the grape cluster ornamentations, the Statue of Freedom, the stylobate, the medallions, the acorn ornamentations, the cornice above the second tier windows, the ornamental pilasters at the spring of the cupola. Additional fastenings have been provided at the rib covers. Defects in castings and ornamentations have been repaired.

Additional leaders and gutters, down drains at the peristyle level, canopy leaders and gutters, and gutter strainers are being provided.

The 32 coats of paint have been sand-blasted off the dome and the metal surfaces have been cleaned of rust and other foreign materials. A dark treatment of paint has been applied to the raw metal after the metal was cleaned by the sand-blasting method. A primer red lead coat was next applied. Upon the red lead coat an intermediate coat of buff-colored paint is being applied. A final coat of oyster white paint will be applied, causing the appearance of the dome to harmonize with the new marble extended east front of the Capitol and the cleaned Senate and House marble wings.

In making the repairs and replacements to the dome structure, stainless steel has been used wherever critical structural elements were involved. In secondary locations, special alloyed steels, incorporating highly corrosion resistant elements, have been used.

An electronic bird control system is to be installed and the work is expected to be undertaken shortly. Additional lightning protection will also be provided.

So, as the first of the new columns is set in place, we are grateful for the courageous beginnings of the new Republic which were represented by the original stones, and for the growth and national prosperity represented by the

new ones. May it be our earnest hope and prayer that this Capitol Building will continue to symbolize this Nation's unending purpose to maintain its leadership on the road to world peace, with justice for all people.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, almost before the last echoes of the battlefields of World War II had faded away, we were faced with the stark reality of another even more evil menace to the free world than that which we had fought so hard to destroy. As early as 1947 the Communists' objective of worldwide domination—and their willingness to use any means to accomplish this objective—had become obvious.

In response to the Communist threat we elected to assist in maintaining the freedom of all countries in the world who had the will to remain free. In fact, this became a basic facet of our foreign policy. This choice was based upon the realization that in the struggle against international communism we need allies, and these allies need us. We realized that only through concerted mutual effort could the free world adequately meet the threat of Communist aggression without individual national efforts of a magnitude that would in the end wreck national economies and eventually hasten the accomplishment of the objectives of the Communist offensive. The success of this concept depended in great measure upon the political, military and economic strength of our allies. In turn, the strength of our allies relied to a large degree upon the economic and military assistance which we could provide. Thus we embarked upon a course of providing this assistance.

The alternative to this course of action would have been a return to isolationism. This was impossible, not only because of the demands of our own national security, but to the mantle of leadership of the free world which was cast upon us at the close of World War II. The probable results had we chosen this alternative would have been disastrous. Had we abrogated our responsibility to the free world and failed to provide the necessary assistance to our less fortunate allies and friends:

Italy and Greece would most probably be Communist today;

The Turkish Straits would likely be controlled by the Soviet Union;

Iran would certainly be a Soviet satellite and the Russians would have established themselves on the Persian Gulf with control over the oilfields of the Middle East;

All of Indochina including Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos would be Communist;

India, Burma, Thailand, and a large portion of Africa would have fallen under

the Communist domination. Berlin would long since have been buried behind the Iron Curtain; and

The lot of the European countries is questionable, but certainly we would not have the vital military bases which we now have in Western Europe, the Middle East, and northern Africa.

Had all these conditions come to pass—and without our economic and military assistance they undoubtedly would have—we would find ourselves on the defensive within our own shores.

Today, the Communist objectives remain unchanged. In fact, the threat to the free world posed by militant communism is if anything far greater than ever before. While our assistance has been highly successful in establishing a strong deterrent to Communist expansion, the day has by no means arrived when we can relax our efforts. Much has been accomplished, but there is much more to be done. We have no alternative, if we are to preserve the free world and in turn our own way of life, but to continue our efforts in military and economic assistance.

The mutual security program as proposed by the President for fiscal year 1961 represents a very modest continuation of our assistance to the rest of the free world. By comparison with the results it will achieve, both psychologically and materially, throughout the free world it is a most economical use of our national resources. We must by all means support this program and the objectives toward which it is directed as an indication of our determination to continue our opposition to Communist expansion.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM VIGILANCE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority members of the Special Select Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program, I state that we were deeply shocked and disturbed over the revelations of fraud, purposeful misrepresentations, falsification of reports and duplication of payments by State employees relating to the Skelly Bypass Highway construction program in Tulsa, Okla.

Even more shocking is the fact that Oklahoma State Highway Commission employees, who had admittedly perpetrated these outrageous frauds and misrepresentations, have not been discharged.

To the contrary, the evidence showed that these people had been promoted, both in salary and responsibility, and were blanketed under a State merit system. Although, admittedly, the present Governor of Oklahoma and the prosecutor of Tulsa County had had evidence of this wrongdoing since September 1959, they had failed and had refused to give this evidence to the Bureau of Public Roads so that the Bureau could protect

the interests of the American taxpayer. Nonetheless, both the prosecutor and the Governor have indicated they are highly critical of the Bureau of Public Roads for not acting on evidence which it did not have and which had been withheld purposefully, which was testified to and admitted to by State employees.

In the face of the undisputed evidence, I cannot in good conscience, representing the taxpayers of the Federal Government, remain silent, or see main issues obscured, or succumb to attempts at soft-pedaling necessary corrective action.

I quote, in part, an obviously misguided and uninformed editorial appearing in the Saturday, May 7, 1960, issue of the Tulsa World, its concluding paragraph:

We seriously doubt, however, that Oklahoma really owes the Federal Bureau [of Roads] a red penny. Rather, the Bureau owes itself a search of its own conscience and policies. There should be no pious shunting of the blame to the State when the Federal Bureau fixes the rules on road building and is vested with the responsibility for seeing that they are carried out.

So that the main issues are not obscured, that the Federal and State areas of responsibility are understood and that there is record of remedial action to protect the taxpayer and to remove any possible doubt on the overall integrity of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal-aid highway program, I submit for the RECORD a letter I dispatched to the Honorable Bertram D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Roads, requesting certain actions and information; a letter I wrote, as second ranking minority member, to the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman, Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program; the reply received from Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of Public Roads; a copy of an additional letter dispatched by Mr. Armstrong to Mr. Roy J. Turner, chairman, State Highway Commission, State of Oklahoma; and instructional memorandum 21-8-60, issued by the Bureau of Public Roads on the subject: "Federal Law Pertaining to Factual Records and Tests of Materials on Construction of Federal-Aid Highway Projects." Additionally, I submit a copy of the May 5, 1960, telegram referred to, and instructional memorandum 20-5-60, issued by the Bureau of Public Roads, which also involves the Federal-aid highway program on the subject: "Inspection of Construction Projects."

I believe these actions should be a matter of record so that Members of Congress and the people of this country can be reassured of the determination of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the minority members of the special subcommittee that future Federal-aid road construction will be free from fraud as uncovered in Oklahoma and from the continued employment of persons who were a party or may be a party to such fraud.

This action should serve as a deterrent against future fraud. As well, it assures that the American taxpayer will be protected in the specific Oklahoma case with

adequate restitution and the firing of employees admittedly involved in the perpetration of this fraud.

There are some who oppose the action taken in the Oklahoma case to protect the taxpayer. Suffice it to say, their arguments are based on quicksand, in my opinion, for to oppose this action, they have to argue that the present law which requires the Bureau to seek restitution and the firing of known fraud perpetrators should be flaunted on the spurious grounds that to live up to the law in this instance might discourage other States from bringing such fraud into the open.

I do not subscribe to this "let's wink at the law in this case" argument for to do so would have the effect of causing others to think they, too, might be "winked at" in the future.

Congress wrote the law and it is the duty of every Congressman to see that it is lived up to, and in doing so serve notice that all future lawless actions will be as rigorously opposed.

In restitution cases, such as that involving Oklahoma, it is the duty of the State as a party to the contract to sue to recover from the contractors, and the Federal demand for restitution from the State assures this action. Failure by the Federal Government to make such a demand for restitution would be a violation of the laws Congress has passed.

The documents referred to are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

Re investigations into Skelly Bypass, Tulsa, Okla.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the
Federal-Aid Highway Program, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing herewith copy of letter addressed to the Honorable Bertram D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, advising him of my intention to request that the records of Mr. James Curry be made available to the Bureau in connection with its negotiations with the State of Oklahoma relative to the above matter.

This evidence was accepted by the committee for the purpose of establishing an estimate of the fraud involved and, being testimony of an expert nature, certainly this information should be made available to the Bureau in substantiating its request for restitution from the State of Oklahoma.

I am confident that you concur in this request and I am asking that I be advised as to the disposition of it.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

Enclosure
WCC:jdm

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

Re Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program Investigations Into Skelly Bypass, Tulsa, Okla.

The Honorable BERTRAM D. TALLAMY,
Federal Highway Administrator,
Bureau of Public Roads,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALLAMY: As I expressed at the conclusion of the hearings regarding the above matter, I was deeply shocked and dis-

turbed over the revelations of the fraud, purposeful misrepresentations, falsification of reports and duplication of payments, by State employees, nearly all of whom remain on the payrolls and have received promotions and/or increases in salary. I was amazed at the testimony by these employees that in some instances they had purposely withheld information of wrongdoing from the Bureau of Public Roads and, further, that public officials in Oklahoma had likewise, after learning of this information, failed to inform the Bureau in timely fashion in order to protect the 90 percent Federal contribution interest in this interstate project.

The evidence is in and is undisputed as to these facts and, as the acting ranking minority member of the Special Subcommittee, I am sure you realize I had a continuing interest in making certain that the actions taken by the Bureau in this matter are carried out toward the end that this Federal 90 percent interest is fully protected. I commend you again for your action on April 26th in advising Mr. Roy J. Turner, Chairman of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission, that his commission is required to make restitution for any erroneous or improper claim made by the State against the Federal government resulting from fraudulent practices on the part of such State employees and any deficiencies in the specifications on the jobs numbered 8, 10 and 20. Mr. James Curry, who was qualified as a competent witness and who had made a thorough investigation of the present conditions of these three sections of the Skelly Bypass, estimated that an overpayment of \$524,698.15 on this \$3.3 million phase of the Skelly Bypass project had been made. You advised the committee that negotiations would be started to acquire restitution to the Federal government by the State in the near future, this being consistent with my position during the hearings that the Bureau has a duty to require such restitution under the law.

In order to facilitate this action, I am requesting the chairman of the special subcommittee to make available to you the testimony and records of Mr. Curry to be considered in your negotiations with Oklahoma State officials. I would appreciate it if you would keep me advised as to the progress of these negotiations and the final restitution made because of my continuing interest on behalf of the Federal taxpayers. I also think that proper restitution in this instance would have a salutary effect on all other road bureau administrations and would perhaps result in the tightening up of their own procedures in an effort to detect any falsification of records in the future.

Likewise, I am requesting that you keep me advised as to whether your demand addressed to Mr. Turner on May 5 advising him that these employees who perpetrated these frauds "are not acceptable to the Bureau of Public Roads as representatives of the State highway department in any employment capacity in connection with Federal aid highway projects," and further requesting that all such persons "be immediately removed from all activities in connection with all Federal-aid highway projects," and that "vouchers will not be approved for payment of Federal funds for * * * any project in connection with which any such persons are employed" in the future.

I trust this will have the desirable effect of removing these employees from the payroll, which should have been done upon their discovery. It is unconscionable to me that the Federal taxpayer should have to assume the risk of their continued employment by the Oklahoma State Highway Department when it involves confessed fraudulent State record manipulators. I would like to be kept advised as to whether the State action complies with your request. As I

interpret the Highway Act, it is mandatory on the Bureau to take such action, and rightly so.

Further, it is my suggestion that a memorandum be prepared for the information of all State road departments as to the Federal authority under the law in cases of this nature and of the action taken in this instance so that all departments will be on notice, and this possibly will act as a deterrent against similar occurrences happening in the future.

This letter is written consistent with my duty as a Member of Congress, as I see it, to see that for any funds improperly requisitioned by the State, restitution shall be made and, further, that undesirable State employees, where Federal projects are involved, be fired. Only in this manner can the public be assured of honest administration of this \$40 billion interstate highway program and of a dollar's worth of value for every Federal dollar spent.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1960.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your letter of May 9, 1960, to Mr. Tallamy, concerning the recent hearings held by the special subcommittee on the Federal aid highway program with respect to the Skelly bypass at Tulsa, Okla.

As stated at the hearings, we fully share your indignation at the testimony which was given by certain employees of the Oklahoma State Highway Department and others.

We sincerely appreciate your request that the chairman of the special subcommittee make available to the Bureau the testimony and records of Mr. James Curry. This information will be helpful in our further review of the matter and our discussions with the Oklahoma officials relative to the restitution of Federal funds. Governor Edmondson has requested that we defer any assessment against the State until after the appropriate Oklahoma officials have had an opportunity to confer with us. The Governor has been advised that we will most certainly arrange such a conference before making a final determination as to the amount and nature of such restitution.

You are familiar with the telegram sent by the Administrator on May 5 to the Oklahoma State Highway Department in connection with the employment of Messrs. Avery and Johnson. I'm sure you will be interested also in a letter I sent to Mr. Roy J. Turner, chairman of the State highway commission, on May 18. A copy is enclosed.

With respect to your suggestion that a memorandum be prepared for the information of the State road departments as to the Federal authority under the law, I am enclosing a copy of an instructional memorandum issued May 5, 1960. I believe that posting this section of the law on all Federal-aid projects will be an effective means of advising all persons involved of the possible consequences of improper action.

The several steps which the Bureau of Public Roads has taken to protect the Federal interest have been made known to the States, both by memorandums and in discussion at a recent meeting of State highway officials. It will be of interest to you, I'm sure, that the American Association of State Highway Officials has named a special committee to review existing State controls in such matters and to recommend any additional safeguards which may be necessary. We are holding an all-day meeting with this committee the first of next week.

I will be glad to keep you advised of the progress of our negotiations with the State

of Oklahoma concerning restitution and as to the State's compliance with our request that certain individuals be removed from Federal-aid projects. It is indeed deplorable that events such as those disclosed at the hearings could have occurred, but I am hopeful that their revelation and the actions which we have taken will go far toward preventing a recurrence of this type of improper activity.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

MAY 13, 1960.

Mr. ROY J. TURNER,
Chairman, State Highway Commission,
Capitol Office Building,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

DEAR MR. TURNER: Further reference is made to Mr. Tallamy's letter of April 26 and subsequent telegraphic exchanges concerning the Skelly Bypass project in Tulsa. We earnestly wish to assist in the continuation of all Federal-aid work in Oklahoma which is being advanced in accord with the governing project requirements, but because of disclosures at the House Public Works special subcommittee hearing involving a number of employees and contractors of the Oklahoma Department of Highways, it was considered necessary to take action of the kind transmitted to you by telegram of May 5. We understand from newspaper reports that you are undertaking an analysis of the hearing transcript to determine what action you feel should be taken by you in connection with these individuals and firms to protect the State's interests, which generally are the same as our own in these matters. We do not wish to determine in advance of your own review what action should properly be taken with respect to several of the present employees referred to in the hearing, other than those named below where action seems clearly to be indicated.

At the hearing there was a definite admission or showing of improper actions on the part of Messrs. J. F. Avery and Joe R. Johnson, employees, and the D & G Construction Co. and Progress Construction Co., contractors. As indicated in our telegram, therefore, we have made the determination that we will make no payment of Federal-aid funds for projects on work done after the May 5 wire for which any of these individuals or firms may have any measure of responsibility. For all other employees who are still employed by the Oklahoma Department of Highways and who were also on the Skelly Bypass projects we are suspending further progress payments without prejudice to a final action yet to be determined. I should therefore appreciate your furnishing such names to our division engineer in Oklahoma as soon as the list can be compiled, together with present Federal-aid project locations of the listed employees, if they are assigned to such work, or a statement that they are not assigned at present on any Federal-aid highway project in such instances as this may be the case.

We also propose to you that we jointly reexamine the payments made and computations of quantities and quality of materials on these referent projects, using the data already developed but augmented as may be found desirable. Such reexamination would form the basis of our determination of what disallowances we should make on account of these projects and how these should be paid. If this is agreeable to you, please so advise, and further arrangements can then be made concerning details of how this is to be carried forward.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.
Instructional memorandum 21-8-60.

Subject: Federal law pertaining to factual records and tests of materials on construction of Federal-aid highway projects.

As pointed out in my circular memorandum of June 29, 1959, the providing of high quality and durable construction in conformance with approved plans and specifications requires that everyone in the engineer-contractor-worker team do their tasks carefully and thoroughly.

An instance has come to our attention which to a certain degree will reflect unfavorably on the efforts of many thousands of men and women working in the State highway departments and for the contractors and materials men dedicated to the building of a fine highway system for our States and Nation. A few, through lack of knowledge and by willful acts, have falsified certain samples of materials and records of tests and work accomplished. They have conspired to deliberately keep any such information from either the higher State officials or the Bureau of Public Roads.

In order to prevent any misunderstanding regarding the seriousness of these and similar acts the following notice shall be posted on each Federal-aid highway project in one or more places where it is readily available to all personnel concerned with the project:

"NOTICE TO ALL PERSONNEL ENGAGED ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS

"Title 18, United States Code, section 1020, reads as follows:

"Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project submitted for approval to the Secretary of Commerce; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of any work performed or to be performed, or materials furnished or to be furnished, in connection with the construction of any highway or related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or false representation as to a material fact in any statement, certificate, or report submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented,

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

A supply of printed posters will be furnished as soon as they are available. In the meantime, the notices should be typewritten and posted by the State highway departments.

The provisions of this instructional memorandum are applicable upon receipt of the memorandum and apply to all Federal-aid projects.

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

MAY 5, 1960.

ROY J. TURNER,
Chairman, State Highway Commission,
State Highway Department, Oklahoma
City, Okla.:

At hearings this week before the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway

Program, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, several present Oklahoma State Highway Department employees have admitted under oath that they prepared false test reports, or prepared or secured spurious samples for submission, or submitted such samples, to the State central testing laboratory, or made other false statements, entries, or reports relative to tests or test samples in connection with Federal-aid highway projects, and did not give information thereof to any State highway department officials superior to the State resident engineer on such projects or to any representative of the Bureau of Public Roads prior to the recent investigations conducted in Oklahoma. Such persons are not acceptable to the Bureau of Public Roads as representatives of the State highway department in any employment capacity in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. It is requested that all such persons be immediately removed from all activities in connection with all Federal-aid highway projects. Vouchers will not be approved for payment of Federal funds for materials supplied or work performed after this date on account of any project in connection with which any such persons are employed after this date. Also, payment of Federal funds will be withheld on current projects, in connection with which such persons have been employed prior to this date, pending a complete examination of such projects.

B. D. TALLAMY,
Federal Highway Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1960.

Instructional memorandum 20-5-60.

Subject: Inspection of construction projects—Supplements policy and procedure memorandum 20-6, dated May 21, 1956.

The Bureau's continuous reviews of its policies and procedures which are established to attain high quality results on every project in the Federal-aid highway program, indicate that still further attention should be given to the matter of testing the quantity and quality of materials incorporated into such projects. Three revisions of current procedures are therefore being instituted with the issuance of this memorandum.

1. In addition to the presently prescribed responsibility of the division engineer or his representative to inspect the material test reports during his visits to projects, he shall hereafter report for the Bureau's permanent project records the findings from such reviews and any actions taken regarding the materials and workmanship being incorporated into the job. Furthermore, in addition to his present responsibility of observing the methods by which these materials are being incorporated into the job, should the State at any such inspection not have on file all material test reports and other reports necessary to reflect the quality of workmanship required by the approved plans and specifications, then appropriate steps should be taken to defer payment of progress vouchers on the project until the necessary corrective action has been taken. This procedure shall become effective on the receipt of this memorandum.

2. Thickness or other lineal measurements of some or all materials in place on the project must be made at random points during each Bureau inspection and the results stated in the inspection report. Additionally a sample will occasionally be taken during such construction inspections at random locations chosen by the Bureau inspecting engineer of any of the materials being placed in the project. Such samples shall be taken in accordance with approved standard procedures, appropriately identified, and packaged for delivery to the State central laboratory for check test which shall be reported to the Bureau's division engineer.

This procedure will be instituted with receipt of this memorandum.

3. At the time of the final inspection of each project or prior thereto, record samples of the finished work in place shall be taken for certification purposes on such items as may be selected by the Bureau's division engineer. These shall be obtained at random locations and in sufficient number to be reasonably representative of the completed work. Such record samples shall be taken and tested by highway department central materials laboratory representatives. The Bureau's division engineer shall be notified prior thereto in order that he or his representative may be present during both the sampling and testing. The results of the tests of such record samples shall then be certified to by the duly authorized State representative, as to conformity with the governing plans and specifications and whether the results of the record sample tests are reasonably representative of the materials incorporated in the project as shown by the regular testing and sampling done on the project as work progressed. This certified report of the record samples, together with certification of all other materials used in the work, will accompany the final voucher when submitted for payment, and no final voucher will be paid without a certification showing conformance with the governing plans and specifications. This procedure will be made effective on all projects for which final inspection is made on and after June 1, 1960.

The provisions of this memorandum will be applicable to all Federal-aid projects except those being constructed under the 1954 secondary road plan, for which projects, paragraph No. 3 only will be applicable.

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

ECONOMY AND INCOME

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in these tense and critical times, there may be a tendency to overlook meritorious work which deserves the attention and commendation of the Congress and the public.

I wish to mention particularly Report No. 1561, dated April 29, 1960, on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961, submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and his subcommittee. This report, on page 43, calls attention to the fact—

In last year's report the committee gave particular attention to the need for some positive integration of Defense communications along the lines proposed during testimony on the 1960 budget estimates.

During the intervening year both the Defense Department and the committee have aggressively pursued this important matter, with the result that the committee was able to reduce the operation and maintenance appropriation request by \$84.3 million on the basis that portions of the overlapping military communications systems could be integrated.

The report further stated:

The total investment in defense long-haul facilities is about \$2 billion and the current

annual cost of leased commercial facilities is about \$160 million. Under present planning, the Air Force alone would spend at least \$1 billion on system modernization and expansion between now and 1970. It is most important, therefore, that the planning of the services be modified to take account of the development of the defense communications network so that the entire Defense Establishment may reap the benefits of joint procurement and joint use at the earliest possible date.

On May 12, 1960, the Secretary of Defense issued Directive No. 5105.19, thereby establishing a Defense Communications Agency (DCA) and on the same date by Directive No. 4600.2 established a Defense Communications System (DCS).

I feel confident that the action taken by the committee and by the Secretary of Defense, if properly implemented, will bring most favorable results to our defense effort both as to economies and effectiveness.

This action with respect to communications service points the way to further integration in the many common supply and service activities in which the DOD is now engaged and which utilize some 50 percent or more of the military budget. It will be recalled that I sponsored an amendment to the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958 which gave the Secretary of Defense great authority with respect to the improvement of management in supply and service activities common to more than one military department. Also during the debate on the bill I specifically mentioned that the amendment would permit the Secretary of Defense to bring about necessary integration in such activities as financial management, budgeting, disbursing, accounting, medical and hospital services, transportation—land, sea, and air—intelligence, legal, public relations, recruiting, military, police, training, and liaison activities.

It is certainly gratifying that this step has been taken with regard to communications since many Members of Congress, including myself, have long been of the opinion that the elimination of overlapping and waste in the many supply and service activities in the DOD, where so many billions are annually expended, would provide funds for many essential civilian and military activities of the Government which some people contend we cannot now afford. This confirms the old proverb that "Economy is a great source of income."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again commend the Appropriations Committee and also others for their effective work.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, like so many organizations in our Nation, has

spoken out forcefully and strongly on behalf of legislation to improve the Fair Labor Standards Act. The federation has urged an increase in the minimum wage to at least \$1.25 an hour and extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions of workers now exempted from it.

The federation's members know from their everyday working experience what real poverty is and how devastating its effects are to the individual, the family, the community, and the Nation. They also know the necessary means for coping with economic suffering of hundreds of thousands of families. They consider the proposed improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act to be one of the basic means for ending poverty.

I include in my remarks the text of the federation's resolution on the Fair Labor Standards Act legislation:

RESOLUTION ON MINIMUM WAGE

Adequate purchasing power is a vital stabilizing factor in a free economy. A minimum wage related to fluctuations in the cost of living contributes to a stable economy and enables the wage earner to maintain a reasonable standard of living.

Therefore, the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers advocates:

1. A basic minimum wage of at least \$1.25 per hour.

2. The extension of the principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act to cover retail and service employees; employees of business enterprises engaged wholly in interstate commerce; farmworkers and professional persons unless self-employed.

We urge that the Congress and the several States enact suitable legislation to accomplish these purposes.

EAST GERMAN COLLECTIVIZATION: MODEL FOR CUBAN EXPROPRIATIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year I have made repeated statements, in and out of the Congress, relative to the Caribbean area, which is now a fourth front with the Panama Canal as its key target. In the contest now going on there, Cuba has become a Soviet captive just as the Soviet zone in East Germany. As such, it serves as a beachhead for Communist attacks on other nations of the Western Hemisphere, which are more dangerous than assaults from a landing force.

Unfortunately, the programs of conquest for either Cuba or East Germany have not been adequately presented to the people of the United States by important elements of our mass media. The prime objectives of these programs include abolition of private ownership in finance and industry and forced collectivization of farmers. In both East Germany and Cuba the patterns of confiscation follows the well-known Stalin-

istic pattern of liquidation that was so ruthlessly enforced in the Ukraine.

These sinister developments in East Germany, which are so applicable to Cuba, were recently described by Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, distinguished military editor of *Christian Crusade*, *American Mercury*, and other publications in a highly illuminating article.

In order that General Willoughby's latest contribution may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress and thus readily be available to the Nation at large, I quote its text:

EAST GERMAN COLLECTIVIZATION: MODEL FOR CUBAN EXPROPRIATIONS

(By Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby, U.S. Army (retired))

Even the dullest liberal corroded by the Jacobinism of this decade, must be aware that the Red police state is buttressed on two basic Marxist actions: the abolition of private property (in industry and finance) and the collectivization of individual farms (Kolkhos). The postwar brigands whom the idiotic West has carefully nursed since 1945, from Cuba to Java, attempt to disguise their Marxist orientation by semantic protests of "agrarian reform" and the "welfare of the underprivileged" but in the end, the raw facts of forcible expropriation, police terror and repression begin to emerge: the hallmark of communism. Castro coolly evicts American owners from sugar plantations and cattle ranches (no white different from farm properties in western United States) while Soekarno, a Japanese collaborator and quiescent set the pattern, at the expense of a war-tested ally (1941-45) the Dutch. Now the same Marxist maneuver is being executed in East Germany, under Russian occupation pressure, promulgated by the Kremlin puppet Ulbricht. The repressive measures were obviously accelerated to create a social "fait accompli" before the summit negotiations, where the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and expellees in the West have become a silent but inexorable item on the agenda.

The collectivization of Ukrainian farmers was one of the most brutal crimes in the sinister record of Stalin: the "liquidation" (i.e., mass murder and deportation) of the "Kulak," the Russian landowning farmer. Stalin has set the pattern to be followed by his stooges and disciples, from the Caribbean to the Mekong. In the enforced Roosevelt-Truman-Stalin partition of Germany (Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran) the brutal action of the present Red German Government is merely one more step in a relentless Communist evolution—but there is only one ending to that tortuous road: the mass collectivization of Red China, the antlike "communes." West Germany with millions of expellees from the Iron Curtain countries within her border, could hardly be indifferent to this prostitution of values. Dr. Walter Becher, Member of Parliament (Bulletin No. 58 German Federal Press Bureau) covered the situation ably:

"The leaders of the S.E.D. (Socialist Unity Party of the Soviet Zone), are not satisfied with collectivizing, step by step, mid-Germany's agricultural economy but are attempting to give this act of brutal compulsion a democratic appearance. Albert Norden, member of the Politburo, recently called the forced collectivization in the Soviet Zone a "democratic plebiscite in favor of socialism and against the war-minded West German deceivers and exploiters of the peasant class. S.E.D. Chief Walter Ulbricht sent the Communist Zone's farmers a congratulatory letter and last Sunday *Neues Deutschland*, S.E.D.'s central organ, termed the '100 percent collectivization' in the precincts of

Rostock, Neubrandenburg, Frankfurt (Oder) and Potsdam the socialist spring of the year 1960."

The regime employed all sorts of dialectical propaganda to portray abroad the mass entry of farmers into agricultural productive cooperatives (Landwirtschaftliche Produktions-Genossenschaften, abbr. LPG) as being a spontaneous and completely voluntary, popular move. Comrade Ulbricht merely admits to some incidental exaggerations that occurred in the eager realization of an otherwise good and progressive program. Ulbricht, of course, could have carried out the collectivization by direct governmental decree approved by the so-called people's parliament (Volkskammer) with 100 percent certainty. In other words, Ulbricht could have reached his goal through a legalistic maneuver, so to speak. He was interested, however, in presenting this act of brutal compulsion as a voluntary move on the part of the mid-German farmers themselves who allegedly were convinced of the advantages of socialized agriculture.

The S.E.D. is also presenting a false picture of spontaneity because of the (then) approaching summit conference and Khrushchev's semantic (doubletalk deception) admission of the right of national self-determination. No doubt, the agricultural bolshevization of mid-Germany will be added to the socialist achievements to date which are not to be sacrificed, as Khrushchev repeatedly demanded, in case of a future reunification of Germany. Therefore, since the building of socialism was originally scheduled for completion in 1965, Ulbricht is speeding up, ahead of plan, the establishment of political facts accomplish to be accepted by the Western World, as expressions of voluntary popular decisions.

Against this background, it is necessary to recognize the manifold aspects of terror used in suppressing the farmers in mid-Germany, and to report on the numerous tragedies now taking place in the Soviet zone. The district and precinct leaders of the S.E.D. are competing with one another in beating the collectivization schedule. Whole brigades of Communist (S.E.D.) agitators are after the farmers, belaboring them day and night, at first with friendly assurances and gratuities of all kinds, then, when these blandishments prove ineffective, with threats and reprisals. In many cases these agents provocateur have even molested the farmers when already in bed, cajoling them and finally intimidating them to submit to the socialist cause, lest they be reported and punished as enemies of progress and peace.

The warning usually implied confiscation of property and loss of personal freedom. The legal and police authorities easily find some pretext for making short work of a blacklisted farmer. His complete ruin is the inevitable result. This explains, why the S.E.D. agents, by mass terror, succeeded in collectivizing 100 percent the agricultural properties in Rostock, Neubrandenburg, Potsdam, and Frankfurt (Oder). The activist brigades are already at work in Saxony and Thuringia and they recently announced that a whole series of communities in that area have become productive cooperatives in full measure.

In order to arrive at large-scale "socialist agriculture" the individual L.P.G.'s are to be merged into even larger cooperatives. The new directives issued by the S.E.D. Politburo for the "socialist transformation" of the Soviet Zone's agricultural economy envisage productive cooperatives of 3,000 to 5,000 acres as the most appropriate size to fulfill the production targets stipulated by the 7-year plan. In this manner, the S.E.D. believes, the population of the Soviet Zone can be fully supplied with its own agricultural products, at a growing consumption rate by the end of 1963, at the same time surpassing the productivity of West German

grain and cattle farming per hectare. This is the tenor of the Politburo's proposed decree to be submitted to the eighth plenary session of the Communist central committee in April.

Such a deceptive forecast is used by Pankov's propaganda apparatus to camouflage the present campaign of terror against the independent farmers in the D.D.R. (German Democratic Republic), although the continued food shortage there is generally known to be due primarily to the failure of the agricultural cooperatives, despite their privileged position and the hundreds of millions of annual subvention moneys allotted to them by the state. It is known for a fact that the private farm operates more efficiently than the L.P.G. But economic aspects are obviously irrelevant, for S.E.D. chief Walter Ulbricht, regardless of costs, is only concerned with creating political faits accomplis designed to consolidate the Communist partition of Germany.

Protestant bishops filed a bitter protest with the Communist authorities of East Germany (Bulletin No. 58), which throws a sharp light on the forcible collectivization of individual farms that is going on there:

"It is not the function of the Church, to decide the merits of State-Socialism in economic problems but we receive reports from pastors and parishes of objectionable methods used to force individual landowners to enter collective units (Kolkhos). We cannot go into details but it is a fact that the individual farmer is exposed to every kind of pressure, intimidation and coercion exercised by police and security organs to relinquish his property and then sign affidavits that it was a voluntary action. What can you expect in performance from people who are coerced by fear and resigned to despair? This is a prostitution of conscience. It is a violation of human dignity. You can stop these repressive tactics. The seventh conference of the central committee of your own party (S.E.D.) has accepted the principle of voluntary work. At a time when peaceful coexistence between people is a slogan, we request that you do not breach the peace amongst your own subjects."

The full impact of this calculated destruction of an entire social category, the land-owning farmer, is evident in the expert comments of Almar Reitzner, editor of the German News and the Sudetendeutscher Artikel Dienst (April 1960). Amongst millions of refugees, fleeing the Soviet Zone there have been relatively few farmers, over the years. The sentimental bond with the land has been a strong one. Suddenly, there has been a sharp increase in fugitive farmers, due to the enforced collectivization of their land. This expropriation was decided on in the recent "Comecon" conferences (on agriculture) in Moscow.

The liquidation of the farmer in Communist East Germany has a calculated parallel in all Communist satellites, in variable degrees of execution. In Albania and Bulgaria, the process of expropriation is practically completed. In the abortive revolution of Hungary, the "Kolkhos" were dissolved in a few days and private ownership restored. With the collapse of the uprising, the Kremlin stooge Kadar, however, has again instituted socialization of agriculture and brought it back to about 72 percent of arable properties. The status in Rumania is evident in the area around Bucharest, where 91,848 farmers were incorporated in the socialist sector, i.e., the state acquisition of about 1 million acres or a percentage level of 71 percent. It is only in Poland where forcible collectivization is cautiously handled, only 13 percent of the average in the general Communist domain. The reason is obvious: Poland is forced to import huge amounts of wheat and edibles; they are furnished by the United States under a patently phony arrangement of transferring

surplus commodities (\$40 million), ostensibly balanced by restitution (to the same amount) of previously confiscated American properties; this is hailed as a masterpiece of diplomacy by a smirking State Department; the bill, coming and going, is paid by that faceless slob the American taxpayer.

The general assault on the farmer, a psychological assault on private property in general, is most advanced in Czechoslovakia which was once the showcase of Wilsonian democracy—indeed his almost single handed creation if we consider the fanaticism with which he "pushed" his protégé Masaryk. Prague is roughly 2 years ahead of Pankov: on that basis, it is easy to speculate what will ultimately happen in East Germany. The Czechs, more rabidly Stalinist than Stalin, have pushed collectivization (the death of the Kulak) approximately 82 percent of the total arable areas; there were 12,500 Kolkhos with a membership of 954,196 farm laborers, working approximately 9½ million acres. There is still a scattering of several thousand small farms in Moravia, of 2 to 4 acres in a relentless process of liquidation, through exorbitant pro rata demands, police persecution and endless trials by people's court (like in China) where they have received sentences of 2 to 7 years for economic sabotage and conspiracy against state organization. This process is in full swing in East Germany now; the percentage of expropriation 55 to 60 percent has not yet reached its maximum attainable level—but 12,000 snoopers, agents, provocateurs, etc., are working day and night, in a war of nerves, that has driven thousands of farmers to flight into West Germany or to suicide, in despair and hopelessness. In the meantime, the apathetic West is practically indifferent to this tragedy. The normally well-informed American press shies away from branding Castro's expropriation of farms and plantations, as an identical Communist maneuver. The defense of private property should be the single all-absorbing factor in the fight against global communism. Teddy Roosevelt, an infinitely better President than any of his colorless Democratic successors, made this the basic issue on his policy vis-a-vis Latin America. In the meantime, the corrosion of the West invites attention, once more, to Dimitri Manulsky's forecast in 1931, lecturing at the Lenin School of Political Warfare, and a timetable of lethal significance:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtones and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to co-operate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Two years after this remarkably frank statement, F. D. Roosevelt recognized Red Russia diplomatically over the bitter protest of many of his advisers—naively opening the Pandora's box that has troubled civilized mankind ever since. Manulsky's 20 and 30 years schedules are not far fetched: in 1951, there was the Kremlin engineered Sino-Korean war—a preliminary test of strength. His 30-year estimate will fall due in 1961. Was Khrushchev's spectacular visit designed to put the bourgeoisie to sleep? Is the Kremlin sponsored total disarmament in the category of electrifying overtones and unheard of concessions?

The forcible collectivization of individual farms in East Germany is not adequately covered by the American press. The affected area is probably too remote to arouse emotional interest. However, this myopic apathy seems to apply to next-door neigh-

bors in the Caribbean? The expropriations of Castro of plantations, large and small, is hardly noted—except by the enraged absentee landlords. The fact that Castro is proceeding to the formation of collectives (Kolkhos) has even found some naive (more likely fully paid) support, as in the case of the tomato farms.

Mr. Speaker, these appeasers throw in the puerile argument that Castro is not considered a real Communist though he has Communist advisers and associates. Card-holding Communists will never publicly admit membership in the party anyway. There is a clear index, however, to Communist character of subservience to the Kremlin; that is the attitude of a government toward private property, especially agricultural and the freedom of the individual from police repressions. The destruction of private property and the calculated harassment—liquidation—of private ownership is the basic principle of Marxist-Leninism. By that yardstick, Castro's government is Communist and in the orbit of the Kremlin.

Teddy Roosevelt understood that administrative distinction perfectly: His foreign policy vis-a-vis some wayward Latin American countries was predicated on law and order, the protection of property and the discharge of foreign obligations. None of his vacillating successors have acted on this vital issue. Now the Kremlin has brazenly moved into the Caribbean. There is an ideological link between Cuba and East Germany. Castro and Ulbricht are birds of a feather.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. INOUYE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for today, on account of official business in his district, inspecting the damages of the recent tidal wave.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, May 31.

Mr. WRIGHT, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, on May 31.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 30 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 60 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, June 1.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 1 hour, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POFF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. PRICE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and to include an address by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GOODELL, to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter and tables and charts.

Mr. OSMERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter during general debate on the school bill.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BRAY.

(At the request of Mr. EDMONDSON, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. MEYER.

Mr. POWELL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1605. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 24, 1960, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2184. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 6, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on York Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 2, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 395); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2185. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, R.I., and Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 396); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2186. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 13, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 397); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

2187. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 9, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of shore from Newport Bay to San Mateo Creek, Orange County, Calif., appendix V, phase 1, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

2188. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to the correction of an error in his message of disapproval on H.R. 7947. In the last sentence of the second paragraph of his message the word "purchases" should be inserted in lieu of the word "sells"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2189. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 37,609,878 pounds of palm oil now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1653. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry

executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 12263. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11522. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1935, to permit certain real property of the United States to be conveyed to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1150. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in trust and restricted allotted lands and restricted purchased allotted lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11953. A bill to provide for the assessing of Indian trust lands and restricted fee patent Indian lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11161. A bill to donate to the pueblos of Zia and Jemez a tract of land in the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant, New Mexico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10639. A bill to amend section 3(b) of the act of May 9, 1958 (72 Stat. 105), relating to the preparation of a roll of the members of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe and to per capita distribution of judgment funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7656. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12381. A bill to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 12382. A bill to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 12383. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage

rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENSKO:

H.R. 12384. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 12385. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 12386. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12387. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12388. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12389. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12390. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 12391. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12392. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to include members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission among the officers and employees of the United States protected against forcible assault and homicide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12393. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12394. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes and for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 12395. A bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission; to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements constructed, maintained, or operated with Federal funds; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZELENSKO:

H.J. Res. 717. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 695. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING: Joint Resolution No. 7 of the Nevada Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Joint Resolution No. 4 of the Nevada Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to prepare adequate State

water rights legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Joint Resolution No. 7 of the Nevada Senate memorializing Congress to propose a constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12396. A bill for the relief of Georges Boutros il Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 12397. A bill for the relief of John D. Rocamora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12398. A bill for the relief of Erwin P. Millsbaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 12399. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12400. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Stultz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12401. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12402. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12403. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sabri Sami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 12404. A bill for the relief of Yee Nee Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 12405. A bill for the relief of Julia and Alfredo Javier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12406. A bill for the relief of Thelma and Romeo Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Memorial Day 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, within a few days Americans everywhere will observe Memorial Day.

In keeping with the occasion the following statement appeared in my Washington Newsletter May 28 in lieu of my usual report on legislative activities:

MEMORIAL DAY 1960

Memorial Day is distinctly an American institution—a deeply significant sentimental custom established by our American people more than 90 years ago. It is not only observed in every community across our Na-

tion but in many foreign lands and across the high seas.

What the American people do in their local communities on Memorial Day is actually symbolic of our contribution to the overall Memorial Day observance which is being duplicated by millions throughout our land and in several foreign countries.

To make the point clear the following facts must be considered: There are more than 1 million names on the honor rolls of the American war dead. These names are the men and women who have fought and died for our country since this Nation was founded some 185 years ago.

Throughout the United States and in some 25 American military cemeteries beyond our shores, the mortal remains of some 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in World War I, and World War II and the Korean conflict are buried or are recorded as missing in action.

At 8 American military cemeteries or special memorials in France, England, and Belgium, there are nearly 31,000 World War I veterans buried.

Some 76,000 World War II dead are buried at 14 American cemeteries in England, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Italy and Tunisia, north Africa. In addition, more than 90,000 World War II and Korean war dead are buried or recorded as missing at American cemeteries in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Philippines.

In Arlington National Cemetery on the banks of the Potomac River across from the Nation's Capital surrounding the Tomb of the Unknowns are some 99,000 other war dead which represent all forms of military service.

In the American military cemeteries are graves and chapels, pools and gardens, statues and—most impressive, the walls of the missing. Aligned in rows there are two designs of white marble headstones, the Star of David for those of the Jewish faith and the Latin Cross for all others. These markers identify the remains of the known American war dead. All of these material tributes are creations of our best talent in architecture and landscaping and in poetry and prayer. These oversea cemeteries and

memorials are in charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Department of the Army.

In our oversea cemeteries where our known American war dead are buried, there are more than 60,000 in France, 13,600 in Belgium, 17,000 in the Philippines, 13,500 in Hawaii, 12,000 in Italy, 8,000 in Holland, 5,000 in Luxembourg, 4,000 in England, and 2,000 in Tunisia, North Africa.

For the unknown war dead, rows of marked graves are to be found in the vicinity of tremendously imposing structures, the walls of the missing. One of these walls of the missing is located on the south coast of England and inscribed on its 274-foot-long wall are the names, the ranks, the combat organization and the home States of American servicemen presumed to be dead but whose remains have not been recovered or identified. The following inscription appears on the walls of the missing: "Here are recorded the names of Americans who gave their lives in the service of their country and who sleep in unknown graves—grant unto them, O Lord, eternal rest."

Thus the real meaning of Memorial Day is revealed by the worldwide tributes that we as Americans pay to our war dead. The sun never sets upon all of these memorials.

Above the hallowed grounds upon which these memorials are located flies the Stars and Stripes—the flag of our country. It is the flag which says: "They were my defenders. They were your defenders. Their patriotism and their valor were proved on the fields of battle. Let their achievements and sacrifices be your inspiration forever."

This is the message for each of us on this Memorial Day of 1960.

Soil Stewardship Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, this is Soil Stewardship Week and a time for each of us to reexamine the great need for the proper conservation of our soil. For 25 years our Nation has been developing a program of soil and water conservation—and they have been years of progress. This I know, because I was personally and actively associated with it for some 14 years: in the early days of the Soil Erosion Service, and on the staff of the first soil conservation district in Vermont which started in 1940. I have watched this soil and water policy grow and expand from its inception to its present status with 2,861 soil conservation districts including more than 90 percent of the Nation's farmland and with the cooperation of some 1.8 million farmers. I have witnessed the manner in which the owners of the land grasped the significance of wise use and, through their local districts, have worked to conserve this basic resource in one of the most successful of Federal partnerships with people and local governments. I have had the privilege of participating in this great endeavor, and I wish to use this occasion to congratulate the people of our Nation for their foresight.

Much greater effort is needed, of course, because of the demands of a constantly growing population with its attendant complexities. There is a vital need for a comprehensive soil and water policy geared to the future. But, judging by our past accomplishments, we may hope to continue the task with a true sense of stewardship.

Opinion Poll for Seventh District Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have been in session this year for better than 4 months. In the remaining weeks before adjournment many important decisions will be made. As I have done on previous occasions, I am submitting to my constituents a list of questions, as follows, and requesting that they express their views in this manner. I will place the results of this poll in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Do you favor:

1. Government-sponsored medical care for social security retirees? H.R. 4700, the Forand bill, proposes that the Government pay the medical and hospital bills—with certain maximum limits—for social security retirees to be financed by increasing the social security tax. Opponents maintain this would injure the stability of social security, and that millions of elderly people not eligible for social security benefits would not receive this assistance.

2. Limiting national expenditures to balance the budget? President Eisenhower has predicted a budget surplus of \$4 billion next year, which he believes should be used to retire part of the national debt. In the Congress many new programs are suggested which seem desirable, but which would involve the expenditure of millions of dollars. In deciding on new programs we must consider how the money for them will be raised or whether to borrow more money.

3. Use of import quotas to protect local industries from foreign competition? Many industries in Indiana manufacture products which are also produced abroad. In the continuing efforts of our Government to reduce tariff barriers, and facilitate world trade, the competition of these products coming from countries where wage standards are considerably lower is intense. It has been suggested that more adequate protection should be accorded our domestic industries, including farming.

4. Increased spending for national defense? We are spending more than \$40 billion a year for defense, which is the major portion of our national budget. Yet many critics say our defense efforts have been pinchpenny and that recent Russian developments necessitate greater defense spending.

5. U.S. recognition of Red China? Today we recognize the Chinese Nationalist government on Formosa instead of the Communist government in Peiping. Some believe that we should recognize and begin trade with Red China.

6. Reduced funds for foreign aid? In the last 15 years the United States has spent in excess of \$80 billion for foreign aid. Some claim that our aid is doing much to halt the further spread of communism and to build strong new bastions of freedom. On the other hand some say that it should be eliminated or cut.

7. Returning to each State one-half of the cigarette tax collected from its residents for educational uses without Federal direction? Proposals are before Congress to give Federal assistance to schools through grants to the States in accordance with a formula weighted to assist those which have a greater need. A different approach would be to return a portion of an excise tax collected in each State, such as the tax on cigarettes, provided that the money would be used for school purposes, either in the construction of buildings or teachers' salaries, but not subject to Federal direction. The return to Indiana of one-half of the Federal cigarette tax paid there, which would be 4 cents on each package, would realize \$24 million per year, three times the amount to be received under another proposed program.

8. Giving in to the Russians by abandoning West Berlin? The prime target of Soviet foreign policy is to get the United States to withdraw from Berlin.

9. Withdrawing from pledge to buy sugar from Cuba at above the world price? We are obligated until the end of 1960, under the Sugar Act, to make one-third of our sugar purchases in Cuba at above world prices. Owing to anti-American feelings which have been expressed since the Castro regime took over, it has been suggested that we not renew the Cuban sugar quota.

10. Repeal of loyalty oath requirement of students receiving aid under the National Defense Education Act? Students applying for loans and fellowships under the National Defense Education Act are required to take an oath of loyalty to the United States. Bills are before the Congress to repeal this oath requirement.

11. Retention of the Connally amendment which allows the United States to reject the jurisdiction of the World Court? In accepting the jurisdiction of the World Court in 1948 the United States reserved the right to determine if a particular matter is domestic and hence not subject to international control. It has been suggested in the Senate that this amendment be repealed.

12. Increasing the conservation reserve—soil bank—from 28 million acres to 60 million acres? If you are engaged in farming, also check here ☐. The basis of the so-called farm problem has been overproduction, which is unquestionably causing great difficulties in the Farm Belt. We can, however, be thankful that our difficulties have been with abundance and not with

scarcity. The soil-bank program sets aside large areas of land for several years, insuring that they will not be used for production and that the soil will be conserved and replenished. There are about 28 million acres currently in this conservation reserve; some analysts suggest that if the reserve were increased to about 60 million acres it would balance agricultural production and eliminate creation of additional surpluses.

I am looking forward to the replies I will receive, and I will advise you at a later date of the results of this poll.

Dedication of Old Ben Coal Corp. Mine No. 21 at Sesser, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing one of the Nation's largest coal-producing areas. We are proud of the great contribution southern Illinois is making to the Nation and the world through the production of this great mineral called coal. Like all other industries we have felt the hardship created through automation by loss of jobs. Therefore, we all rejoice when a new mine is opened.

On June 14, in southern Illinois, an event will take place that may well become a milestone in the industrial progress of the United States. That event is the dedication of Old Ben Coal Corp. Mine No. 21 at Sesser, Ill. The new mine is a deep-shaft coal mine, the largest in the Midwest devoted to the production of metallurgical coal.

The significance of this new mine to national progress is best explained in the light of the relationship of coal and steel, as well as by the great changes that have been taking place in the coal-steel economy of this country.

America is the world's greatest steel producer, due largely to the abundance of iron ore in this country. Yet without an equally abundant supply of coal, the iron ore might well remain unused. For without coal and the coke made from it, there would be no practical, low-cost way to convert iron ore into steel.

From its earliest beginnings in this country and elsewhere, the steel industry has considered the availability of metallurgical coal to be of prime importance, and has located its mills close to this coal. For nearly a hundred years, the Appalachian region has been the major source of coking coal for steelmaking, and has accounted for the growth of Pittsburgh and other eastern cities as world-renowned steel-producing centers.

At the turn of the century, certain industry leaders realized that, if America were to continue satisfying the ever-increasing demands for steel, provision would have to be made for the day when eastern coal reserves would no longer be

sufficient, and when steel production itself would move westward.

Thus it was that in 1918, the Old Ben Coal Corp. of Chicago purchased a reserve of 100 million tons of metallurgical coal in Franklin County, Ill., to be held against the day when the steel industry in the Midwest would match or exceed production elsewhere in the Nation.

This day has now come to pass. For several years now, steel production of the Chicago-Gary area has outstripped the East, and there are many indications that the Midwest will grow in importance as a steel region. Briefly, these indications are:

First, the central location of the area with respect to geography and population, an important consideration in market accessibility and shipping costs.

Second, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the availability of the many fine water routes of the Mississippi Valley States, which make it economical to ship iron ore from new fields in Labrador and Venezuela directly to the mills.

Third, the availability of vast reserves of low sulfur metallurgical coal in Illinois for iron ore reduction.

It is interesting to note that even though steel production has made great progress in the Midwest, the mills have up to now continued to utilize eastern coal. This has resulted partially from past practice, partially from unfamiliarity with midwestern metallurgical coal.

In deciding that now is the time to open mine No. 21 and tap its metallurgical coal reserve, Old Ben officials believe that the steel industry is ready to begin buying Illinois metallurgical coal in ever increasing quantities. By 1962, much of mine No. 21's output of 3 million tons annually is expected to be going for steel production.

The dedication of this new mine is signal in Illinois history. It marks the first time a coal producer in the State has opened a mine designed specifically for metallurgical coal production. It also marks the tapping of the largest commercially available tonnage of metallurgical coal remaining in the State.

By making this pioneering move, Old Ben, which has 86 years of history behind it, is setting the stage for further development of the Midwest as a steel and coal producing center.

The anticipated benefits of this development are remarkable to contemplate. In the Chicago area alone, metallurgical consumption amounts to 18,250,000 tons yearly, which is now largely being met by coal from eastern fields. Much of this market is expected to be developed by Illinois coal producers.

For the steel industry, utilization of nearby coal means important freight savings, in some cases \$1.50 per ton differential between coal shipped from the East and coal shipped from southern Illinois. At the same time, the railroads of the Midwest can look forward to more metallurgical coal traffic.

There is also the matter of many new jobs in mining and coal hauling for the people of southern Illinois, and for the hundreds of industries and businesses which supply the living needs of these

workers. Increased industrial development of the area should contribute to its stability and economic health.

Finally, by contributing to the further development of the steel industry, mine No. 21 is providing new strength for our consumer economy and our national defense.

The foresight of company officials in obtaining the coal reserve, and their patience in waiting for the proper moment in the evolution of steel industry logistics to open the mine, are worthy of note. Their action will be of immense benefit to an industry, to a State, and to the Nation.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Osmer's Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, those at home and abroad who think the Paris summit fiasco has divided the American people had better take a look at how voters in my district reacted to Khrushchev's abuse of our President.

On May 2, I mailed out 46,000 questionnaires to typical voters in my district. Just about half of the more than 9,800 replies which have been received to date came in before the ill-fated Paris meeting. Only 52 percent of my constituents replying prior to the Paris blowup favored the overall record of the Eisenhower administration, 34 percent were opposed to it with 14 percent undecided. Immediately after the vicious attack by Khrushchev on our President the percentage of those favoring the administration jumped to the almost unbelievable high of 82 percent, with only 11 percent in opposition, and 7 percent undecided. If Moscow is laboring under the impression that our people are divided by the U-2 incident and subsequent events, these answers from a good cross section of our people will set the record straight. Once again we have proof that, despite our many partisan differences over domestic issues, Americans close ranks when facing up to foreign threats. The final percentages on the record of the Eisenhower administration were 59 percent in favor, 30 percent opposed, and 11 percent undecided.

The replies to another one of my questions prove that Castro is in serious trouble with the American people. Only 9 percent of those answering were opposed to cutting Cuban sugar imports if Castro continues his anti-U.S. campaign, with a resounding 77 percent favoring such cuts.

It is interesting to note that a Federal program of health care for older citizens had better than 7 to 1 support among my constituents, 85 percent voting in favor and only 12 percent in opposition. On this question only 3 per-

cent were undecided. A voluntary plan for such health care was favored by 56 percent while 44 percent thought a compulsory one best.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will be interested in the replies to other questions, too: Seventy-eight percent favor the United Nations as the best means of maintaining world peace; 80 percent want Congress to pass a strong law to curb radio and TV payola and fakery, and 60 percent favor legal action to end southern lunch counter sit-downs by requiring stores to treat all customers equally.

More than half, 53 percent oppose the present foreign aid program.

A strong majority want Federal help and tax relief for commuter railroads. An increase in the present Federal minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 per hour was favored by 63 percent with only 34 percent opposed to the increase. On this question 3 percent had not made up their minds.

On two of the three questions relating to education, the poll showed an almost even division of opinion on two of the questions. Those favoring education benefits for peacetime GI's led by a 46-percent to 44-percent margin over those opposed, while 10 percent gave no opinion; 39 percent opposed eliminating loyalty oaths and non-Communist affidavits by Federal scholarship students; 36 percent want them retained; 25 percent were undecided. On the third education question, voters favored Federal aid to education by 2 to 1, 59 percent to 29 percent, 12 percent expressing no opinion. Of those favoring Federal aid to education, 69 percent want the aid used for school construction, 14 percent for teachers' pay, while 17 percent thought all purposes should receive help.

This is the sixth year that I have conducted this broad poll, and the number of replies is the highest ever received. As in previous years, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of letters and comments on the

questionnaire subjects, and others, have given me a wonderful insight into public opinion on the issues of the day at the grassroots in my district.

For the first time, a presidential poll was included this year at the request of many constituents. As soon as the results have been tabulated, they will be made public.

The mailing list used consists of two categories: First, 85 percent are registered voters taken at random from voting lists in the 39 municipalities in the Ninth Congressional District. Second, 15 percent are leaders and professional people in the district, such as doctors, dentists, clergymen, lawyers, labor leaders, clubwomen, businessmen, bankers, retailers, public officials, accountants, engineers, architects, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the 12 questions and the answers in percentages immediately following these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Percent]

Do you favor—	Yes	No	Undecided	Do you favor—	Yes	No	Undecided
1. The overall record of the Eisenhower administration?-----	59	30	11	7. Eliminating present loyalty oath and non-Communist affidavit requirements for students receiving Federal scholarships?-----	36	39	25
2. The United Nations as the best means of maintaining world peace?-----	78	12	10	8. Legal action to prevent southern lunch counter sit-downs by requiring stores to treat all customers equally?-----	60	25	15
3. Cutting Cuban sugar imports if Castro continues anti-U.S. campaign?-----	77	9	14	9. Increasing Federal minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 per hour?-----	63	34	3
4. Our foreign aid program at present levels.-----	39	53	8	If no, minimum of? 67 percent \$1.15; no increase? 33 percent.			
If no, more economic aid? 27 percent; less economic? 24 percent; more military aid? 3 percent; less military? 38 percent. No aid at all? 8 percent.				10. Providing Federal help and tax relief for commuter railroads?-----	58	35	7
5. A Federal program of health care for older citizens?-----	85	12	3	11. Granting peacetime GI's, with at least 2 years' active duty, education benefits similar to those given wartime GI's?-----	46	44	10
If yes, compulsory plan? 44 percent; or voluntary plan? 56 percent.				12. Federal aid to education?-----	59	29	12
6. A strong Federal law to curb payola and fakery on radio and TV?-----	80	15	5	If yes, for construction? 69 percent; teachers' pay? 14 percent; all purposes? 17 percent.			

A Tribute to Jane Addams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on April 29 I had the honor of participating in a series of meetings held at Rockford College, to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams. I ask unanimous consent that the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

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

A TRIBUTE TO JANE ADDAMS

(Delivered at Rockford College, Apr. 20, 1960, by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

Of all the American men and women of the last century the two, who to my mind most closely approached sainthood, have been Abraham Lincoln and Jane Addams. And we of Illinois can take a proper degree of local pride in the fact that both of these supreme characters developed within the texture of the life of our State.

When Jane Addams died a quarter of a century ago she was loved by many, respected by multitudes, but bitterly reviled and hated by most of the so-called leading citizens and formers of public opinion. Now with the passage of time, her nobility is

more fully appreciated while the traducers have either died off, been converted, or have decided that since Miss Addams is no longer living they can afford to allow her to be praised.

So all over this country at this centennial of her birth proper tribute is being offered for her life and works. And since the dead lend themselves very readily to reconciliation we probably should not scrutinize too closely the credentials of those who elsewhere join to pay her honor.

Like most true saints, Jane Addams was a robust character who lived in no ivory tower but moved instead at the very center of the stresses and tensions of life. There was symmetry and nobility in every phase of her development from her girlhood in the Quaker home beside the mill in Cedarville, on through the years of illness, study, and travel both here and abroad and then to her busy life on Halsted Street as the helpful friend of the poor, the weak, the confused, the unfortunate, the exploited, and the friendless. And then by her awareness of the "solidarity of the human race" she became first a mighty force for good in Chicago and in Illinois, then a national figure almost as commanding in her way as was Lincoln in his, and finally to deserved honor and then to death and simple burial on the hillside slope in Cedarville from whence she sprang.

The mere contemplation of such a career is in itself life enhancing and hence is ample justification for the services which are being conducted both here and elsewhere.

But Miss Addams was always a most modest person who was almost exclusively interested in the good which she could accomplish both for her generation and for

those which were to follow and not in retrospective praise for her past achievements. So if her spirit watches these proceedings (as I hope it does) she would welcome any impetus which our tributes might give to help lessen the burdens, the dangers, and the anxieties which the men and women of today and tomorrow will inevitably experience. I hope you will pardon me if in a few brief minutes I try to sketch some of the general lessons which her life seems to me to impart, leaving for the discussion period the questions as to what her attitude would be as regards current questions and problems.

The first lesson which I would draw from Miss Addams' life is the esthetic beauty and practical ability of intelligent and energized compassion. This is a brittle and hard-boiled era in which commitment to causes and a desire to help people is not regarded as "good form." But Miss Addams' whole life was devoted to those purposes from the time that she and Ellen Starr moved into the big house on Halstead Street and began to nurse the sick, to offer counsel and recreation to those who sadly needed both, on through the days when she fought for laws and institutions which would protect women and children from being broken by excessive toil, starvation wages and insidious temptations, and then on to being a pilgrim for peace involved in the fate of mankind, who pled with the lowly and mighty alike that they might abandon the institution of war and devote their energies to the arts of peace. No person in our times has done so much for people.

And in thus devoting herself to others, Miss Addams became an ever more noble and more attractive woman. There was indeed never a better example of the truth of Jesus saying that "he who loses his life for My sake shall find it."

The second lesson which I would draw from her life is that in general it is better to begin where one lives, to be helpful there, and then follow life outward, upward, and I may say, inward as well. Miss Addams started on Halsted Street. She was the supremely good neighbor without being in the slightest sense a busybody or the proverbial lady bountiful. Just because she was a good neighbor, she took on the job of garbage collector and gradually excavated the loathesome piles which covered the streets and alleys of the bloody 20th ward. Then as a result of trying to help boys and girls out of trouble, she founded the Juvenile Protective Association, helped to create the juvenile court, and became a reforming member of the school board. She not only cared for individual immigrants, but set up the Immigrants Protective League to do the same job on a broader scale, with her doughty associates Julia Lathrop, of this very city of Rockford, Florence Kelly, and Alice Hamilton, Jessie Binford and the two Abbotts she crusaded for and obtained much-needed legislation to protect the women and children not only of Halsted Street but also of Illinois and the Nation. She was not afraid to defend the Pullman strikers of 1894 and the clothing workers in the great strike of 1910 and she helped to lay the basis for the model labor-management relations which have existed in the latter industry for the last 50 years. But since she was rooted in Halsted Street and always lived on intimate terms with her neighbors her advocacies were based in reality while her testimony had a vivid and living pith to it which the abstract statements of experts commonly lack. If we can take another moral from her life it is, "Begin where you are but do not be afraid to follow where truth and the pure spirit of the inner light may lead you."

Finally Miss Addams combined culture with character. There are too many of us who specialize on one of these attributes to the virtual exclusion of the other. But Miss Addams through her wide travels had sympathetic communion with the people of many lands; from her wide reading the whole great world of literature was part of her life as were the breathless creations of beauty in painting, sculpture, and music. She encouraged all this in her neighbors with her industrial museum, her Little Theater, and the classes in the arts, and in music which she and Miss Starr fostered. And this was reflected in the moving and prescient books which she wrote such as "Twenty Years at Hull House," "Democracy and Social Ethics," "The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets," "The Long Road of Woman's Memory," "Peace and Bread in Time of War," and the "Second 20 Years at Hull House."

What a legacy she has left us and what an inspiration her life still is. And in the words of a Victorian poet whom Miss Addams loved:

"Through such souls only God stooping
Shows sufficient of His light
For us in the dark to rise by."

Perhaps I should stop here but this last week as I reread Bernard Shaw's "Saint Joan," I thought of the similarities between Joan of Arc who after five centuries was made Saint Joan, and our citizen of Illinois and of the world whom we may reverently term "Saint Jane." Saint Joan was burned at the stake for heresy in believing that God's voice told her to liberate France. The body of our brave saint was not burned at the stake but her spirit was scarred and indeed nailed upon the figurative cross of public passion and opinion.

And in the epilog of Shaw's play you will remember how Joan's shining apparition appeared a quarter of a century after her execution to those who had put her to death and to the friends who had failed her in the

death agony. And in repentance they all praised her, confessed their sins, and vowed to do better. But when Joan announced her intention of returning to earth, one by one they all scurried away with the last to leave being the hulky and sensual soldier who had held up a cross before her dying eyes.

And I thought would that we could have this experience of our Saint Jane returning to us on this spring day a full quarter of a century after her death. Would our praise turn to abandonment if she or someone like her were to sound clear notes on the trumpet of probity.

It is quite probable, and I am frank to confess that knowing something of the nature of tyranny of the police states, I could not follow her in rejection of all forms of force. But I do say that if we could have more who would live as she did in the spirit which takes away the occasion for all war, the necessity for the use of force would be greatly reduced.

And I think we would all echo the last plea which Shaw made Joan utter, "O God, that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive thy saints? How long, O Lord, how long?"

Thirty-second Anniversary of Jordan's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 32d anniversary of Jordan's independence. The history of the Jordanian independence dates back to May 25, 1928, at which time a self-internal independence became known as the Princedom of Transjordan. As the years drew back the curtain of repression and self-expression, in 1946 Trans-Jordan concluded a treaty with Britain, whereby the latter recognized the independence of Jordan and its full sovereignty, with His Majesty, King Abdullah, as the newly proclaimed King. This achievement of independence, this long awaited dream for Jordan's people became a reality through the unceasing efforts of His late Majesty, King Abdullah, the grandfather of His Majesty, the present King Hussein.

April of 1950 viewed the end of hostilities between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine. The Jordanian Parliament, composed of central Arab Palestine and Trans-Jordan proper, approved the union of the mentioned regions with the new state to be acknowledged as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Presently, Jordan's monarch is His Majesty King Hussein, the young grandson of the late King Abdullah.

The historic perseverance of this kingdom's zealous struggle for independence, the vigilant alertness which it protects itself from shackling antidemocratic elements, the perpetual challenge it brings to other nations, certainly characterizes a kingdom deservant of distinguished recognition.

From a persistent strife of chaos, a kingdom has risen to exert itself among the free nations of the world. Amid present misunderstandings and misgivings, the true sovereignty of Jordan has shown that the seeds of democratic principles can only grow and blossom through the tender nurturing of patience, understanding, and tolerance.

On this, their day of Independence, I wish to extend greetings to the people of Jordan, His Majesty, King Hussein, and the Honorable Dr. Yousuf Haikal, the Ambassador from Jordan.

Jobs for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, during my study of the subject of juvenile delinquency, one of the greatest complaints against industry and government in connection with the prevention of juvenile delinquency was the failure to provide employment for the youth of our country. After high school and before induction into military service, employers have been reluctant to hire a young man because of the uncertainty of continuity of employment. As a result, young men who do not preoccupy their time in college find themselves unable to obtain employment to provide for their miscellaneous needs and to prepare for a future. The gloomy outlook is either a draft in the service or enlistment.

Some organizations have recognized the desideratum or need during this critical period and have embarked upon a program of obtaining jobs for youth. One of these organizations is the "Jobs for Youth," a nonprofit organization which has attempted to fill the needs of the employers and to help the youth of the community. The organizer and moving spirit of this group is Mr. Anthony Sorvillo of 68 East 97th Street, New York City. The organization Jobs for Youth is located at 400 East 83d Street, New York, N.Y. It has endeavored to obtain employment for young men as stock boys, messengers, packers, and delivery boys.

A brochure issued by this enterprising organization Jobs for Youth sets forth its purpose and the scope of its activities. If more agencies or organizations carried out a similar program, boys would be occupied and less likely to become juvenile delinquents. The brochure reads as follows and I commend it to the readers' attention:

Jobs for Youth is a free employment bureau and guidance service for young people. It serves youth 16 to 21 years old with special emphasis on boys. Younger boys are also given counseling and referred for after-school and summer work.

Boys who are intimidated by large downtown employment offices eagerly seek the advice of a friendly neighborhood counselor. In addition to the regular staff there is a part-time worker assigned from the New York State Employment Office who does counseling and job referral.

We know that a boy at work is less likely to become a delinquent or get into trouble.

Secretary of Defense Gates Opens SEATO Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address delivered by the Honorable Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., Secretary of Defense, on Wednesday, May 25, to the opening session of the 12th Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) Military Advisers Conference, in Washington. I had the great privilege of witnessing this historic event.

Secretary Gates' speech was a clear, concise, and dignified greeting and statement of our Government's stand against the Communist threat to world peace. With his usual and noteworthy clarity, he told the world of the U.S. intention to honor our commitments in defense of freedom-loving peoples in this important quadrant of the world's surface. The speech follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., AT OPENING OF THE SEATO 12TH MILITARY ADVISERS CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Excellencies, military advisers, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a unique honor to address this distinguished group and to open the 12th SEATO Military Advisers Conference.

On behalf of President Eisenhower, the U.S. Government, and the American people I extend to each of you a most cordial welcome.

We meet at a time when the world has been startled and shocked by the abruptness with which the hopes for the reduction of tensions from a successful summit conference have been shattered. One thing has emerged of great value to all who are devoted to freedom: a new appreciation of the solid basis on which our relationships with our allies rests. The people of this country are deeply grateful for the unity shown by the nations of the free world at this time. The bonds among us have never been stronger.

The purposes, current activities, and future tasks of SEATO constitute a vital element in maintaining stability in the course of world events. With communism seeking to destroy all that the free nations of the world are striving to build and to maintain, the stability of the free world depends on the security of each of us. SEATO is based on this concept of interdependence, and is a proud demonstration of its success.

The purposes of the SEATO collective defense to which we have mutually bound ourselves remain valid. Time moves quickly.

It has been 6 years since eight free nations pledged their collective resources to maintain the peace and security of southeast Asia and southwest Pacific through common action. It is significant that the Communists have not challenged its integrity nor tested its collective strength through direct overt aggression.

During its short span of life SEATO has grown from an idea into an effective organization. National forces of the Southeast Asia countries, backed by powerful mobile forces contribute to the deterrent and provide the security behind which the free peoples of the area live and develop their resources. Coordinated SEATO military plans have been prepared and are capable of rapid execution to parry any likely Communist threat.

Through military field exercises, skills have been developed and refined, operating procedures established, and command arrangements tested. SEATO exercises have progressed from simple observer type to the sophisticated maneuvers of land, sea, and air units of member nations.

The United States remains dedicated in its support of SEATO. We are prepared and will honor our commitments. Our military forces have never been more powerful. They are capable of decisive action in general war if this should be forced upon us. Together with our allies we can meet lesser military actions anywhere in the world.

While it is inspiring to note the strides already made, great tasks still face us. The military threat of communism has not declined since SEATO was born in Manila 6 years ago. Communist leaders remain dedicated to the achievement of their goal of world domination. Their tactics, as you are aware, consist of threats and blandishments, warnings, and false promises. They exploit every opportunity and apply various forms of pressure. If a government is weak, greater and increasing pressures are applied in the hope that a revolutionary situation will develop. If a government successfully counters one particular Communist thrust, the Communist tactics change. The recent history of Southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific is replete with evidence of such Communist actions. They will may resort to military force if they believe it will be successful.

The nature of this opposition simply makes it more difficult for us to accomplish our high purpose. We can be encouraged, however, by our success to date. The collective security arrangements of the free world have deterred military aggression. The resolution of the nations of SEATO, backed by the tangible assistance rendered by the United States through its military assistance program, have achieved an effective defense.

The Secretary of State, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I are convinced of the indispensability of military assistance as an integral part not only of our own defenses but those of the entire free world.

We are strongly supporting the program of the President. We are determined to make the maximum use of the resources which Congress makes available. Our goal is to obtain on a worldwide basis the best possible free world defense.

I have just returned from Paris. Since the world press featured the Paris events on their front pages almost continuously for 2 weeks, there is not much I can add to what you already know. In view of the happenings in Paris, I wish to quote from President Eisenhower's message to the NATO ministerial meeting in Istanbul about a month ago:

"We approach these Paris talks with a sincere desire to do all possible to reduce the tensions and dangers that now exist. Yet we cannot reasonably anticipate any quick or

spectacular results. This meeting will be one more in what may prove a long succession of diplomatic exchanges dealing with some of the most difficult problems of our era. These are not susceptible to early solution. We can, at best, hope to make some modest progress toward our goals."

We did approach these talks with a sincere desire to reduce world tensions. As the developments unfolded, however, it became increasingly clear that the Soviet Union had decided well in advance to torpedo the summit. Western firmness did not back down before Khrushchev's ultimatums.

I would be remiss if I failed to note that our colleagues from Britain and France, as well as the other NATO partners, displayed a convincing unity of purpose and action in the face of Soviet divisive efforts. The Soviet conduct both in Paris and at the United Nations demonstrated that a difficult road lies ahead as we seek solutions to the most complex problems of our times.

It is too early to tell what further developments may take place. The President of the United States will continue his efforts toward peace with justice and still hopes to make, as he put it, "some modest progress towards our goals" even though the Soviet actions have increased the difficulties. In short, we still intend to seek a relaxation of tensions by all means, short of impairing our common security. We must always negotiate from strength.

We recognize that military preparedness will not by itself meet the challenges facing Southeast Asia. Our multilateral efforts to promote the economic growth of the area and the material well-being of the people must be intensified. Mere survival is not enough to meet the demands of the future. Social and economic progress must be made. Mature and stable national institutions are necessary to the structure we are jointly striving to build.

Each SEATO Military Advisers Conference has cemented the ties of friendship and cooperation. Conferences have developed ideas and recommendations which resulted in coordinated plans and actions. This meeting I am confident will be no exception. I take pleasure in declaring this conference open, and I wish you every success in the work before you.

The New Spirit of Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of northeastern Oklahoma have just had the opportunity to observe a splendid demonstration of the coordination and unity which are strengthening our Armed Forces in their preparation for American defense.

The occasion was the observance of Armed Forces Day in Muskogee, last Saturday, May 21.

Thousands of Oklahomans were on hand to witness a combined Air Force, Army, and National Guard operation in which a mock battle was fought for control of Davis Field.

Thanks to television and radio coverage, additional hundreds of thousands of our citizens were both thrilled and

impressed by the well-planned and perfectly executed maneuvers, both on the ground and in the air, which accompanied the battle.

The demonstration not only provided a vivid illustration of the readiness of our National Guard and Reserve Forces, but also impressed thousands with the importance and effectiveness of strong, well-balanced forces to meet all military situations.

In the mock battle at Davis Field, an important airbase was saved from "enemy capture" by well organized team effort of our defense forces.

That team effort, which played such a significant role in the victory of World War II, is even more essential in the perilous times which now confront our Nation.

As representative of the district in which Davis Field is located, I am proud of the contribution which its mock battle of last week has made to public understanding of our defense effort, and to the effectiveness of that effort in Oklahoma.

I am also proud of the officers and men of all the Armed Forces units who planned and executed the exercises of last Saturday so admirably. They are all a credit to the uniforms which they wear.

Porter Hedge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the farmer has lost a good and true friend. Members who knew Porter Hedge will share with farmers everywhere the loss of one of agriculture's most articulate and well-informed voices.

Many of us knew of his ill health, but we were poorly prepared to learn of his passing Saturday last in the Arlington, Va., hospital.

Porter Hedge, who was a native of Iowa, was graduated in agricultural journalism and achieved a notable career in newspaper work in Iowa and in Texas. He was the author of the widely read book on agriculture, "The Fifth Plate."

At the time of his passing, Porter Hedge was associate editor of the Washington Farmletter, reviewing the field of farming and the activities of Federal agencies. His knowledge of agriculture and the laws pertaining to farming was remarkable. His able pen put into layman's language the intricate rules and administrative directives issued from Washington. His analysis of commodity programs assisted farmers of the Nation to plan their planting programs to best stabilize their business operations.

While Porter Hedge wrote on all aspects of agriculture, soybean growers will perhaps miss him most, for he was widely acquainted throughout the soybean industry and his columns on the soybean situation reached most of the commercial soybean growers of the belt.

But, Porter Hedge will be remembered most because of his integrity and his pleasant approach to all matters. He was a fine man and a devoted friend to agriculture. In a time when farmers need friends who can tell their story, they have lost one of the very best.

Slater High School Commencement

Address, May 17, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the commencement exercises of Slater High School on May 17, 1960:

Reverend Byers, Reverend Hellwege, Dr. Gamby, Mr. Grubb, class of 1960, ladies and gentlemen, we all regret the death of Mr. Kendrick's mother and his unavoidable absence on this occasion and extend our deepest sympathy in his bereavement.

Your selection and invitation for me to be your speaker is a great honor to me and I hope I can justify your choice of a speaker by informative words which you will enjoy and always remember.

It has been said that new and important occasions teach new duties. Therefore I believe it to be my duty to discuss a few very important subjects with you this evening. First, I want to talk to you about the importance of government or politics—mind you, not Republican and not Democratic—but simply politics as the science or method by which all governments, big and little, are created and maintained throughout the world.

In this world in which we live today there is no subject which should have more interest and attention. And the subject of government should be particularly important to the young people who are now graduating not only from high school, but graduating soon into mature citizenship and full share of responsibility to the preservation of our great Nation.

If a nation values anything more than freedom and good government, it will lose its freedom and self-government; and the irony of it is, that if it is easy comfort or money that it values more, then it will lose that too.

Our priceless form of government was fashioned, in all of its ingenious complexity, to preserve to the very fullest extent possible the freedom and security of each individual citizen. This was the goal; this was the objective of those brave and thoughtful men who drafted the Declaration of Independence and adopted the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States. That was the goal of our forefathers; that was the purpose of their documentary handiwork; that was the heritage which they handed down to us.

Among the great and noble men who established our form of government was Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence. You will always remember his historical words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That

to secure these rights governments are instituted among men * * *"

Then, almost 96 years ago, that great immortal Abraham Lincoln, standing on the site of one of the great battles of the Civil War, said this:

"Four score and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

There were times in the past history of mankind when the problems of all governments were extremely simple, when the citizen of any government expected no more of it than the protection of life and property. That was a long time ago.

As the centuries have rolled by, governments have materially changed. Leaving their simple character of early days, they have constantly become more and more complicated organizations as they have undertaken to perform added services and make greater requirements of the individual citizen.

Thus it came about that government has its hands upon all of us in some way from the moment we are born until the last rites when our mortal remains are whisked off to the cemetery.

If the influence of government is all pervasive in our lives as I have said it to be, then there can be little hesitation upon the part of any citizen, man or woman, about the necessity for his or her active participation in civic and political affairs.

In a word, it behooves every citizen to actively participate in civic and political affairs. And again I reiterate and emphasize that I do not recommend that you necessarily have to make politics a personal career nor do I suggest that it is necessary for you to seek public office in order to participate in government or political affairs. By the use of the word "politics," I am referring to the unbiased and serious study and discussion of the governmental issues and the exercise of your leadership and influence on those issues.

The United States, though but 194 years old, has lived through three epochs and is now at the threshold of the fourth. The three epochs that have passed into history are: (1) Independence; (2) enfranchisement; (3) unification. Today we are confronted with many serious problems and issues. The time allotted to me as your speaker this evening is insufficient to discuss all of these problems and issues. But I will mention a few which are vitally important to every man, woman and child.

Our military preparedness programs are essential but the present annual cost or expenditures for this purpose, plus the mutual security and other so-called foreign aid programs are endangering our national economy via inflation and a national debt larger than all other nations combined. This is a very serious problem.

Then we have the problem of inflation and high cost of living affecting millions of our citizens with stationary or retirement incomes; the problems of agriculture, so important to our national economy; the problems of taxation and Federal aid to education. There are many other important State and National problems which you must think about and help in solving by participating in political and civic affairs of your community and our country.

Bear this fact in mind—the American people are currently in the throes of tormenting and frustrating readjustment. Both as a nation and as individuals we grew up accustomed to regard war and peace as distinctly separate states of affairs like day and night. But, today we live in an around-the-clock twilight of neither war nor peace.

Youth is the first victim of war: the first fruit of peace. It takes many years to make a man: it takes only a few seconds of war to destroy him.

Too much is being spent by all nations today in fear of war. Sixty-five percent of every Federal tax dollar collected in our country each year in a so-called peace period is spent on military affairs. If these resources were turned to peaceful uses, many, many more of the world's problems could be more easily solved.

Once upon a time, we led the world, we, Americans, towards a lighted window, and, I think this is important and certainly before we spend any more billions trying to buy collective security, we owe ourselves this backward glance. From 1789, until World War I, all other nations on planet earth were totalitarian except the United States. Did you ever stop to realize this?

In 1789 we were a little country of 3 million people completely surrounded by an ocean of totalitarianism. Everywhere else kings claimed to rule by divine right, others ruled with military might, but we alone ruled ourselves. What happened? Suddenly, the rest of the world watching our experiment in individual liberty and self-government began to copy us. Statesmen and writers visited the United States and returned home with glowing reports and the urge for freedom began to spread like a prairie fire across whole continents. The French threw off the yoke of their dissolute king and repacious aristocracy. England initiated sweeping democratic reforms. Mexico, and Central America and South America freed themselves from Spain.

From 1789 until the full World War I broke out, democracy was spreading around the world. How come? Our Nation had not given the old nations any money. We had sent forth no paid propagandists. We'd beamed no broadcasts beyond our neighbor's borders. We hadn't sent any experts overseas to show them how. We sent them no guns, no butter, no money. We made no concessions to foreigners which would penalize domestic producers. Our new Nation didn't insist on any mutual defense agreements. And, yet, though we ignored them, the older nations began to imitate our example and freedom was the world's dynamic, expanding force prior to 1914, and when the German dynasty collapsed in 1917, the Russian's in 1918, the last strongholds of despotism had fallen.

But now what? Suddenly democracy began to take itself for granted. Communism, fascism, nazism—these became the world's dynamic political forces. We shot two, but we failed to follow through, and since World War II, communism has captured approximately 100 million new disciples every year. Our better product has been left unsold because they have a better sales technique; because, instead of trying to lead other nations as our gallant 3 million forefathers did, we've been trying to push them. Our Declaration of Independence has been supplanted with half a hundred declarations of dependence on others and so, failing to command respect, we try to buy it.

Times have changed? No, times haven't changed. We have changed. For all our grandeur and our gold, we win fewer converts to democracy today than our great granddaddies did with nothing but a light in the window.

I remember August 1945, when suddenly a weapon 400 million times more lethal than anything ever before had been loosed on the world—we sat down in our councils of men chewing our fingernails up past the second knuckle worrying about what we are going to do with this hideous weapon that suddenly had been loosed upon us.

Even today, there are some who would say we should bury it in a cave in New Mexico

or, in concert with other nations, destroy this technological advantage. In World War III, God forbid it should ever be, they're going to outnumber us 8 to 3 and I mean even if all our frightened friends stick with us, the Soviets and their satellites are going to outnumber us better than 2 to 1.

We need Will Rogers with us today and I imagine he would say:

"Folks, I guess I ought to come back. Wyatt Earp is back and Matt Dillon and Bat Masterson and a lot of others.

"Do you know why folks nowadays like TV westerns? I'll tell you why. We've got so we can't do much for ourselves, anymore, so we like to watch somebody who could.

"Then a man could solve all his problems with a gun and a horse; today he needs radar, sonar, and an IBM machine.

"We had spacemen, though, back yonder. Cowboys ridin' herd on a quiet night in the middle of the prairie with all the heavens hung out above 'em. A cowboy could pick a star or the moon and go to it anytime he wanted. Must have gone to the moon a hundred times, sometimes twice a night.

"Then we went on those space flights for fun. Today you go on the run, scared. Little wonder. Some radio stations today make more noise just introducing a newscast than we did gettin' out the Claremore fire department. News ain't news, anymore. It's a round-the-clock warning.

"Why, you got a generation of parents scared of their own kids. Maybe it happened when you all moved to town. Men build great cities, but cities don't build great men.

"How many boys nowadays have seen a crop come on—and helped harvest it? How many boys know what it is to raise pigeons, to hear a screech owl at night, to be butted by a goat and 'rassle' a calf—that a 'possum can gnaw out of a wood box and be gone in the morning? That you don't have to sow weeds; you just put down the hoe and they'll choke out the flowers.

"How many boys know what nature always does to a coward or a loafer or a thief?

"The big city makes a man think he's boss—but he's not. That's why the Bible was written by farmers and shepherds and fishermen.

"Also, I figure this juvenile mischief was partly brought on by the safety razor and the electric shaver.

"So, 2 years in a row you had to go back to the one State of Mississippi to get yourself a beauty queen. You know, I remember once back in Claremore we had a beauty contest and nobody won. Nobody even came in second. A traveling man came in third and he wasn't even in the contest.

"So you took in Alaska and Hawaii? I'll say you did. Now they gotta kick into the Federal oversea kitty and provide asylum for their own old used Congressmen. Instead of askin' to be States, Alaska and Hawaii might a done better by askin' to make 'em full fledged foreign countries instead.

"Why did I leave this earth 'before my time,' as so many of you kind folks have said? I don't know. A fellow has something to do and he does it. He has something to say and he says it. After awhile there are new things to do and new people to do them, new things to say and new people to say them.

"The old fellow is from a different age and new people don't understand him. He is the 'old man around the house' who always wants to give advice. A man is seldom old enough to be a philosopher until he has looked into the eyes of his grandchild, and then he is so full of compassion and has so many warnings that the young'uns don't like to listen. A man had better do what he can and say what he has to say while he has people his own age to listen."

And then Will Rogers would probably say:

"My time's up. Thanks for lettin' me drop in like this. Now it's your turn. So long."

Well, at least Will Rogers was spared the indignity of TV. I got along so well for many years with radio that I kind of resent this TV stepchild in our midst. Also I seemed to have timed things so badly. Television was on the way in at the same time my hair was on the way out. But as some of you can attest, there's one thing about being bald—it's neat.

I keep remembering the old Mack Sennett comedies where the culprit chased by the policeman would point and say, "He went that-a-way." The policeman would tear off down the street after nobody and the thief would stroll home with the loot. We are chasing Russia and Russia is pointing at the moon and saying "That-a-way." While Russia prepares to pick up the marbles on planet Earth.

Soviet cars are now moving into U.S. markets. Khrushchev has declared economic war on us and when we strengthen his economy we're helping him win that war. Ten thousand Russian-made Moscovitch sedans have been ordered delivered in Syracuse, N.Y., where a dealer wants to sell them in the United States. But Congress is debating the space race and who will get first to Mars. Some of us are getting ulcers on our ulcers worrying that Russia might get to Mars before we do and the Russians have already landed in Syracuse.

Don't think the Soviet press wasn't delighted when that announcement was forthcoming. All 16 of Moscow's newspapers headlined the fact that "Soviet technical achievements are now such that Americans are having to buy Russian-made cars." In an economic war they construe this to be an American retreat.

Back in Washington military men are being called on the congressional carpet, confronted with the evidence that the Soviets are winning the space race and asked, "Why?" The result is almost certain to be an increased military budget, not because it makes sense, but because it will silence congressional critics in election year. Military men challenged, a military budget, military objectives, and we're not fighting a military war. We are engaged in an economic war, and we're not winning it.

In buying cars from the Soviets we are in effect supplying weapons to the enemy—inviting mass unemployment in the American automobile industry. Cheap foreign labor plus government subsidies have been enabling other countries to build 2,000-mile-an-hour jet airliners now, and we're not.

American manufacturers cannot afford to compete. The Russian and British Governments give tax dollars to the plane makers. CAB says unless our Government now subsidizes our plane makers, American airlines might be buying airliners from Russia in 5 years. I wonder if it isn't time for us to tend now to our homefront economy to keep us strong, to defend us against invasion from without and to think twice about hurling 100 missiles at the sky while Russia carefully tests only two.

I cannot help feeling—and I hope others will realize it—that our teachers in truth are our first line of national defense. In fact, they always have been, but we have never talked about it enough. Our school-teachers, who are so grossly underpaid, are the quiet force in this country that molds our most precious resource—our children. The full impact of the valuable service teachers give to the people of this country and its future, in a sense, ultimately guides the destiny of the free world. I earnestly hope, in the near future, that we can find a

way to provide for our school systems the additional Federal financial support which they so urgently need.

During the present period of world strife and tension in international affairs and in the future, you of the class of 1960 will play an important part in preserving our democracy and American way of life. You will be called upon as an American citizen to exercise your influence to keep and preserve our democracy and form of government and the liberties which we American people now enjoy.

I recall my graduation from high school as the proudest occasion of my life, and I know that this evening you are affected with a deep feeling of nostalgia; memories of your school days, teachers, and friends. Nothing is so delicate as friendship and yet, nothing is so durable, so necessary, so pleasant, so inspiring, and so profitable as fond lasting memories and friendships.

But your graduation today is not a day for looking back. You have not traversed enough of life's path for that. This is a proud day for looking forward to the future.

High school graduation is indeed one of the major milestones in the journey through life. It symbolizes the transition from a period of youthful preparation to a lifetime of adult service and citizenship.

Even so, I am confident that you will regard this as a beginning, and not an ending, of your quest for knowledge and experience, and that you will apply your talents and energies to the development of a finer and better America for the future.

You are now facing one of the first really big decisions of your life. You must decide whether or not you will go on from high school to college. With the possible exception of choosing your future vocation or a husband or wife, this decision will probably have as far-reaching effect upon your life as any other decision you will ever make. Whether you realize it or not, the pattern of your life for the next 50 years may be determined by your answer to this question.

The question of whether or not you should seek a college education is for you to decide, with guidance from your parents, teachers, and older friends who have been through the mill of college. Don't plan your future education without examining all available sources of education. Don't decide hurriedly. Don't be swayed or influenced by such factors as whether or not your best friend is going to a certain college with you.

It is true that a college education is now considered as important as a high school education 50 years ago. However, many of the best thinkers on the subject today believe that even though it is essential for nearly everyone to complete high school, it is not necessarily essential for every young person to complete college. Probably a 2-year or junior college plan will be desirable for many high school graduates. However, a student who plans to enter a profession or special fields or arts, science, or executive administrative work will be compelled to attend college from 4 to 8 years.

The American creed that all men are created equal is not exactly true. What is actually meant is that before God, before the law, and before our fellow men we all start equal, and there is equal opportunity for all who have the talent, the ambition, the courage, and personality to use that opportunity.

But, we should always bear in mind that opportunities are not always in faraway lands. For most people it can be found at home, or in their own community, country, or State.

I am sure that you have heard the story of the man who, in his youth, constantly dreamed and was determined to become rich and successful by exploring and discovering diamond mines. He left his farm home and traveled throughout the world—working and

toiling in his efforts to discover a diamond mine. Finally, in his old age, he returned back to his old home—sad and disillusioned. He resumed his farm operations on the old farm and one day while in his own backyard digging a well, he uncovered the greatest diamond mine ever discovered.

And so, in the battle of life, you can never be assured of the exact course one should travel for the location of financial success. But, above all financial success one may obtain in life, the most important success is happiness and contentment, and that success can never be achieved without honesty and faith.

Shakespeare said:

"This above all; to thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not be false to any man."

No better advice can be found for the young men of this class than the advice given to Andrew Jackson by his beloved mother. When Andrew Jackson left his mother in North Carolina as a boy to seek his fortune in the West, he knew he probably would never see her again. After the Battle of New Orleans, this great man told his comrades:

"Gentlemen, how I wish she could have lived to see this day. There was never a woman like her. She was gentle as a dove and brave as a lioness. Almost her last words to me when about to start for Charleston on the errand of mercy that cost her life were: 'Andrew, if I should not see you again I wish you to remember and treasure up some things I have already said to you: In this world you will have to make your own way. To do that you must have friends. You can make friends by being honest, and you can keep them by being steadfast. You must keep in mind that friends worth having will in the long run expect as much from you as they give to you. To forget an obligation or be ungrateful for a kindness is a base crime—not merely a fault or a sin, but an actual crime. Men guilty of it sooner or later must suffer the penalty. In personal conduct be always polite, but never obsequious. No one will respect you more than you esteem yourself. Avoid quarrels as long as you can without yielding to imposition. But sustain your manhood always. Never bring a suit of law for assault and battery or for defamation. The law affords no remedy for such outrages that can satisfy the feelings of a true man. Never wound the feelings of others. Never brook wanton outrage upon your own feelings. If ever you have to vindicate your feelings or defend your honor, do it calmly. If angry at first, wait till your wrath cools before you proceed.' Gentlemen, her last words have been the law of my life. The memory of my mother and her teachings were after all the only capital I had to start in life with, and on that capital I have made my way."

And to the young ladies of this class of 1960: I hope you will always remember that in whatever role your lives may be cast, whether as homemakers, in the professions, the business world, or in religion, real success, and happiness will depend far more on character than on any other single element you count among your resources. Character is a thing of many facets. In women, as in men, it means integrity, strength, courage, consideration for others, ability to discern, and appreciate what is worth while, and to pursue it in spite of every distraction and every obstacle.

In addition, in woman, it implies the development and enrichment of qualities that are her special God-given gifts—namely, gentleness, graciousness, and the capacity for unselfish, and yes, at times even heroic, dedication.

I commend the faculty for their great work in this school and I join with each member of the graduating class in expressing appreciation to your proud parents and all

others who provided for and made this high school graduation possible for you to achieve.

And I sincerely congratulate every one of you, the Slater High School class of 1960: Barbara Ackelberry, Emma Aldridge, Edna Baker, Jo Ann Bearden, Bobby Black, Betty Bock, Eldred Borgman, Larry Bossaller, Beverly Butts, Gay Byers, Catherine Coleman, Larry Cott, Wayne Cott, James Elliott, Jo Ann Feuers, Craig Gann, Everett L. Gilliam, Gladys Hader, LeRoy Hager, Birdie Hamilton, Lols Harris, Melody Ann Harriss, Brenda Herrmann, Kathleen Hogan, Nancy Huston, Corinthian Jaco, Jim Klasing, Sally Martin, Carol Ritterbusch McFarland, Edward McMeilen, John Miles, Doris Murphy, Edward Narron, Geary Norris, Anna Lee Norton, Wayne Ruppert, Audrey Shepard, Sherry Shook, Charles Smith, Terry Ann Taylor, Linn Van Winkle, Michael Walker, George Washington, Dickie Wise, Elizabeth Wykoff, and James Young.

With all good wishes for your happiness and success throughout life.

Air Transport Progress Is Discussed by Stuart Tipton at Morgantown, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce 40th Anniversary Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last night at Morgantown, W. Va., the chamber of commerce of that city held its annual dinner meeting in celebration of its 40th anniversary.

It was my privilege to have been a participant in the program in which Gov. Cecil H. Underwood and Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS made brief remarks.

The event, for which President Robert B. Creel ably served as toastmaster, was built principally around the theme of air-transport expansion and development and the importance of air transport to commerce, industry, educational progress, and community betterment.

To develop and discuss the topic, the organization appropriately had as guest speaker, Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, with whom I have had a most pleasant relationship which dates back to my 14 years of service in the House of Representatives during the 1930's and 1940's.

Stuart Tipton was one of the men in government who was active in the drafting of legislation which culminated in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. He later served in the agency, and still later became associated with the organization he now leads, composed of 49 air carriers employing 120,000 men and women.

Mr. Tipton congratulated the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce on its 40th anniversary and noted that the Air Transport Association is having its 25th anniversary this year. He competently developed the story of the quarter of a century of progress by the air transport system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extracts from Mr. Tipton's address.

There being no objection, extracts of the address were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF ADDRESS BY STUART TIPTON

It was just 25 years ago that the airlines got together and formed the Air Transport Association. That was the beginning of the creation of an air transport system. There were airlines operating before 1936, of course, but they were operating in a highly individualistic manner. The common ground of a trade, and service, organization, permitted the airlines to offer the public a truly integrated network of transportation.

That network is still the backbone of the Nation's air transportation.

I'd like to tell you a little about this network because it has a direct application to Morgantown, and indeed, every city in the United States.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 established certain guidelines for the Nation's airlines. The act said that the airlines were to serve the Nation's domestic and international commerce; the post office; and the national defense.

As part of this mandate, the airlines were certificated by the newly formed Civil Aeronautics Administration in 1938. They were awarded certificates of convenience and necessity. Convenience: For the traveling and shipping public. Necessity: Because the Congress of the United States realized even in those fledgling days of air transportation that the future was in the air. And, if the United States was to take the leadership in air transportation, Government encouragement and Government leadership were vital.

This has been the result. The United States now has the finest, most efficient, system of air transport in the world.

But, all of the credit for this growth cannot be assigned to a single, Federal source.

It must be shared by the managements of the airlines, and by their employees, and by the investors who provided the private funds that permitted the carriers to invest in continually better aircraft.

But, it must also be shared by some 50 States of the Nation, and hundreds of municipalities.

I say this because it was the States, cities, and local communities that saw the air age approaching and set about to prepare for it. They did this by building airports.

I don't think I have to tell you that without airports, you don't have a system of air transportation. And if you didn't have a system of air transportation, here are some of the things you wouldn't have:

Almost 55 million passengers traveling by air, spending about \$4 billion for food, lodging, entertainment, and other expenses, and about \$2 billion for the air transportation.

Almost 2 billion letters sent to U.S. citizens throughout the Nation.

More than 650 million ton-miles of freight and express flown throughout the country, and to overseas destinations. And, perhaps more importantly, a fleet of 1,900 aircraft that are ready to support the defense effort in time of cold, or hot, war. Some of these aircraft—about 300—are in what is known as the civil reserve air fleet. These planes, and their crews, are frontline, modern, four-engined planes, ready on 36-hour notice to support the military anywhere in the world, carrying troops and critical supplies.

Other planes are part of WASP, the War Air Service Pattern. Their mission is to provide support to the military effort within the United States.

And, of course, all of the scheduled airlines would take a major role in the trans-

portation of priority passengers on their regular routes and schedules during a crisis. It would be impossible for any transportation pattern to be devised that would not place primary reliance on air transport. Last year, for instance, 47 percent of all common carrier, intercity passenger-miles were handled by the commercial airlines.

Probably about this time, at the present rate of expansion, the total passenger-mile haul of the airlines is equal to the total of all intercity railroads and all buses.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in fact, said: "The importance of commercial air carriers and general aviation as elements of U.S. airpower has never been greater nor more influential than it is now."

But that's just one side of the contribution that the civil air transport system, and the civil airport system—and I can't emphasize that word system enough—make to the national defense.

Actually, the civil airport is an important link in the airpower chain. Here is how it works:

During World War II, about 430 airports were turned over to the military in the interest of the war effort. These fields had been designed, and built, from the ground up, to fulfill the needs of civil air commerce but the easy convertibility of peace to war needs made the transition smooth, and inexpensive.

And, today, 15 years after the end of hostilities, there are some 245 airports for which the Department of Defense has some military requirement. Just recently, the Air Force announced that it was considering plans for periodic or emergency dispersal of its B-47 bombers from military bases to civilian airports to help meet the growing Soviet missile threat."

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee also saw the overall value of the airport in terms of military preparedness. Last February, the committee pointed out that: Airports are not wholly local assets serving as vital and necessary links in the interstate flow of goods and passengers, in our foreign trade, in the discharge of Federal responsibility for the carriage of mail, and as active or standby facilities for military use." "Thus," the report went on, "in addition to the emergency value of civil airports, there is a day-to-day utilization of them by components of our Military Establishment."

And, I think you might be surprised to know that one out of every five landings or takeoffs at the Nation's civil airports is by a military plane.

The value, then, of airports in terms of the needs of the commercial airlines, and the national defense, is a dramatic, and visible, fact.

What is not as well known, perhaps because it is so well camouflaged into the routine fabric of community life, is the fact that the airport serves in other ways.

Take, for instance, that great and growing segment of activity known as general aviation.

The airlines operate less than 2,000 aircraft, the military about 37,000. General aviation—and by that I mean the private and company-owned aircraft—operates more than 70,000 planes.

Airports have provided an enormous stimulant to the postwar tendency to locate plants in smaller cities, and corporate aircraft have become flying offices—connecting the home factory, many miles away, with branch plants, subcontractors, and markets. Many corporations have established their own private airlines, in fact, and these are used in the main for trips to off-line airports. About 70 percent of the total passenger-miles of annual corporate flying is to these smaller airport cities.

The private pilot, and the student pilot, have a need for the airport because it provides the vital facilities—fuel, hangar space, trained mechanical personnel—that they must have. Some 400,000 men and women hold private pilot licenses. They are the nucleus of the Nation's reserve air strength, and the Civil Air Patrol.

It is not generally known that the airport is a tremendous asset to the farmer. In 46 States, farmer operators annually fly some 800,000 hours doing farm chores, such as spraying, seeding, dusting, surveying, checking crops, counting wild ducks, shooting coyotes, and fertilizing. Almost three-fourths of the Nation's airports sustain some portion of agricultural activity.

The airport today, then, is a key link in a circle of industrial and community development.

I have chosen "circle" as a description because it is more appropriate to the actual sequence of development than the analogy of the "chain."

Let's look at the circle. If you have an airport that is not up to date, that cannot adequately service all users, and I mean, of course, the private, the business, the corporate aircraft, as well as the commercial airline, then you will not be able to attract these users.

And, if you do not attract these users, the firms who are out scouting for new plant locations, will pass by your city, and look for one that can accommodate their aircraft.

If the plant scouts overlook your city, industrial development will lag and the need for commercial airline service that follows industrial development, with all of its attendant activity in terms of freight, passengers, and mail, will not materialize, and the airlines, too, will look for those cities that can produce the necessary amount of traffic.

Along about this time, you might find yourself like Goldsmith's "Deserted Village," where "village statesmen talked with looks profound—and news much older than their ale went round."

In brief, a community without an adequate airport in these days of air commerce, finds itself severely handicapped. It lacks that basic tool for getting, and doing business. As Gen. James Doolittle said: "A city's economic health depends to a considerable degree on its ability to accommodate aircraft efficiently and safely."

The modern-day ambitious city must grab that circle of development. And the place to grab hold is right at the threshold at the airport.

Let me bring this image into a little sharper focus and take a closer look at the Morgantown Airport.

As I understand it, the city council has decided to submit a \$790,000 airport improvement bond issue to the voters at a city election on June 7. This represents the first opportunity that voters will have had to vote on a bond issue to improve the airport.

Several times during the past 10 years, your city leaders have applied for, and received, matching funds from the Federal Government. But Morgantown was unable to meet the Federal appropriation on the required 50-50 basis.

What this has meant, of course, is that needed improvements have not been made at the airport, and its facilities are just about what they were about 20 years ago when the first scheduled airline service was introduced.

As some of the forward-looking leaders in your city have pointed out, you have, in effect, stood still in this era. But as you know, transportation does not stand still. The picture has changed. I'm told that railroad passenger service is no longer available at your city. Bus service has changed

only slightly. The highway network in and around the Morgantown area is inadequate.

So, your future, as well as that of any city, of any size, is in the air.

But, let's do a little arithmetic on the problem of the airport improvement. Let's see what you get for your investment.

Last year, for instance, there were an estimated 75 persons earning their living in Morgantown in the aviation fields. Their total payroll was close to \$350,000. And, more than half of the people were located at the airport itself.

Well, I've been talking in overall terms about the value of air transportation, now what does all this mean to Morgantown? It means this: Almost three-quarters of a million dollars a year.

Here's how it adds up. Last year, almost 10,000 persons came to Morgantown by air, most of them via commercial air transport. Their average stay was 3 days, and their average expenditure was \$25 a day. The total for the year: three-quarters of a million dollars.

But the bond issue only calls for \$790,000. Therefore, in the first year alone, your community will get back almost its entire investment.

And, of course, that return doesn't come back in chunks to a few; it spreads throughout the whole community—to hotels, and restaurants, and their suppliers; the retail stores, the local transit lines, the banks, the drugstores, and every kind of service and supply.

These figures are based on the "old" airport. A new airport, with adequate runway lengths, with more and better facilities for attracting the private pilot, the corporate plane, the commercial airliner, will add greatly to the return on the investment.

I can't imagine a better buy for the money.

But, looking at it from another point of view, suppose the airport is not improved. The impending sale of the Morgantown Ordnance Works brings the area to the doorstep of a potentially tremendous industrial expansion.

This expansion can only come about if you have a good "sky harbor"—available for industry and its ever-expanding and important labor force.

Also, consider the responsibility you have to the present industries and firms which are already here, and operating.

In order for them to compete with rival industries throughout the country, they, too, must have adequate air service, and an airport that can match that service.

A new hospital is going up at the university medical center. Much of the success of this new addition will depend upon the ease of transportation for the patients, visitors, medical specialists, staff, and critical supplies from Morgantown, to all parts of West Virginia.

But, this is the air age, and Morgantown, or Wheeling or any city in any State is not an entity, separate unto itself.

It is important, even essential, for instance, to Pittsburgh, that Morgantown have a modern airport because there are letters and express shipments, passengers, and freight, in Pittsburgh that are destined to be flown to Morgantown.

How many letters, how many passengers, how much freight is delivered, and how frequently, from just this one point depends upon what Morgantown is doing to improve its air facility: the airport.

This concept, really, is the heart of the Federal system of airports and it is why the Government does appropriate funds for airports throughout the country.

The Congress has passed, over the years, various pieces of legislation, and for varying amounts, to the end that this system would be strengthened.

They have had faith in the future of Morgantown as an important center of commerce. That's why, through the Federal Aviation Agency, funds are made available for the development, and improvement of your airport, and others.

They're described, as I said earlier, as "matching funds." What is needed, it seems to me, is for "matching faith" on the part of the Morgantown area residents who share the Government's optimism, as well as respect, for the potential of this city.

West Virginians can be well assured that they are being represented by legislators who understand the meaning of, and will work toward, the full realization of industrial and community development that the air age can bring.

Gen. Edward P. Curtis summed up what this means for all of us several years ago when he told President Eisenhower in a special report:

"The United States is becoming more and more an air community. During the last several years our national strategy has come to rest essentially upon airpower in its widening manifestations. The industrial skills devoted to air technologies now comprise the largest single pool of employment in manufacturing. The airplane has become the prime mover of our population in its circulation over distances of 200 miles. These developments are changing the American way of life, our habits of work, our national outlook. If they are given room to follow their logical evolutions they may well provide the principal sustaining elements to our social and economic well being as well as our national strength, for years to come."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in my remarks in introducing Mr. Tipton, I declared that West Virginia cities need better airlines service and suggested that there is a case pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board which could be most helpful to our State and its citizens, namely, the so-called Great Lakes Local Service case on which the Board should reach a decision, inasmuch as it has been processing the matter for more than 3 years.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed following these remarks, and at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, further excerpts from my talk at the chamber of commerce meeting.

There being no objection, excerpts from Senator RANDOLPH's remarks were ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT MORGANTOWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER MEETING, MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

The CAB, by other decisions in recent years, has established a pattern of strengthening local service carriers, either by substituting them for larger trunklines in smaller and medium-size cities, or by decertifying long-haul airlines at points where the feeder carriers have already been serving in conjunction with the bigger companies.

The purpose of these air traffic pattern changes has been to improve schedule frequency, and, at the same time, reduce the subsidy of the local carriers. The CAB has applied this program to dozens of cities, and it is significant that, although some communities raised questions at the time the issue was posed, I know of none which objected after the alteration in service was instituted.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, following receipt of the examiner's report last September, has had more than 7 months to reach a decision in the Great Lakes Local Service case which could be the means for real improvement in air traffic for numerous communities of West Virginia and other nearby States.

Frequency of service, and increased aircraft departures and enplaned passengers, are vital to our State. It has been the experience of other States and areas that frequency of departures and passenger increases have been stepped up as much as threefold after the changeover to local carrier service has been accomplished.

Then, too, new and expanded air transport service will aid in the industrial development of West Virginia.

It is appropriate, however, that I speak of the splendid service which has been provided to our State and its citizens by both trunklines and local carriers during the pioneering and transition period in which the pattern of airline service has been changing. I mention especially the American, Capital, Eastern, Trans World, Allegheny, and Piedmont Airlines.

I emphasize that it has been almost 8 months since a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, after more than 3 years of investigations, made recommendations to the Board.

I do not imply any prejudice as to how the CAB should rule in deciding the case, but it does seem unreasonable that the Board should further delay a formal ruling which I hope would be consistent with the pattern it has established for other areas in recent years. Such a decision is vital to a number of West Virginia communities, especially those which presently experience too-infrequent aircraft arrivals and departures, such as Morgantown, Clarksburg-Fairmont, Elkins, Wheeling, Parkersburg, Huntington, Beckley, and Bluefield. Any decision improving local service schedules likewise would benefit aerial intercourse between these communities and the Capital City at Charleston, a trunkline airport city.

Recently, I addressed the members of the CAB and brought to their attention a special study which shows the remarkable increase in schedules and traffic enplaned at a number of typical cities in the year immediately following replacement of a trunkline by a local carrier, or suspension of a trunkline where a local carrier was already operating.

It was noted, for example, that at Bristol, Va., a trunkline company had 4,559 aircraft departures the year prior to August 25, 1952, whereas its successor on that date—a local service airline presently serving West Virginia—had 6,605 aircraft departures during its first year of operations at that airport following the August 25, 1952 trunkline-to-local service changeover. The trunkline had served 19,195 passengers the year prior to that date, whereas the local service airline successor served 29,416 passengers its first year at Bristol.

At Mansfield, Ohio, where another local service airline which figures in the case presently pending before the CAB replaced a trunkline had only 658 aircraft departures the year prior to April 15, 1953. But the local carrier successor had 2,332 aircraft departures its first year in service at Mansfield following that changeover date. Enplaned passengers increased from the 2,961 served the last year by the trunkline to 4,444 served by the local service airline its first year at Mansfield.

Equally significant changes could, and probably would, occur at the Morgantown, Clarksburg-Fairmont, Elkins, Wheeling, Parkersburg, Huntington, and other airports in West Virginia if the case pending before the CAB for so long could now be expedited and implemented.