United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

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

Father of all mercies, with the unsatisfied desires of our yearning hearts, we turn unfilled to Thee.

Like the flowers in June gardens uplifted to the sun, like still waters that mirror the eternal stars, so we would lift our needy souls to Thee, our light and our life. Without Thee, our science but whets the sword to a sharper edge, and would destroy us with our own wheels and wings.

Without Thee, even learning cannot redeem us, for we know now that the mere sharpening of the intellect, the massing and mastery of facts and figures, may but fit men to be tenfold more masterful in the awful art of slaughter.

And so we pray that Thou wilt shatter our delusions, shine through our blindness, and shame our pride, that in folly we stray not away from Thee and the things that belong to our peace.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. AIKEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 13, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10021. An act providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10921. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10952. An act to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society;

H.R. 11931. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12055. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12520. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939, so as to authorize Group Hospitalization, Inc., to enter into contracts with certain dental hospitals for the care and treatment of individuals, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12584. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 12597. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 10021. An act providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10921. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10952. An act to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society;

H.R. 11931. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12055. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12520. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939, so as to authorize Group Hospitalization, Inc., to enter into contracts with certain dental hospitals for the care and treatment of individuals, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12584. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 12597. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee and the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the nominations of U.S. marshals.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

T. Harold Scott, of Colorado, to be an Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, vice Arthur V. Watkins.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive E, 86th Congress, 2d session. A Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan, signed at Washington on January 19, 1960 (Ex. Rept. No. 8).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the U.S. marshal nominations, will be stated.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the U.S. marshal nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNCLAIMED FUNDS ACT FOR LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the administration of unclaimed funds held and owing by life insurance companies in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 960, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF WEST CENTRAL TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION OF WADENA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, members of the West Central Telephone Association of Wadena, Minn., have unanimously approved a resolution calling for elimination of the Federal excise tax on telephone service. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, approved at the association's annual meeting on June 6, 1960, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 10-percent wartime Federal excise tax was imposed as a temporary measure; and

Whereas that, unlike jewelry, furs, and liquor, the telephone is not a luxury item, but is an everyday necessity, and, therefore, should be classified as an essential service along with other utilities such as water, gas, and electricity; and

Whereas Congress voted last year to drop the Federal excise tax on local telephone service June 30, 1960: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be asked not to rescind the repeal action of last year and the Federal tax on local service be eliminated.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. Res. 329. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 330. Resolution to study the conditions in American Samoa; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

H.R. 11706. An act to authorize an extension of time for final proof under the desert-land laws under certain conditions (Rept. No. 1568).

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

H.R. 6456. An act concerning payment of debts out of compensation for trust land on the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation taken by the United States (Rept. No. 1578);

H.R. 6498. An act concerning payment of debts out of compensation for trust land on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation taken by the United States (Rept. No. 1579);

H.R. 6529. An act concerning payment of debts out of compensation for trust land on the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation taken by the United States (Rept. No. 1580);

H.R. 9028. An act to provide that certain funds shall be paid to the Kickapoo Tribal Council of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 1581); and

H.R. 10639. An act 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 Missouria Tribe and to per capita distribution of judgment funds (Rept. No. 1582).

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

H.R. 11161. An act to donate to the pueblos of Zia and Jemez a tract of land in the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant, New Mexico (Rept. No. 1577).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 3319. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to release the recapture provisions contained in the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Little Rock, Ark., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1569); and

S. 3486. A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture, and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1570).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 3439. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet (Rept. No. 1572).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 3158. A bill to exempt State controlled banks belonging to the Federal Reserve System from the statutory limits on the number of their directors (Rept. No. 1571).

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

H.R. 12052. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, for an additional 2 years (Rept. No. 1573).

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. 3549. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation (Rept. No. 1574).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 11390. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1576).

HOUSING ACT OF 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 3670) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1575) thereon, which was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "DOCUMENTATION, INDEXING, AND RETRIEVAL OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION"

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 333) to print additional copies of the report entitled "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information", prepared by the staff of

the Committee on Government Operations, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, and that four thousand three hundred additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 3668. A bill relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishment of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3669. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3670. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above bill when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS: THE NEED FOR FAIR COMPETITION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. BUSH submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 110) relative to consideration of certain tariff reductions and wage differentials at the coming GATT Conference, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

RESOLUTION

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 333) to print additional copies of the report entitled "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS: THE NEED FOR FAIR COMPETITION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the representatives of the United States to the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade must not only put into effect the President's recommendation to withhold reductions on tariffs on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country, but should also consider wage differentials, in order to protect American labor and industry, and work for the development of fair labor standards in exporting countries in the interests of fair competition in international trade.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution gives Congress the opportunity to express itself concerning the growing problem created by imports from foreign countries in which wages and labor standards are far below those prevailing in the United States.

I am glad that this problem is now being recognized by the labor unions in my own State of Connecticut. The third constitutional convention of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, in September 1959, adopted a resolution on international trade policy which calls attention to the unfair competition from foreign imports based on unduly low wages and labor standards in exporting countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution, a letter I addressed to Mr. Joseph M. Rourke, secretary-treasurer of the council, in response to his request for my comments upon the council's resolution, and that resolution, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution, letter, and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 110), submitted by Mr. BUSH, was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the preservation of existing jobs in American industry is vital to the national economy, and the expanding population of the United States requires the constant creation of new employment opportunities; and

Whereas the general levels of wages paid to industrial workers in foreign countries are substantially below levels prevailing in the United States, thus increasing the competitive standing of foreign producers in international trade; and

Whereas foreign labor unions generally have weaker bargaining powers than those of this country, which makes closing of the wage cost differential between foreign and domestic producers a difficult and slow process; and

Whereas the Eighty-fifth Congress passed the Trade Agreements Extension Act in August 1958, authorizing the President within the four-year period ending June 30, 1962, to reduce existing customs duties in stages by any one of three alternative methods as follows:

1. Reducing the rate existing on July 1, 1958, by not more than 20 per centum, provided that no more than a 10 per centum reduction may be made effective in any one year;

2. Reducing the rate existing on July 1, 1958, by not more than 2 per centum ad valorem (or the ad valorem equivalent, in the case of a specific rate or a combination of ad valorem and specific rates), provided that no more than a 1 per centum reduction may be made effective in any one year;

3. Reducing to 50 per centum ad valorem or its equivalent a rate which is in excess of that level, provided that no more than one-third of the total reduction may be made effective in any one year;

Whereas an international conference held under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will be convened in Geneva, Switzerland, in September 1960, and continue into 1961; and

Whereas the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Organization, consisting of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior, the United States Tariff Commission, and the International Cooperation Administration, has published a Notice of United States Intention to Negotiate and a List of Products to be Considered for Possible United States Concession, subject to modifications following a "peril point" investigation by the United States Tariff Commission; and

Whereas the President has recommended that the United States "withhold reductions in tariffs on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country" and that the United States seek to raise labor standards in foreign countries "through consultative procedures and cooperation in international conferences such as those sponsored by the International Labor Organization": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the representatives of the United States to the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade must not only put into effect the President's recommendation to withhold reductions in tariffs on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country, but should also consider wage differentials, in order to protect American labor and industry, and work for the development of fair labor standards in exporting countries in the interests of fair competition in international trade.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. BUSH are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED FORCES,
February 25, 1960.

Mr. JOSEPH M. ROURKE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, Hamden, Conn.

DEAR JOE: When I dictated my letter to you yesterday concerning the Connecticut State Labor Council's resolutions on post office workers, I was not aware that your letter to me also enclosed a resolution on international trade policy and did not see the latter resolution until my reply was placed before me for signature.

I am glad, indeed, to comment on the resolution on international trade policy, which I thoroughly approve. I must confess that I read it with a smile, for I recall very vividly the days in 1953 when, as a newly appointed member of the Randall Commission, I vainly sought advice from the Connecticut AFL and CIO, then separate organizations, as to their positions on the issues the Commission was facing. I was told, as I recall, that the opinion of your membership was so divided on these controversial questions that an official expression of views could not be made. I might say that I got the same reaction from the Connecticut Association of Manufacturers, and the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce.

So, as a member of the Randall Commission, I had to face the issues without guidance from the groups in our State most immediately affected—the labor unions, and the manufacturers and businessmen. I went ahead on my own, and, at the risk of appearing immodest, I believe that my persuasion, at least in part, led to the Commission's recommendation to retain the "peril point" and "escape clause" safeguards in the Trade Agreements Act, and to the paragraph in the Commission's report which is quoted in

the Connecticut State Labor Council's resolution. I refer to the paragraph urging that in tariff negotiations, representatives of the United States "should simply make clear that no tariff concessions will be granted on products made by workers receiving wages that are substandard in the exporting country."

Indeed, former Congressman John Vorys, of Ohio, and I went further in a concurring statement. We took the view that our negotiators should consider not only substandard and depressed wage levels in the exporting country, but also wage differentials, as between American and foreign industries, in order to protect American labor. You will find our statement on page 63 of the Commission's formal report.

As I interpret paragraphs on the second page of your Council's resolution, it appears that your Council is now very nearly in accord with the views expressed 6 years ago by Mr. Vorys and myself. I refer to the paragraph pointing to the danger of "unfair competition from foreign imports based on unduly low wages and labor standards in the exporting country" and the following paragraph urging that "where it is clearly demonstrated that jobs are being lost by American workers as a result of such imports, consideration be given to the placing of adequate protective tariffs and quotas on typewriters and other products that are affected by foreign imports which now enter this country free and clear of any import duties."

I think it should be pointed out, however, that a foreign industry's wage rate may be standard, or even above standard, in its own country, and yet be far below the wage rate paid by a competing industry in this country. In such cases, I believe it is proper to consider the imposition of tariffs and quotas to protect American labor producing the goods affected, whether or not the competing imports are now entering duty-free.

I agree, of course, with your council's view that wage differentials cannot be controlling, but I believe this is a factor which should always be considered, especially in cases involving American industries particularly vulnerable to imports from countries with very low prevailing wage rates.

Finally, Joe, I hope that you will give this letter wide circulation among the members of the constituent unions of your council. As one who has often been marked "wrong" on Cope's voting scoreboards—on the basis, in my opinion, of politically slanted choices of issues—I'd like Connecticut union workers to know that on this issue—and a very important one for the protection of their jobs and wage standards—I was "right."

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH.

RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY

(Resolution adopted by the third constitutional convention of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, September 10, 11, 12, 1959)

The past several years have seen the economic recovery of many industrial nations of the non-Communist world, in many cases greatly aided by U.S. help in the form of Marshall plan aid, and other forms of economic assistance. As these countries reentered the world market, they have sent more and more products to the U.S. market in direct competition with manufactured goods produced by domestic industries.

In Connecticut the competition offered by many of these products has had an adverse effect on the total business of Connecticut firms, because of the lower prices of the imported products; and some manufacturers have urged unions representing their employees to seek the imposition of higher tariffs or import quotas to limit the amount of competing goods which could be sold in U.S. markets. Among the Connecticut industries which have felt the effects of this import competition are the textile, hat, apparel, flatware, typewriter, sewing machine, brass fabricating, and rubber footwear.

The policy of high protective tariffs has previously been tried and found ineffectual, as late as the 1930's, when the Smoot-Hawley tariff measure succeeded in reducing the volume of imports but also resulted in reciprocal high tariffs in foreign countries. This cut down our substantial export trade to a fraction of its previous volume, thus eliminating additional industry and jobs in this country. The high protective tariff policy was abandoned after the great depression and was followed by the reciprocal trade agreements program.

1. AFL–CIO POLICY

The American labor movement has vigorously supported the reciprocal trade agreements program from its very inception more than two decades ago. This traditional support was reemphasized in the resolution unanimously adopted at the 1957 convention of the AFL–CIO. The resolution urged extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of at least 5 years with reenforcement of "the basic goal of the Reciprocal trade program, the gradual reduction of barriers to trade without undue hardship to American industries or American workers. The achievement of this goal must be sought, however, in the light of present-day conditions in our own Nation and in the nations allied with us in the common struggle for the preservation of freedom and democracy."

2. FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

The labor movement has also long advocated the principle that fair competition in international trade requires fair labor standards in exporting industries. This principle has been given at least some official recognition in recent years.

In its January 1954 report, the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (Randall Commission) stated: "The clearest case of unfair competition is one in which the workers on a particular commodity are paid wages well below accepted standards in the exporting country. In such cases, our negotiators should simply make clear that no tariff concessions will be granted on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country."

If this is the objective we are seeking, then our course should be to determine tariff policy in accordance with a liberal trade policy, but for those items made in industries where there are unfair labor standards in the exporting countries, existing concessions should be conditional upon sincere efforts in the exporting country to eliminate unfair labor standards. Failure of the exporting country to take steps to eliminate unfair labor standards should be grounds for withdrawal of the concession.

As a first step, U.S. representatives to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade Agency (GATT) should urge acceptance of a clause on fair labor standards in international trade similar to the one proposed in 1953. Toward this end, and in preparation for the multilateral tariff negotiations to take place in 1960, U.S. representatives should ascertain the facts regarding wage levels and working conditions in industries in exporting countries. In such negotiations, specific recognition should be given to the level of labor standards in such industries in any tariff concessions the United States may be prepared to offer.

In making these recommendations, we are fully aware that it is neither desirable nor feasible that wage levels be equalized in all countries. We recognize that the stage of development of a country's economy and the productivity of its industries may limit the level of wages that can be paid. Therefore, it is to be expected that wage differentials will continue to exist, and such disparities should not impede international trade. But we insist that wages and working conditions in exporting industries fully reflect the productivity and technological advance of the industry and the national economy. Substandard wage levels or working conditions are clear evidence of the existence of unfair competition in international trade and should be eliminated as rapidly as possible.

Development of a fair labor standard in international trade will benefit workers and employers in the United States because it will assure them that they will not be faced by unfair competition from foreign imports based on unduly low wages and labor standards in the exporting country. In the exporting countries themselves, promotion of fair labor standards will contribute significantly to advancement of living standards and economic growth. The people of those countries will find, as we have found in America, that decent wages and decent working conditions promote domestic purchasing power, industrial productivity and sound economic growth.

We also urge that where it is clearly demonstrated that jobs are being lost by American workers as a result of such imports, consideration be given to the placing of adequate protective tariffs and quotas on typewriters and other products that are affected by foreign imports which now enter this country free and clear of any import duties.

This third constitutional convention of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, therefore goes on record as urging our representatives in Congress to support most actively the adoption of the policy set forth in this resolution.

DESIGNATION OF DOUGLAS McKAY DAM AND RESERVOIR, OREG.—AMENDMENT

Mr. LUSK. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to H.R. 7634, to name the Detroit Dam and Reservoir on the North Santiam River, Oreg., after Oregon's late Governor and former Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay.

The Senate, on August 19, 1959, passed S. 2440, providing that the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir be named the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir. In the House, however, an amendment was adopted which provided that the Detroit Dam and Reservoir be named after Douglas McKay. A further amendment was adopted which has nothing to do with the naming of any Oregon dam. That amendment seems to be controversial and has resulted in no final action being taken on the proposal to name the dam after the late Douglas McKay.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the printed House committee report on S. 2440, prepared and submitted by the Interior Committee appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DOUGLAS M'KAY DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Detroit Dam is located on North Santiam River 60 miles above its confluence with South Santiam River. The North and South Santiam Rivers unite to form Santiam River, which 10 miles downstream enters the Willamette River. The main Detroit Dam is a concrete gravity structure about 454 feet high and 1,522 feet long. The reservoir has a usable storage capacity of 340,000 acre-feet. The project also provides for a reregulating structure 3 miles downstream at the Big

Cliff site. This structure, also concrete gravity type, is approximately 172 feet high and has a usable storage capacity of 2,430 acre-feet. The power-generating facilities at the main site include two units of 50,000 kilowatts each. The reregulating structure has a power installation of 18,000 kilowatts.

The project was selected for construction under the authorization contained in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. The Flood Control Acts of December 22, 1944, and July 24, 1946, modified the project to provide for recreational facilities, and the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, authorized installation of power facilities including construction of the reregulating structure. The cost of the completed project was $62,730,000.

Douglas McKay was born in Portland, Oreg., in 1893. He served as mayor of Salem, Oreg., served several terms in the Oregon State Senate, and as Governor of Oregon from 1949 to 1953. He was appointed Secretary of the Interior on January 21, 1953, and resigned from that position in May 1956. He was appointed as Chairman, International Joint Commission, in August 1957, and served until his death on July 22, 1959.

Mr. McKay was a distinguished political leader of Oregon for more than a quarter of a century. He was always interested in the development of the natural resources of the Nation, particularly the water resources. He was Governor of Oregon during the time the major projects in the Columbia River Basin were authorized. In his capacity as Chairman of the International Joint Commission, he served with distinction, and deserves much of the credit for the progress which has been made in reaching an understanding with Canada with respect to the use of the Columbia River waters.

The committee believes it fitting that the Detroit Dam and Reservoir be named for Mr. McKay in recognition of his long and outstanding service to the State of Oregon, the Pacific Northwest, and to the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX FOR SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT TRUSTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of New Jersey submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8229) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FONG submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 19, line 2, after the word "titles:", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, allotments under title III of said Act for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language equipment and minor remodeling of facilities and for grants to States for supervisory and other services, shall be made in such manner as to extend the benefits thereof to the State of Hawaii on the basis of equality with the other States."

Mr. FONG also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. FONG also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 21, line 19, after the word "year:", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, allotments under section 2 of the said Act shall be made in such manner as to extend the benefits of such section to the State of Hawaii on the basis of equality with other States."

Mr. FONG also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. FONG also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, page 28, line 15, after the word "herein", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, allotments under such parts C and G shall be made in such manner as to extend the benefits of such parts to the State of Hawaii on the basis of equality with the other States."

Mr. FONG also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1961—AMENDMENT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit an amendmnet to H.R. 11390, the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The amendment provides $7,362,000 for payment to school districts for fiscal year 1959. This is the amount of the entitlement of the school districts of the United States which was unappropriated and unpaid under Public Law 874.

I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a tabulation showing the loss of funds, under Public Law 874, resulting from the 5-percent deficit for the fiscal year 1959. The tabulation shows, by States, the total number of applicants and the total entitlement remaining unpaid at this time. It also lists the school districts having a loss of over $10,000 in each State.

I am happy to be joined by 38 Senators as cosponsors, and I have the assurance of many more of their support of this amendment.

Mr. President, if we are not to appropriate the full amount of the entitlement to the school districts who have made application under existing law, then we should amend the law to provide that they are not entitled to the full amount which they have been told they would receive on the basis of the Federal impact upon their school districts.

This appropriation, in my estimation, must be passed, if we are to keep faith with the districts which had every reason to believe that they are entitled to these funds, and who were paid only 95 percent of that to which they are entitled under the law enacted by this Congress and signed by the President of the United States.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may lie on the desk until the opening of the Senate tomorrow, to enable other Senators to become cosponsors, if they see fit.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, also, to have printed as a part of my remarks a tabulation entitled "Loss of Funds Under Public Law 874 Resulting From 5-Percent Deficit for Fiscal 1959." That is the deficit which this amendment is calculated to reimburse.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the tabulation will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, submitted by Mr. KERR (for himself, and Senators MONRONEY, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, YARBOROUGH, COOPER, ENGLE, GREEN, TALMADGE, BEALL, MCNAMARA, HART, PASTORE, RANDOLPH, CASE of South Dakota, YOUNG of North Dakota, CHURCH, MORSE, GRUENING, MCGEE, MUNDT, CHAVEZ, SCOTT, LONG of Hawaii, FULBRIGHT, ERVIN, FONG, SYMINGTON, BENNETT, MANSFIELD, SCHOEPPEL, KEFAUVER, CARROLL,

ANDERSON, BARTLETT, HARTKE, CANNON, MOSS, HENNINGS, MURRAY, and KUCHEL), was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts," fiscal year 1959, $7,362,000.

The tabulation presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

LOSS OF FUNDS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 RESULTING FROM 5-PERCENT DEFICIT FOR FISCAL 1959

School districts having a loss of over $10,000 are listed individually.

	Loss in dollars
Alabama:	
Total applicants 53	177,200
Huntsville City	24,100
Montgomery County	22,800
Mobile County	38,900
Alaska:	
Total 20 applicants	144,000
Territory of Alaska	75,900
Anchorage ISD	29,500
Arizona:	
Total 109 applicants	176,500
Fort Defiance	15,600
Tucson ESD	29,400
Tucson HSD	13,300
Fort Huachuca accom	14,900
Page accom	11,800
Arkansas:	
Total 36 applicants	44,700
Pulaski County spec. SD	12,700
California:	
Total 398 applicants	1,335,800
Monterey City	30,700
Folsom Jt. Unif	13,200
Monterey UHSD	10,100
Coronado Unif. SD	11,200
San Juan ESD	13,400
Rio Linda USD	14,300
Vallejo Unif. SD	36,700
Alameda Unif. SD	19,900
Grant UHSD	11,100
Mount Diablo Unif. SD	13,000
Oceanside-Libby USD	13,800
China Lake Jt. SD	18,600
Chula Vista City	13,300
Crystal USD	10,700
Sweetwater UHSD	12,100
Lompoc USD	11,800
Kern County Jt. UHSD	10,800
San Diego Unif. SD	132,900
City of San Bernardino	17,300
City of San Bernardino HSD	10,500
Lancaster SD	13,700
Sacramento City USD	18,900
San Francisco Unif. SD	42,900
Antelope Valley Jt. UHSD	13,100
Long Beach Unif. SD	57,700
Riverside City	12,000
Torrance Unif. SD	13,900
Oakland Unif. SD	34,300
Muroc Unif. SD	12,600
Colorado:	
Total 80 applicants	212,700
Lakewood	13,100
Colorado Springs	31,900
Denver	55,800
Pueblo	13,000
Fountain	16,100
Adams-Arapahoe Jt. SD	17,400
Connecticut:	
Total 39 applicants	75,900
Town of Groton	24,100
Delaware: Total 9 applicants	9,100
Florida:	
Total 18 applicants	208,200
Escambia County	28,300
Brevard County	36,600
Bay County	11,000
Monroe County	16,100
Duval County	38,200
Okaloosa County	19,800
Hillsborough County	11,400
Orange County	12,300
Georgia:	
Total 76 applicants	200,200
Cobb County	20,200
Bibb County	19,000
Houston County	19,000
City of Savannah	10,700
Muscogee County	27,000
Richmond County	16,800
Dougherty County	12,000
Hawaii: 1 applicant	145,700
Idaho:	
Total 36 applicants	58,800
Mountain Home	11,600
Illinois:	
Total 88 applicants	125,600
North Chicago	19,400
Rantoul City	16,700
Mascoutah Comm. Unit	11,900
Indiana: Total 106 applicants	37,000
Iowa: Total 25 applicants	20,200
Kansas:	
Total 200 applicants	199,500
Junction City	16,900
Wichita City SD	49,300
Fort Leavenworth	11,400
Kentucky:	
Total 52 applicants	51,400
Jefferson County	11,900
Louisiana:	
Total 10 applicants	45,200
Bossier Parish	14,000
Maine:	
Total 63 applicants	61,900
Town of Limestone	19,600
Maryland:	
Total 14 applicants	293,200
Harford County	26,600
Anne Arundel County	33,000
Montgomery County	89,800
Prince George's County	79,900
St. Mary's County	13,800
Washington County	12,400
Massachusetts:	
Total 139 applicants	205,500
Town of Ayer	10,500
City of Springfield	11,100
City of Chicopee	19,700
Bourne SD	14,200
Michigan: Total 75 applicants	38,100
Minnesota: Total 32 applicants	19,000
Mississippi:	
Total 22 applicants	58,500
Biloxi Mun, Sep	13,400
Missouri:	
Total 130 applicants	93,600
Waynesville Reorg, SD	12,400
Montana: Total 77 applicants	53,300
Nebraska:	
Total 35 applicants	70,700
Omaha	11,100
Lincoln	20,800
Bellevue	20,000
Nevada:	
Total 11 applicants	52,700
Clark County	28,800
New Hampshire:	
Total 30 applicants	40,800
City of Portsmouth	25,300
New Jersey:	
Total 114 applicants	121,400
Pemberton Township	17,200
Eatontown	11,000
New Mexico:	
Total 51 applicants	183,200
Alamogordo Mun	17,200
Albuquerque Mun	59,500
Las Cruces	18,100
Gallup-McKinley Counties	17,100
New York:	
Total 161 applicants	182,000
Rome City SD	21,100
North Carolina:	
Total 30 applicants	84,100
Craven County	13,000
Fayetteville	11,100
Cumberland County	12,400
Onslow County	13,700
North Dakota: Total 24 applicants	13,500
Ohio:	
Total 163 applicants	192,400
Dayton	26,700
Fairborn	11,900
Columbus	35,200
Oklahoma:	
Total 278 applicants	280,400
Midwest City	40,000
Lawton	36,400
Tulsa	22,400
Oklahoma City	35,700
Oregon: Total 89 applicants	40,300
Pennsylvania:	
Total 138 applicants	190,000
Philadelphia	91,600
Rhode Island:	
Total 21 applicants	69,500
Newport	18,500
Town of Middletown	12,800
Town of North Kingstown	15,500
South Carolina:	
Total 30 applicants	122,500
North Charlestown	21,500
Columbia	11,100
Beaufort County	11,200
Aiken County	14,200
South Dakota:	
Total 53 applicants	81,400
Rapid City	15,400
Douglas	16,900
Tennessee:	
Total 49 applicants	81,900
Shelby County	10,100
Knox County	10,100
Texas:	
Total 263 applicants	478,000
Fort Worth	38,500
Ysleta	19,200
El Paso	49,400
Killeen	18,500
Edgewood	11,200
San Antonio	50,300
Randolph Field	12,200
Fort Sam Houston	15,700
Abilene	11,100
Arlington	11,000
Corpus Christi	12,000
Utah:	
Total 12 applicants	69,200
Tooele County	10,400
Weber County	12,300
Ogden City	12,600
Davis County	24,300
Vermont: Total 4 applicants	3,900
Virginia:	
Total 45 applicants	542,500
County of Princess Anne	39,500
City of Portsmouth	21,400
City of Hampton	20,300
County of Arlington	72,000
County of Fairfax	130,900
County of Norfolk	36,400
City of Norfolk	83,700
City of Alexandria	29,500
County of Prince William	12,600
Washington:	
Total 192 applicants	327,300
Clover Park	18,100
Highland	13,400
Bremerton Cons. SD	21,700
Moses Lake	12,300
Tacoma	19,200
Dupont-Ft. Lewis SD	18,200
Seattle	39,800
Spokane	10,000
West Virginia: Total 5 applicants	6,000
Wisconsin: Total 45 applicants	26,000
Wyoming:	
Total 17 applicants	22,700
Cheyenne	11,200
Guam	30,000
Virgin Islands	2,200

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL-STATE JURISDICTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 7, 1960, the name of Senator MCNAMARA was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3633) to amend section 14(c) of the National Labor Relations Act relating to Federal-State jurisdiction, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS on June 7, 1960.

FOREIGN COMPETITION WITH AMERICAN INDUSTRY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 13, 1960, the names of Senators HICKENLOOPER, WILEY, HRUSKA, COTTON, DWORSHAK, BUSH, KEATING, AIKEN, JAVITS, PROUTY, BENNETT, SCOTT, BRIDGES, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMITH, CASE of New Jersey, and CARLSON were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN on June 13, 1960.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join in cosponsorship of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to create a Commission on International Trade which would be designed to study the influence of foreign trade upon the U.S. economy.

I stress these thoughts at this time, however. I hope the Commission will not only take into consideration the domestic and foreign-policy implications to the United States in terms of its economics, but also in terms of its peace leadership, for the political and diplomatic implications of the U.S. trade policy in our struggle to cope with the massive and many-faceted Communist challenge, in my opinion, is at least equal to those in their importance.

This must be emphasized because, in foreign trade as in so many other aspects of our national life, we are going to have to make some sacrifices in order to keep the world free.

Furthermore, I know such a Commission will avail itself of the manifold resources and talent available in such agencies of the U.S. Government as the Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, and other agencies of government, as well as private agencies. The experience and the information that has been accumulated in these organs of government will, I am sure, provide invaluable assistance to the work of the Commission.

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this being Flag Day, it is well that we recall the story of how our flag got its nickname, Old Glory.

One bitterly cold day in 1830, the *Charles Dagett* stood ready to set sail in Salem Harbor. The captain, William Driver, was about to begin the ceremonies for the embarkation.

A sailor passed to him the flag folded in the form of a triangle, and said:

> Sir, in the days gone by, it was the custom of sailors embarking on a journey to dedicate the flag to the Trinity—God, the Father; God, the Son; and God, the Holy Ghost. Then, after benediction, the flag was unfurled and raised, and the sailors would shout "Glory, glory, glory."

As Captain Driver looked up at the flag being hoisted, he cried out:

> To thee, let me call thee "Old Glory."

Thirty years later, during the Civil War, the city of Nashville, Tenn., fell to soldiers of the North. Ceremonies were planned to fly the Stars and Stripes, but the flag in use for the occasion was too small.

Captain Driver, still in possession of "Old Glory," was there. He offered the flag for the ceremony. A cry went up from the crowd. Someone shouted "Old Glory"; and the famous nickname stuck. It has been the popular name for the American flag ever since.

Mr. President, today being Flag Day, I wish to quote the words from "A Toast to the Flag," by John Daly:

> Here's to the red of it.
> There's not a thread of it,
> No, nor a shred of it,
> In all the spread of it
> From foot to head,
> But heroes bled for it,
> Faced steel and lead for it,
> Precious blood shed for it,
> Bathing it red.
>
> Here's to the white of it.
> Thrilled by the sight of it,
> Who knows the right of it,
> But feels the might of it,
> Through day and night.
> Womanhood's care of it
> Made manhood's dare for it;
> Purity's prayer for it
> Keeps it so white.
>
> Here's to the blue of it.
> Heavenly view of it,
> Star-spangled hue of it,
> Honesty's due of it,
> Constant and true.
> Here's to the whole of it,
> Stars, stripes, and pole of it,
> Here's to the soul of it,
> Red, white, and blue.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. ARMY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, today, June 14, commemorates the 185th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army by authority of the Continental Congress. From the date of its establishment in 1775 through the years, the relationship which has existed between the legislative branch of the Government and the Army has been a close one. The action of the Continental Congress in 1775 enabled the freedom-loving people of the Thirteen Original Colonies to wage war successfully for their independence and to set an example for the entire world.

The action of the Congress in strongly supporting our Army is the symbol of its high respect for the Army and the fine job it has done over the years and is doing now. It must be comforting to the citizens of the United States and of the free world to know that Congress realizes the great importance of a strong Army.

As capable as our Army is today, the Congress must be always on guard to see that it is maintained modern, efficient, and ready to strike rapidly in event of aggression.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the acting majority leader about the calendar and the business for today, and for tomorrow, if possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to respond to the query of the distinguished minority leader and state that, contrary to what I said yesterday, Calendar No. 1586, H.R. 7634, the public works authorization bill, will not be brought up today, but will be brought up later in the week, possibly on Thursday, although I cannot make a definite commitment in that respect.

It is contemplated that, at the conclusion of the morning business, the Senate will turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1374, Senate Resolution 279, to authorize additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations; Calendar No. 1375, Senate Resolution 310, to increase the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services; Calendar No. 1376, Senate Resolution 305, to provide for a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

Those three resolutions are from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to repeat what I said on yesterday, in which the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]—who, incidentally, I learn, has no opposition this year—is interested.

At the conclusion of the consideration of those measures, we will turn to 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.

Then it is quite possible that, at the conclusion of the consideration of that measure, if there is time, we shall turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1411, S. 2929, a bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

It is anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will turn to the consideration of the Defense appropriation bill, Calendar No. 1614, H.R. 11998.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I ask the acting majority leader whether these measures will be called up in the order of the

calendar numbers given; namely, 1374, 1375, 1376, 1163, and 1411?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the anticipation, and that is what will be done, if it meets with the approval of the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

RELATIONS WITH CUBA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, there has always been the warmest feeling on the part of the people of the United States toward Cuba and its people. As a result of close association and the confidence the people have for each other, Americans have invested billions of dollars in Cuba. Because of this, Cuba enjoys a standard of living higher than that of any other Latin American country.

Much of this feeling of friendship, as well as investments by citizens of the United States in Cuba, has been jeopardized since Fidel Castro rose to power in Cuba and launched his hate-monger campaign against the United States. His actions have caused people in this country to give a great deal of thought as to what to do about sugar legislation and the favorable position Cuba enjoys under this program. Recently Castro has adopted an even more vicious anti-American attitude and has been tying Cuba ever closer to Communist Russia.

Mr. President, I doubt if any country in the history of the world has ever been more tolerant of criticism than we have been of the Castro regime. This cannot go on forever. The attitude of Premier Castro indicates a complete lack of gratitude for the invaluable assistance his country receives from the United States through the sugar program. It is imperative that the Congress schedule legislation extending the Sugar Act for early action and also that additional consideration be given to greater quotas for farmers of the United States who are plagued with surpluses of virtually every crop they raise and need alternative crops.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Communists Take Over 90 Miles From United States," which appears in the June 20, 1960, issue of U.S. News & World Report, including the brief biographical sketches of Premier Castro's chief advisers. I wish to commend the editors of the U.S. News & World Report for another outstanding article. This is one of the most sensible discussions of the Cuban situation I have ever read. It points up very graphically the impossible situation in which we find ourselves as concerns Cuba and our aid to this country through our sugar program. I hope, Mr. President, that the article will be widely read.

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

COMMUNISTS TAKE OVER 90 MILES FROM UNITED STATES—HOW THEY DID IT—WHAT IT MEANS

(Castro's Cuba is now exposed in its true role—a Communist satellite offshore from the United States.

(After months of careful preparation Red dictatorship is in full control, backed and guided by Moscow. It is cut to the classic pattern: "politburo" in charge, filling jails with all who resist; press leashed to the Communist line; plots against neighbors; collective farms; an end to private property.

(All this is causing official U.S. concern at last. Communists, with Cuba nailed down, are branching out, spreading "hate America" through the hemisphere, eyeing military sites that can be converted into Red bases.)

Communists now have taken full control in Cuba—an island located strategically only 90 miles from the United States.

The Communist takeover—long discounted by the U.S. State Department—is beginning now to be recognized and admitted.

A dictatorship of the proletariat is firmly fixed. This dictatorship looks to Soviet Russia and to Communist China for political guidance and for support.

All opposition to the Communist dictatorship, where it rises, is suppressed. Secret police spy on the people, spreading fear. Thousands of political prisoners crowd jails.

The last of Cuba's independent newspapers have been taken over or suppressed. The government controls all broadcasting. It now is a crime to make any statement unfavorable to communism or to the government.

Private property, more than $300 million worth of it American owned, has been seized by the government without tangible compensation. Large amounts of property remain to be seized.

Only one political party, the Popular Socialist—Communist—Party, is permitted to exist.

VISITORS FROM MOSCOW

It is against this background that Nikita Khrushchev, Soviet dictator, has agreed to visit Cuba. Anastas Mikoyan, Soviet No. 2 man, already has visited the island to do business. Both the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are opening large embassies in Havana. A mutual defense treaty is being mentioned.

Cuba's rulers intend soon to recognize Communist China. They plan to ask Chou En-lai, Red China's Premier, to visit the island. Chinese Communists are increasingly active in Cuba.

The communization of Cuba is being pushed in all fields.

The New York Times, which has been friendly to the Castro government, reported in a dispatch from Havana dated June 6:

"The Castro regime is bending every effort to capture the minds of youth.

"The pattern of training is similar to that used by many totalitarian governments. It includes indoctrination in schools, on radio and television, and in the press; military training from 7 years of age; a hate campaign, this time directed against the United States; the organization of work brigades of boys from 14 to 18; and meetings and fiestas, all with a political purpose.

"The Government feels that, once the youth of Cuba is indoctrinated with hatred toward United States, the relations between the two countries will be permanently damaged."

The Associated Press, in a dispatch from New York City dated June 7, said:

"Three exiled Cuban newspaper publishers declared today that the Fidel Castro government is a puppet regime of the Soviet Union. * * * The three publishers, now living in the United States, all expressed agreement when asked if they considered the Castro regime a puppet of the Soviet Union."

The AP, in an article from Caracas, Venezuela, dated June 7, said:

"Enthusiastic demonstrations greeted Dorticós (Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticós) last night on his arrvial at Maiquetia Airport from Lima, Peru, and in the working-class sections of Caracas."

Dorticós has been on a tour of six Latin American nations, selling anti-Americanism to workers, students, and peasants.

HEMISPHERIC BASE

Use of Cuba as the base for Communist operations in the Western Hemisphere is beginning to be recognized by the U.S. Government as of great and growing importance to the Soviet Union.

Communists, earlier, had gained control in two countries of this hemisphere—Guatemala and British Guiana. The British Government in 1953 threw out a Communist administration in British Guiana. In 1954, a revolution in Guatemala drove out the pro-Communist regime. Communists are looking for a comeback in British Guiana once independence is given to that British outpost.

The Soviet base in Cuba is described as of vastly greater importance than earlier bases.

Here, on the doorstep of the United States, is an island country 780 miles long, offering potentials for military operations as well as for propaganda offensives directed at a whole continent.

Military possibilities, related to Communist purposes, are no longer being discounted.

The U.S. naval base at Guantánamo Bay, important to defense of the Caribbean area in time of war, is being harassed. Its removal is an objective of the Communist rulers of Cuba.

The Panama Canal already is in the line of political fire. There, too, Communists are active from their base in Cuba. Cubans staged an abortive invasion of Panama in 1959. Political means are expected to be employed from now on to try to force the United States to give up rights in this vital area.

In Cuba itself, Soviet "geologists" are making a complete survey of the island.

Important U.S. military officials believe that these "geologists" are studying possibilities for submarine and missile bases in this strategic area—up against the so-called soft underbelly of the United States. Officials are convinced that, as of the present, Soviet submarines are not being supplied from Cuba, although they are operating in Cuban waters.

In recent months, Cuba's Communist Government, already heavily armed, has invested up to 100 million more dollars in new weapons.

INVASION STRATEGY

Haiti, only 45 miles away, lives in constant fear of invasion. The Government of Guatemala charges that the Cuban Government is training forces that will try to put Communists back in power in that country. Reliable sources report that Cuba is training troops in the Sierra Maestra for a landing in the Dominican Republic.

The plan is said to be this: Before the end of 1960, an internal uprising or military coup will be staged against Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo. When this happens, Castro will announce that the help of Cuba has been asked, and will move in on the Dominican Republic to establish a Communist Government.

Cuba alone, U.S. officials realize, is not the final objective of the Kremlin.

It is through Cuba that the Soviet Union expects to create trouble and to outflank the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Soviet Russia, highly sensitive to U.S. bases on its own periphery, is greatly interested in finding a way to show the United States what it feels like to have a potentially hostile military base next door.

THE FINANCIERS

How much money the Soviet Union and Communist China are prepared to invest in their Cuban satellite remains a question.

To date, Russia has accomplished her objectives at no cost. Instead, the Soviet

Union has saved some money by purchasing a substantial amount of Cuban sugar at below the world price. Russia then sold this sugar to her people at a profit.

Castro's Communist Government is paying the Soviet Union and Red China a high price for the technicians, "geologists," and others who are moving in to remake Cuba into a Socialist state.

Means to finance the communization of Cuba actually are being provided on a large scale by the United States.

U.S. consumers in 1960 will contribute $128 million to Cuba as a subsidized price for sugar. That total may rise to $140 million through diversion of unfilled portions of sugar quotas to Cuba. In addition, American companies have contributed goods and services amounting to between $100 million and $150 million for which they have not been paid.

In 1 year, official observers point out, the United States is putting up about a quarter of a billion dollars to finance a regime that is openly hostile.

On top of that, the Communists in Cuba have confiscated more than $300 million worth of American property. An additional $500 million worth of American property is in danger of being taken over. The fiction of payment is created by offering some Americans bonds of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform in amounts far less than the real value of the properties. Bankers describe these bonds as having little value.

Communists are pictured in Havana as enjoying the spectacle of the United States financing a Communist revolution—while under violent attack by the Communist rulers it is helping.

The U.S. Congress has balked at a recommendation from President Eisenhower that he be given authority to reduce the subsidy to Cuba.

Resources from the United States are helping a government that is actively engaged in promoting the success of Communist movements throughout Latin America.

AGITATION TARGETS

In the field of agitation and subversion, Cuban agents are highly active. Labor unions, student groups, journalists, professors, landless peasants and nationalist movements of all kinds are primary objectives of Communist penetration from Havana.

In Venezuela, Cuba's leaders are striving to gain hold of the powerful Oil Workers Union. Labor unions of Cuba have been taken over by the government. Their leadership is in Communist hands. The Reds have had some success in breaking the influence of more-conservative labor organizations in a number of South American countries. Chile, in the same way as Venezuela, is a major target for Communist penetration of unions.

All through Latin America, Cuban embassies are centers of Communist activity. American officials describe these embassies as areas of infection from which Communist doctrine and activity are spread.

In private conversations, officials show growing concern. One pointed out that Chile's big Communist Party is now 100 percent for Castro. Said the defense chief of another Latin-American country: "Castro is sending agents all over South America. He is backed, and presumably financed, by Russia. He's being taken as a serious threat."

The Federation of University Students of the University of Havana is active among student groups in many Latin-American countries. Students, in turn, are leaders in the attacks upon the United States and in supporting Communist causes. Financing of this activity that had come almost entirely from the Soviet Union now is supplemented by support from Cuba.

In the field of propaganda, Cuba's activity is even more intense.

Attacks upon the United States and glowing accounts of the socialization of Cuba are beamed by powerful radio stations out of Havana to listeners throughout South and Central America. These stations are Government operated. Their No. 1 product is anti-American propaganda.

A Cuban news service, Presna Latina—staffed largely by Communists—is furnished free to newspapers of Latin America. This is a full-fledged press service—costly to produce and transmit. Part of the bill is picked up by the Castro Government in Cuba and, it is understood, part by Moscow.

Cuban officials are constantly on the move in the hemisphere. Their attention is directed not at the governments of Latin-American countries increasingly hostile to the Cuban revolution, but to disgruntled groups within nations where political stability is rare.

THE LAND REFORM

Socialization of Cuba itself is proceeding at a rapid rate.

Basically, Cuba is an agricultural country. Its socialization is being carried out under INRA—the National Institute of Agrarian Reform. INRA has become a superstate. It holds more than 4 million acres of land—about half of it taken from American owners and the other half from Cubans. It holds feed mills, packing plants, the entire fishing industry, many factories, about 600,000 cattle. INRA has seized or established more than 2,000 rural stores, now called "stores of the people."

Plans call for INRA to take over all privately owned sugar mills, including American ones. The agency already holds about a fourth of the country's mills. INRA's plans also call for creation of a government-owned iron and steel complex, with plants to be supplied by the Soviet Union.

At first the talk was of "land reform." Peasants were to be given the land of big landowners—many from the United States. This idea drew widespread support from commentators in the United States.

Actually, INRA is creating giant cooperative farms—along Soviet lines. Instead of owning land, most peasants are ending up as wage earners, in the same or a less desirable state than before the theft of what had been privately owned land.

INRA's executive director, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, on a recent trip to Moscow, arranged for Soviet experts in large numbers to carry forward his program, now in a disorganized state.

Under socialism, as brought to Cuba by Castro and his Communist aids, the people are not faring too well. The loyalty of the peasants and of many workers, however, is being held by promises of many good things to come.

Pay of workers, in fact, has been reduced by "voluntary contributions" to revolutionary activity. Inflation is beginning now to eat into standards of living as wages are controlled and prices move higher. Goods of many kinds are beginning to run short. Replacement of these goods is more difficult as American suppliers begin to balk at making gifts of their products.

In the middle class and among some groups of wage earners, including construction workers, there is growing dissatisfaction and alarm. Here, methods taught by the Soviet Union are applied to keep people in line.

BRIMMING JAILS

Spies and informers are on every side. Waiters in cafes and bars, barbers, beauty-shop operators, store clerks, taxi drivers, bellhops and servants report any criticism of the regime to intelligence agents. Children in the juvenile patrols—which the Government organized to replace boy and girl scouts—are instructed to inform on their parents and neighbors.

Arrest swiftly follows these denunciations. Cuban prisons are jammed with political prisoners. The largest prison, on the Isle of Pines, holds about 5,000 with two prisoners in cells intended for one. Food is bad, sanitary facilities worse. Reading is prohibited. Common criminals are given better treatment than political prisoners.

Communist techniques are applied in all fields to try to socialize Cuba.

There are growing doubts whether a Communist Cuba can be made to work. These doubts would increase further, some officials believe, if the United States should decide not to subsidize the venture into communism taking place next door. It now is doubted that American businessmen will continue to supply goods to Cuba without certainty of payment.

The question being raised is whether Soviet Russia, guiding Cuba to communism, will come forward with the volume of aid that would be required to prevent an outbreak of violence among the people. American officials say that the Soviet Union never has been noted for making outright grants of aid on a large scale.

Russia obviously is playing for bigger stakes than Cuba. Through a communized Cuba, the Soviet rulers are described as aiming to penetrate and to get a firm foothold in the larger nations of South America. Once they are in the Americas on a firm footing, trouble confronting the United States could be immense.

IS THE MONROE DOCTRINE DEAD?

What the Monroe Doctrine is: A warning to the rest of the world to keep its hands off the Western Hemisphere. Issued in 1823 by President James Monroe—partly to stop Russian moves of that day in the Americas.

What the Monroe Doctrine says: The American continents "are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Also—

The United States would consider "any attempt" by European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The question now raised: Does the Monroe Doctrine apply to the Communist takeover in Cuba? Or is this 137-year-old policy dead, in practical terms?

A proposed "New Monroe Doctrine": Historian Samuel Flagg Bemis has urged that Congress add to the Monroe Doctrine a resolution declaring the United States would be "justified * * * in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World." The Bemis resolution has been introduced in Congress, but no hearings have been held, because of State Department opposition. The State Department argues that Latin Americans might resent a U.S. declaration of intent to "intervene" in a Latin country, and that Communist penetration has to be handled by joint efforts of the American nations.

THE "POLITBURO" NOW RULING CUBA

Fidel Castro: Rabble-rouser, influenced by other members of "politburo." Like them all, a bitter hater of United States. Out to communize Cuba, spread communism through Latin America with Soviet help.

Raúl Castro: Fidel's younger brother, first in line of succession. Communist trained and married to a Communist. Once kidnaped U.S. marines and got away with it. Shrewd and devious.

Ernesto (Ché) Guevara: President, National Bank. Known as agent of international communism. Goes armed to bank meetings. Holds dictatorial power over national finances.

Antonio Núñez Jiménez: Economic dictator, as head of INRA (National Institute of Agrarian Reform). Known as a Communist. Importing Soviet experts to try to make socialized industries work. Seizing private property on vast scale.

Osvaldo Dorticós: President. Former private secretary to Communist Party chief. Heads anti-U.S. propaganda mission through Latin America. Is consulted on important decisions.

Augusto Martínez Sánchez: Labor czar. Far to left, with Red connections. Runs government-controlled unions with power over hiring, firing, wages. Has power to seize businesses involved in real or trumped-up labor troubles.

Juan Marinello: Veteran head of Popular Socialist (Communist) Party. Stays out of limelight, but is a powerful influence on ruling "politburo" of Cuban Government.

Carlos Rafael Rodríguez: Dedicated Communist, editor of Communist paper "Hoy." Close adviser to Fidel Castro. Helps to shape anti-U.S. line of propaganda for radio station and press service directed to all of Latin America.

MEDICAL AID WILL SAVE SENIOR CITIZENS FROM CONSTANT FEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how much longer can we, as a nation, permit a situation to exist where millions upon millions of our senior citizens live with the cost of medical assistance that can bring life and health beyond their reach?

No problem of old age is as great as that of health. Illness is the focal point of fear among our older people. As their health declines, their insurance rates climb. Forced by low fixed incomes to adhere to rigid budgets that do not and cannot provide for any emergency, these people know that any serious illness can wipe out what little security they have.

The U.S. Senate is under extreme moral obligation to recognize this grave situation and to cope with it through effective legislation just as quickly as possible.

I have here a letter, typical of hundreds I have received, which tells in simple and thoughtful language the plight of our senior citizens. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEAR SENATOR: It is indeed frightening when one attempts to visualize the future where earning ability has ceased and the needs of life must be met with a very meager income. Where a person's humble security can be changed to a condition of want by one short period of illness and exorbitant medical and doctor bills. Too few persons are fortunate enough to earn sufficient income to provide assurance against such an uncertain future and a way must be provided now so that all can systematically build a fund for what lies ahead.

There are millions in this same predicament. The proposed Forand bill is the first step to provide assurance of care when we are unable to bear the burden.

We sincerely urge your support of this legislation which will assist those unable to assist themselves when it becomes needed most.

With best wishes, I remain,

Yours respectfully,

——— ———.

REVISED DEFENSE MANPOWER POLICY NO. 4

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, along with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I filed a minority report in the volume which contains the report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems.

The minority made a number of recommendations to aid the unemployed, particularly the unemployed in distressed areas. On page 183 of its report, the minority recommended, that—

The Federal Government direct all Federal agencies, defense and nondefense, to give preferential treatment to areas of substantial labor surplus in their purchasing and contracting.

The minority also recommended, that—

All Government agencies, both defense and nondefense be directed to give special consideration to placing new installations in areas of substantial labor surplus when locating or expanding outside of Washington.

Mr. President, I am pleased to say that on June 7 the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization announced the issuance of a revised policy dealing with the placement of Government contracts and Government-financed facilities in areas of high unemployment.

The majority report contained no recommendation of this nature.

So that all Senators will be familiar with the character of the Revised Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, I ask unanimous consent that a press release which explains the policy revision be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND
DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D.C.

Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization Leo A. Hoegh announced today the issuance of a revised Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, dealing with the placement of Government contracts and Government-financed facilities in areas of high unemployment.

The revised policy provides that the preference given to surplus labor areas under DMP No. 4 for purposes of Government procurement and facilities construction or expansion will be offered first to areas of persistent high unemployment levels. The Department of Labor will classify these persistent surplus labor areas separately from other areas with substantial current unemployment levels.

Another policy revision encourages prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms which will perform a substantial portion of the production involved in the persistent surplus labor localities. A change in certification procedures provides that the national office of the Labor Department will issue certificates of eligibility to firms in localities too small to be regularly classified as to unemployment status. These certificates are now being issued by State employment security offices.

In announcing the revision, Mr. Hoegh stated that the action was taken to improve the policy as a device to maintain skills important to defense industry in areas of substantial unemployment. He said that every effort will be made by Federal procurement agencies to assist such areas, but the effect is likely to be limited by the lack of appropriate plant facilities in many such areas.

The full text of the policy will appear shortly in the Federal Register. It becomes effective on July 6. Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 was one of a number of manpower measures instituted during the Korean mobilization period.

CONSTRUCTION AID TO COLLEGES

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I was delighted to have an opportunity to read, a short time ago, an article by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] which appeared in the Albany Times Union. The article deals with the all important problem of making room in our Nation's colleges and universities for the many young people who wish to pursue studies in institutions of higher learning.

This article merits the attention of all Senators, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

KEATING URGES UNITED STATES STEP UP CONSTRUCTION AID TO COLLEGES

(By KENNETH B. KEATING)

We must face the growing crisis in American higher education, brought on by dramatic increases in the number of young people seeking admission to college and compounded by the financial pressures which beset the Nation's colleges and universities. Colleges and universities have existed in the United States for more than three centuries, and have flourished in a situation in which funds for their support have been derived principally from private, philanthropic sources and local and State governments. The question that now faces us is, essentially, can these traditional sources of support be relied upon to sustain American higher education in its hour of crisis?

I think it is generally agreed that we would all like to see our rich pattern of higher education maintained in this great tradition of autonomy and independence, just so long as it is humanly possible to do so. And I have great confidence in the willingness and ability of traditional patrons of higher education to rise to the present challenge.

There is, on the other hand, a belated but growing recognition that there is a profound national interest in American higher education. No longer can we afford to overlook the fact that what goes on in our colleges and universities—or more importantly, what does not go on in our colleges and universities—has profound implications for the national welfare, and more specifically, for the national defense. It was largely because of this important link between a vigorous system of higher education and the national defense that an impressive majority of Members of Congress voted to enact the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

MOST VITAL IN CENTURY

In the field of higher education, this act directs its attention to certain imbalances which are the particular concern of those whose responsibility is to carry on the affairs of the Nation. It seeks to avoid the loss of able manpower in our educational system by providing financial assistance to deserving students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and it seeks to reestablish

the study of modern foreign languages in our total educational system, recognizing that Uncle Sam, in order to conduct effectively his international affairs, must have "more than one tongue in his cheek."

This legislation has been described as the most important single Federal action in higher education since the passage of the so-called "Land-Grant Act" in 1862, which brought into being those vigorous colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts which now contribute so substantially to the breadth and quality of our higher educational system. I was pleased, as a Member of the House of Representatives, to lend my support to the passage of the National Defense Education Act, because the legislation as adopted embodied the important principle of Federal stimulation and leadership, without Federal control. The scope of the act is limited to areas in which the Federal Government has a legitimate concern, and is so written that it will not weaken the basic fabric of support upon which our colleges and universities have so long been dependent.

While the National Defense Education Act, through its graduate fellowship program, addresses itself to one of the most pressing problems facing the Nation's colleges and universities today—the need to recruit and train sufficient faculty of high quality—much more needs to be done to make it possible to retain such individuals. Moreover, the need to provide the physical facilities in which collegiate instruction is to take place remains to be met effectively. The question is basically the degree to which the Federal Government should participate in the effort to meet these two most pressing needs.

I must express at the outset my grave concern regarding the prospect of having the Federal Government participate in the payment of teachers' salaries. I regard the tradition of autonomy and independence among our colleges so highly that I would view with alarm any tendency to have this spirit undermined by a sense of dependency upon a Federal agency.

SEES GREATER DANGER

I do not say that Federal control would follow automatically upon the payment of instructional salaries, or payment of other current operating expenses, but I do not hesitate to say that the danger is greater in this area than it is in others. If it is true that "he who pays the piper calls the tune," it would be easy for some to argue that since the Federal Government was paying the salaries of college teachers, it should have some say as to what they teach. Nothing could be more destructive of the spirit of our educational enterprise, and nothing could be more destructive of the essential strength of our Nation.

I see as a much more likely prospect, and as a much safer prospect, the participation by the Federal Government in a program to assist colleges and universities in providing the physical facilities that surely are to be needed in the years to come. The "bricks and mortar" concept of Federal aid is by far the sounder concept. This avenue of potential Federal assistance seems to me both safer and more promising.

There is an old adage, to which I happen to subscribe, to the effect that it is important not only to do the right thing, but to do it the right way. I think it is of importance, therefore, that in our common desire to have the Federal Government assist our colleges and universities in meeting the profound challenge that now confronts them we do all in our power to see to it that what the Government does it does in the right way. We must not be so carried away by an emotional desire to do good that we surrender some of the most precious values we have in our higher educational system.

DEBT SERVICE GRANTS

For these reasons, I am much interested in the proposal submitted to the Congress by President Eisenhower which would authorize the Federal Government to make grants for debt service retirement to colleges and universities, both public and private, for the construction of residential and related facilities and academic facilities, where there existed a true need for such facilities, and where it is necessary to borrow funds for the purpose. Under this program, the Federal Government would make annual grants (representing 25 percent of principal) to participating institutions in equal installments over a period of 20 years, to assist them in the retirement of long-term construction obligations. In addition, under the proposal of the President, a Federal guarantee of non-tax-exempt bonds would be offered to colleges and universities.

I believe that the President has succeeded in pointing out to the American people and to their Congress ways in which the Federal Government can be lastingly and soundly helpful to the cause of improved education. I am extremely hopeful Congress will take action on this proposal, and that it will also devote considerable study to other pressing needs of our institutions of higher learning. I am personally very interested in the problem of insuring reimbursement to colleges and universities of an amount more nearly approaching the actual indirect costs involved in Government-supported research and training programs.

TAX LAW REVISION

I am also studying means for revising our tax laws in order to provide greater incentives for private individuals, organizations, and businesses to contribute to higher educational institutions. It strikes me that by careful changes in the present laws, perhaps in the form of special tax credits, we can stimulate the flow of voluntary funds which are essential if our colleges and universities are to live up to their grave responsibilities in our democratic society.

These, then, are some of the things the Federal Government can and should do for American higher education. There is no task to which Congress and the American people can devote themselves which will, in the long run, pay greater dividends for our country and the free world.

AWARD TO SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH BY GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last evening the General Federation of Women's Clubs gave awards to seven outstanding American women for their work in various fields. The Senate was signally honored by the selection of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, to receive one of these awards in the legislative field.

Mr. President, I first became acquainted with MARGARET SMITH during the days of World War II, when, as a Member of the House from Maine, she was fighting vigorously and successfully to secure dairy feed for the farmers of her State. From that time to this day the farmers of Maine have had a consistent champion in Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, who has supported beneficial and sound agricultural legislation. However, Mr. President, it is not the farmers alone who owe a debt of gratitude to MARGARET CHASE SMITH. As we all know, she is one of the most effective legislators in this body. She has been particularly effective in the fields of education and national defense, and her work on the Committee on Appropriations over the past few years has been outstanding.

The favorable publicity which MARGARET SMITH has brought to the State of Maine probably could not be purchased for a million dollars a year. I think she has not only reflected great credit upon her State but also upon the Senate. For that reason I am paying tribute to her today.

SOUTH DAKOTA HIGH SCHOOL EDITORS SPEAK OUT AGAINST OBSCENE LITERATURE RACKET

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the traffic in mailing and distribution of obscene literature is of growing concern to Americans in every walk of life with the exception of those who are wallowing in the works of filth which they are disseminating throughout the country.

The perpetrators of this despicable practice of printing and circulating illicit literature have been and are violating the decency and morality of the youth of our land. There is no question in my mind that the unconscionable creatures who carry on this gutter operation long ago abdicated both the responsibilities and the privileges of a citizenship which is predicated on a freedom which has made this Nation one in which the greatest of liberties are enjoyed.

The children of America comprise the foremost target of the peddlers of pornography and obscene literature. Therefore, I think it is highly significant that among the voices rising up in protest against these vile practices are those of responsible young people who are fully aware of the dangers confronting our country if the obscenity racket is not halted.

Mr. President, I deem it both a pleasure and high privilege to be able to bring to the attention of the Senate today the viewpoints of several young Americans who have given this matter their earnest consideration and have taken the time to write statements on this problem.

A number of high school newspaper editors in South Dakota have written editorials, and I request that these outstanding articles be printed in the RECORD.

Before placing the editorials in the RECORD, Mr. President, I should like to add a few words of commendation to these youngsters for what I think are excellent contributions to assist in our consideration of the problems of the smut racket. I certainly feel that a salute is in order for each of the editors for bringing this subject to the attention of not only their classmates but to parents and others in their home communities.

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

THE GROWING MENACE OF MAIL ORDER OBSCENITY

(By Winifred Joann Harris, editor, Aga Times, St. Agatha High School, Howard, S. Dak.)

Today, approximately 1 out of every 35 students in grade and high school is the object of a deadly "game" through which he

receives unordered lewd and obscene literature. His silent "playmate" is an emotionally insecure and mentally incompetent person who deals in the worst possible kind of filth. But, the game is not for innocent recreation and does not provide the recipient of this material with educational or enjoyable reading. The smut merchant is hardly the kind of person parents wish their children to have any dealings with, yet the Post Office Department predicts that that number could be 1 out of every 18 within a few years unless action is taken.

These vile racketeers have hidden behind postal laws made for the protection of the common people and the sanctity of first-class mail. This illegal function which deals in obscenity and pornography by mail is doing business at an estimated half billion dollars a year. According to estimates by the Post Office Department, these extensive operations will double within the next 4 years.

The far-reaching effect of this underworld activity is becoming increasingly evident. By contacting children at such an impressionable age, they are slowly but efficiently deteriorating the moral fiber of a whole Nation. Sadistic material has been a prevalent cause of juvenile delinquency and crime in the United States as has been observed by noted authorities.

That a function of the Federal Government should, knowingly or unknowingly, willingly or unwillingly, be a party to such corrupt activity, is a constant source of shame and embarrassment to decent-minded citizens. But, this function can be only what the citizens make it. Adult America owes their children a life free from the threat of horror and filth. Today, the victim is the child next door; tomorrow, another "innocent" will be seized in its ruthless grasp. A matter of such consequence as this deserves the attention of every person who wishes to maintain the moral strength of our Nation and preserve the standards upon which democracy is based.

WE ARE THE PRINCIPAL TARGETS

(By Margaret Devitt, coeditor, Maroon and Gold, Harrisburg High School, Harrisburg, S. Dak.)

Senator MUNDT recently called to the attention of Congress a serious moral problem facing our Nation today, the mail order obscenity racket. He has introduced a bill in the Senate which would do much to curb the peddling of obscene and indecent literature.

Although Senator MUNDT stressed the fact that parents and other community organizations should be alerted to the dangers of this menace, it is actually we teenagers and young people who are the principal targets of these smut merchants. The racket, which has reached a sales level of over a half billion dollars, openly solicits anyone whose name they can obtain through "fake" business fronts, purchase of mail, or any other deceitful manner.

We, who are most affected by this, must become aware of the dangers of this vile racket and do everything in our power to do away with this threat.

These racketeers, who use the defense of "freedom of the press" in conducting the sale of obscene literature are misinterpreting this freedom as a part of our democracy. Such use of this basic American right will be a destroyer of democracy itself by weakening the morals of the people, making them more susceptible to the threats which could overtake our Nation.

We, as American youth, who will be the adults of tomorrow, will characterize the moral fiber of the Nation in years to come by our own moral standards which we build today.

JOIN FIGHT AGAINST OBSCENE LITERATURE

(By Loretta Mohr, feature editor, the Beaver Chatter, Alexandria High School, Alexandria, S. Dak.)

In compliance with a request received from KARL MUNDT urging active participation in the matter of salacious literature and pictures coming through U.S. mail the Beaver Chatter is printing this editorial to tell parents more about this situation and how they can help stop it.

Until August, 1958, obscenity laws kept the Government tied by permitting it to prosecute the guilty persons only at the mail's point of origin. In August, 1958, an amendment was enacted and was signed by President Eisenhower allowing prosecutions to take place where the obscene material was received.

One out of every 35 grade and high school students receives this mail whether interested or not. The racketeers mail material to every name they can obtain, even names answering advertisements to innocent items such as baseball bats or toy automobiles, or they obtain names of students joining youth clubs or social groups.

It is estimated that 700,000 to 1 million American children will receive unsolicited obscene and pornographic literature through the mails this year. In a raid by postal inspectors in New York City, 17 tons of printed and filmed materials were found. Mailing lists of thousands of high school graduates whose names were obtained from yearbooks were also found.

Investigation of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement and forgery show that those guilty of the crimes usually have been exposed to this material.

If obscene material is mailed to your home, you are urged to turn it in. All you have to do is save all materials received, including the envelope and all exposures and give the materials to the local postmaster, either in person or by mail.

Postmaster General Summerfield said, "We are, in effect, declaring war on these purveyors of filth, big and little, high and low. We are launching an intense and unrelenting effort to stop this monstrous assault on the Nation's children in every way possible. And we are confident that, with adequate public and legislative support this job can be done."

Let's join the fight against obscene material. By giving the postmaster all materials you receive you can do your part to stop the mailing of this material and thus help to end this racket. Help make America's teenagers clean-minded teenagers; help stop obscene mail.

HELP WIPE OUT DELINQUENCY

(By Esther Brown, editor, the Cardinal and Black, Arlington High School, Arlington, S. Dak.)

Juvenile delinquency is often blamed on the child's environment or on his parent's negligence. This may sometimes be true, but there are likely to be several other factors that have led the individual into delinquency.

One of these seeds of evil is obscene literature that is sent through the mail to unsuspecting adolescents. If the companies who print such trash can interest young people in reading it, they have started a very profitable racket at the expense of the youth of today.

Circulation of this literature sheds a rather dim light on the future of America. If the leaders of tomorrow are exposed to and learn to enjoy such filth, America can look forward to a very insecure future.

It is the responsibility of alert parents to make sure their child doesn't read such material. Every adolescent should be acquainted with the dangers of reading obscene magazines; and if the material comes into the home, the parents should see to it that proper authorities are notified.

If you receive any of this literature in the mail, save it, including the wrapper it came in, and give it to your postmaster. If everyone will cooperate in the drive that is now being promoted by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield we can stop the "smut racket" and rid our great Nation of this threat to decency.

FULL SCALE WAR

(By Johannas Asmussen, editor, the Scribbler, Agar High School, Agar, S. Dak.)

Parents, if your child received obscene or pornographic material, would you know it? What would you do about it if you did? Hide it? Throw it away? Report it?

Children, if you received obscene or pornographic material would you hide it? Throw it away? Read it and send for more? Show it to your parents?

Are you now saying to yourself, "These questions are not for me?" Just hear me out and you may change your mind.

The racket in vile material has reached an estimated sales level of more than half a billion dollars a year. The smut merchants prey on the young of the Nation, corrupting the very core and future of our United States, for that is what the Nation's youth is. Every youth who has had his name in a school year book, answered an ad for free or reduced merchandise, or done numerous other things, things that are normal and right, may be sent this type of literature. You need not ask for it, if the smut merchants have your name and address you may receive their merchandise.

The Post Office Department cannot begin to stop this racket because one of our unalienable rights is the privacy of the mails and to stop this racket they would have to infringe upon this right. Rather than do this we must fight on another front, the home front. The Post Office Department is launching a full-scale war against smut on the home front, but to launch a war they must have men and equipment to fight the battle. The Post Office Department cannot use conscription, it must rely on volunteers. Parents can and must explain to their children in simple but direct language what the material is and what to do with it if they should receive it and why. The why is a big factor; don't overlook it. Work with your civic groups to help educate everyone and defeat this enemy.

If you think that these peddlers of smut can do no lasting harm, hear what Postmaster General Summerfield said and I quote: "Unquestionably, these large, defiant barons of obscenity are contributing to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency, as many noted authorities have publicly observed on repeated occasions." Senator KARL E. MUNDT also stated, "Repeatedly, in the investigations of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement and forgery, authorities find that those guilty of the crimes were early collectors of obscene pictures and films. Authorities also point out that sex criminals and sex murders almost always prove to have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material."

How did you answer the questions asked? I hope the answers went something like this. Parents, if your child received obscene or pornographic material would you know it? Yes. What would you do about it if you did? Report the matter immediately to the local postmaster, and turn in all the material received, including the envelope, and all enclosures. Also explain to your child the reason for material being unfit. Don't

frighten your child by cross-examining him or making him feel he has done something wrong. Making an issue out of it will raise its value and importance in his eyes.

Children, if you receive obscene or pornographic material would you hide it? No, it is nothing to be ashamed of or feared, but it is disgusting. Throw it away? This would be good if only you were involved but the Post Office Department needs it as evidence. Would you read it and send for more? No. Show it to your parents? Yes.

It is the parents, the citizens of the community, who will benefit from a "full-scale war" on the smut material and its peddlers.

Join the forces and help make war on smut merchants. Directly or indirectly their corruption is felt in all our lives.

CONSIDER THE COST TO YOUR CHILD

(By Judy Anderson, assistant editor, Viking Voice, Midland High School, Midland, S. Dak.)

If an official public estimate was made proving that milk served at school lunchrooms and cafeterias would expose 1 out of every 18 children to a crippling disease, you would be very concerned.

You should also be concerned by the fact that if the present trend is not checked, 1 out of 18 children will be receiving some form of indecent literature or film which will cripple his mind.

To stop this trend, you as parents should save all such material and immediately turn it in to your local postmaster. Without this action the senders and publishers cannot be traced.

This type of reading matter is very harmful to a child. Repeatedly, in investigations of armed robbery, extortion, forgery, and sex crimes, the criminals and murderers have been proven to have a record of addiction to a pornographic and sadistic material.

Join the Post Office Department and your Congressmen in their war against these purveyors of filth, which can harm your child as much as a crippling disease.

THE MENACE OF THE OBSCENE

(By Gerald Lee Kotas, editor, the Tripp Wildcat, Tripp High School, Tripp, S. Dak.)

Recently, a syndicated column in one of the leading Midwest newspapers carried the story of a 17-year-old boy, of average circumstances, who received through the mail several packets of obscene literature and perfumed love letters in response to his answering an ad for stamp collectors. His immediate reaction, due to his Christian upbringing, was to burn this trash and forget the incident. However right his reaction may have appeared, he could still have served better purpose; possibly even an obligation; merely by saving the material, including the enclosures, and turning the same over to his local postmaster.

Although most of us rather conform to the wrong than to fight it, this is one duty that we as Americans and recipients of pornographic writings must not pass by lightly. For every day hundreds of innocent children as well as teen-agers are the victims of the merchants of filth as they are preyed upon through the media of the mails. It is not common for 8 or 9 year olds to be the recipients of trash, dirt, and filth such as is delivered to those 18 or 19 year olds. And the smut racket is growing, growing, growing, fattening itself on the pennies, nickles, and dimes of children. The kids in the neighborhood; the ones next door; the ones right at home.

The dealers of pornographic material have many ways of obtaining your child's address, none of them highly secretive. High school yearbooks, newspaper stories, replies to ads offering anything from stamps to free toys are all good sources for compiling a mailing list. And from there it's anyone's guess as to how much smut the dealer will peddle until he is reported, tracked down, and arrested, an increasingly complicated job. But with the help and cooperation of the parents of America the dirt and smut delivered to your door via the mailbox can be stopped.

Resistance to obscene materials can best be obtained by watching your children's mail. If anything curiously different appears, check it. Or, since your child or teenager may already be receiving pornographic literature, watch their reactions, for you as their mother or father can tell if they might be concealing such items.

Upon finding or receiving obscene literature, remember the following:

First, save all the items enclosed; books, letters, envelopes, and papers as well as the original wrapper. Then turn those materials in to your local postmaster immediately, either in person, or by mail. It is important that you cooperate fully with the postmaster, even so far as to write come on letters to further lure the racketeer from seclusion or as evidence for prosecution.

Besides that, we can all help by informing friends, neighbors, and relatives of the methods of detecting obnoxious materials and of keeping on the alert. Tell them that a poisoned mind is worse than a poisoned body.

If you want to keep America strong and right, this is your chance to play an important part in the future of our country. Most obscene literature is received by those persons who are someday going to be the citizens of America. Do you want this country run by sex maniacs, racketeers, and buyers and sellers of filth?

HELP TODAY'S YOUNG PEOPLE

(By Ruth Anne Moller, editor, the Westonian, Wessington High School, Wessington, S. Dak.)

Recently I received a letter from Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, asking if I would write an editorial on the terrible racket that affects one out of every 35 children—the sending of obscene literature through the mail. Because it is sent first class, nothing can be done about inspection. Young people do not have to show any interest in the writings and pictures to receive it, for names can be obtained from many innocent things, such as membership records and advertisements.

Many young people are impressionable, and sometimes go to any lengths to continue receiving the pornography if once subjected to it—even going so far as selling it to others.

Why do the people distribute this? They purposely want to give America's young people a bad name for such reasons as communistic motives and to promote juvenile delinquency.

What can be done to get rid of this type of writings and pictures? First, I think young people should be told of this type of thing. If any such material is received it should be turned over at once to the post office.

In a few years one out of every 18 young people could be on the mailing list. The racket must be stopped. It is important all civic organizations work against it to help today's young people grow up in a better way.

STOP IT BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

(By Arlene Fritz, co-editor, the Pep-A-Graph, Lennox High School, Lennox, S. Dak.)

Have you been a recipient of the obscene literature which has been frequenting the mail the last few years? This question must be given very thoughtful consideration, for this problem has been growing and will continue to increase unless it is stopped. Too easily we may say, "Why should I worry? I'll never receive any of this pornography unless I submit my name to a mailing list or send in for it outright." But this is a mistaken impression too many people have gained. Agents who spread the filth on our mail today obtain names from yearbooks, newspaper articles, enrollments of youth organizations and countless other ways. Younger children may be put on a mailing list when they send for a toy or a doll collection from a magazine advertisement.

We remember the fuss made over cranberries last fall. Everyone hesitated to eat them, fearing they would be poisoned. Is not a poisoning of the mind and morals as horrifying as a poisoning of the body? Yet, we do not give it the attention which it deserves.

The destruction of the ideals and morale of the American youth is a very important step in the spread of communism. Obscene literature is doing the job for them. Juvenile delinquency and crime in later life very often stem from a childhood with exposure to this filthy material. Like a narcotic, it seems with some teenagers that once they have sampled the material, they become addicted to it and will do almost anything to obtain more of it.

Parents play a significant role in stamping out this dreadful racket. They are asked to keep any such material which enters their homes and report it to their local postmaster, turning the material over to him.

This is a problem of the people of our Nation and therefore must be handled by them. The Post Office Department has done much to stamp out this racket, but privacy of mail is an American right which they respect and so must depend on reports from the receivers of this obscene material. Educational leaders, parent-teacher organizations, extension clubs and religious leaders are performing magnificent works to end the threat to the Nation. Congress has passed an act to combat the sending of this material, but they cannot perform the job alone. We are an important instrument in the battle against this literature. Through our efforts, only, will the spreading smut racket be obliterated. Are we, as American teenagers, going to remain exposed to this public enemy of our Nation?

FLAG DAY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am delighted to call attention to the fact that this is the 183d anniversary of our flag's adoption by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777.

On this Flag Day we mark another significant transition, for in our homage to our national emblem we mark another firm step in national progress in officially flying our 49-star flag for the last time. In less than a month, on Independence Day, to be precise, we shall raise to the top of the mast the brilliant colors of this great Republic containing 50 stars.

So I think it is appropriate on this Flag Day that we not only pay tribute to our colors, but also that we add a salute to those newest of States, Alaska and Hawaii.

These are proud days for our new sister States. And they are proud days for the Republic. Flying high over the Nation is the emblem which has for 183 years symbolized the foresight, the dedication, the independence, and the God-fearing spirit of our forefathers, who in

their determination and zeal gave to this land a form of government which brought to us the greatest freedoms ever enjoyed by a civilized society.

On this day as we pay homage to our flag, let us not forget that in our remembrance we also must render tributes of the highest order to those who have fought and shed their blood so dearly in defense of the colors.

I think perhaps one of the most heroic of all deeds which brighten the illustrious pages of American history occurred on that little far-off island in the Pacific during World War II.

To me, the flag raising at Iwo Jima by a handful of U.S. Marines, captured in the never-to-be-forgotten photograph of Joe Rosenthal, of the Associated Press, and permanently enshrined as one of our most beautiful monuments across the Potomac from the Nation's Capitol, stands as one of those moments in history when the true spirit of man dedicated to preservation of our ideals reached full bloom.

As Adm. Chester Nimitz said, in speaking of the gallant action of the Marines, "Uncommon valor was a common virtue."

Our history is filled with similar stories of such dedication by Americans. So today our tributes are more than a salute to our national emblem, we also pay homage to those of the past who have made it possible for us to sit in this Chamber today beneath the fluttering of the Stars and Stripes, truly the flag of freedom.

I would be remiss, Mr. President, if in my brief remarks, I did not extend my personal commendation to those patriotic and loyal organizations which today are joining in commemoration of Flag Day.

In my home State of South Dakota, and I am sure throughout the land, three such organizations are holding special commemorative services. These are the Elks lodge and the various American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars posts.

Mr. President, I believe it is most fitting to extend our congratulations today to these organizations on the important part they are playing in leading the Nation in ceremonies paying proper respect and tribute to our colors, which are symbolized most effectively in the Elks' theme of the observance to demonstrate to the world that in our land there is "unity in the face of international tension."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, today is the 183d birthday of our American flag. The flag itself has changed in its design over the years—and will again change this year with the addition of a 50th star for the admission of Hawaii to statehood—but the flag itself has remained constant as the emblem of our thought, our purpose, our unity, and our power as a Nation.

The United States Flag Foundation has long worked hard to foster the proper display of our flag. Mr. President, on this anniversary of the American flag I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following article about the United States Flag Foundation which appeared in the Plainfield Courier-News on Thursday, April 9, 1959.

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

The United States Flag Foundation of New Jersey, a nonprofit society to further the work of the late Gridley Adams, of Weehawken, has been incorporated with Harry E. Foster, of 161 Somerset Street, listed as trustee-director.

The foundation's incorporation has been recorded in Somerset County. Its purpose is one of advancing education about the U.S. flag, what it symbolizes and how it should be displayed and used.

Foster was associated for several years with Adams before Adams' death June 23, 1958, at the age of 90. Adams was author of the booklet, "So Proudly We Hail." He devoted many years of research to authenticity of flag traditions and procedures and was chairman in 1922 of the national flag code committee, representing 112 patriotic and fraternal societies.

He was instrumental in securing revision by the 77th Congress of laws relating to the flag.

Foster was left all of Adams' material at the time of the older man's death. He said today that the booklet Adams wrote would continue to be available to the public and that it was his desire to advance the newly incorporated foundation to a national level.

Copies of "So Proudly We Hail" have been sent to every State, to South America, several European countries and to the Vatican, Foster said.

Adams had been in the process of incorporating the foundation in New Jersey at the time of his death. He was then its director general.

REVIEW OF UNITED STATES-JAPANESE RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has now embarked on a Far Eastern tour to bring messages of friendship and pledges of cooperation by the United States to the people in the Orient. With him go the best wishes and blessings of the American people.

For the most part, I am deeply confident that—as evidenced by previous trips—this tour of the Far East will help to further improve U.S. relations in that area of the globe. The tremendous reception which President Eisenhower is receiving in the Philippine Islands again symbolizes the warm affection for our President and great respect for our country inherent in people all over the globe.

Unfortunately, however, the flareup in Japan reflecting anti-U.S. sentiment, creates a serious situation. We recognize, of course, that the riots are prodded, agitated, and directed by leftwingers and Communists. Too, there may be internal factors—including political crosswinds—affecting the situation.

However, the big question confronting the Japanese people is: Will they allow a rabble-rousing minority to jeopardize United States-Japanese relations and determine criteria for national conduct for the Japanese people—in effect, present their "face" to the world.

As a national policy, we do not interfere with the internal affairs of other nations. However, we have a great stake in Japan—one of ideals, and one written in the blood of over a million wounded and dead in World War II.

The reestablishment of good relations between the two nations—in the aftermath of an all-out conflict—is, of course, a sensitive, difficult task.

Realistically there may be scars of the Second World War that have not healed and vanished. No doubt, the agitators are playing on any "under the surface" feelings that still exist. Nor can it be forgotten that we, as a nation, also have scars.

In the postwar era, however, we have been willing to demonstrate—as a people—a new kind of conduct in international affairs. Following World War II, the United States adopted a policy—unique in world history—not of pillaging, raping, and grinding "under its heels" the vanquished; to the contrary, we attempted to reconstruct Japan, promote a climate of respect for its people, and enable it, as a nation, to assume a significant role in world affairs.

Realistically speaking, this was not altogether altruistic. By experience, we have learned that if there is to be permanent peace, then all people must be accorded respect for their national integrity and opportunity, as nations, to play proportionate roles in world affairs.

Fundamentally, however, it must be recognized that that the U.S. policy evolved out of a traditional humanitarian "will of its people," as well as the nonaggressive, nonexpansive policy—symbolized by the fact that, despite a major role in two World Wars, have not taken for ourselves one foot of new territory.

A big question arises: Will history record U.S. postwar policy as an error? I sincerely hope and pray that it will not.

During the days ahead, we will be closely watching developments in Japan. The security of our esteemed, beloved President—the future of United States-Japanese relations—the stability of economic and military conditions in the Far East—all of these depend to a degree upon the conduct of the Japanese people and their Government in the days ahead.

The vast majority of the people—who, I feel, do not support the current anti-U.S. demonstrations—ultimately must make their voices heard for the reestablishment of peace and order within that country.

Unless this is done, however, the United States will need to take a new look at its overall policies in relation to Japan, on the edge of the Communist orbit, and the Far East generally.

The free world now looks to the Japanese people for signs and action to reaffirm our confidence in their dedication to peace, to preserving a free democracy, and to demonstrate their capability to maintain internal order in the face of Communist pressures.

MEMORIAL DAY FLAG DISPLAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the Southtown Economist of Sunday, June 5, 1960, published in Chicago, Ill., and I draw attention to a picture of a row of American flags flying from the residences in

the 2800 block of West 102d Street in commemoration of Memorial Day this year. I should like to draw this to the attention of my colleagues because I find that in our Nation's Capital this last Memorial Day there was a disheartening, if not disgraceful, lack of recognition of the honors so much deserved by our valiant war dead. There were endless blocks in which not one flag was flown and hardly enough in the entire District of Columbia to indicate this day was different from any other holiday.

Memorial Day was established, as everyone knows, pursuant to a military order by a great Illinois general, John A. Logan, and it is one day when the reverent spirit should rise in souls everywhere in the country, and the day should be fittingly observed.

I should like to ask unanimous consent for the article to appear in the RECORD—and I express my regret that the picture cannot be reproduced—so that other people may know that there is at least one community in this country, and I am proud that it is in Chicago, where the citizens have a plan for showing their pride in the country and their respect for its soldier dead, not just on Memorial Day, but on Flag Day, June 14, and Independence Day, July 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

"ALL AMERICAN" BLOCK

Desire of residents of West 102d place, from South California to South Francisco Avenues, to fly the American flag more frequently than has been the custom in recent years has received an assist from the Economist newspapers.

An Economist employee who lives in the area told them of the Economist flag offer and through his cooperation almost all of the residents obtained flags which they flew in front of their homes over the Memorial Day weekend.

The photograph shows the attractive picture the flag display made in the neighborhood.

Residents said they plan to fly their flags again on Flag Day, June 14, and on July 4.

The Economist newspapers' offer, of which they took advantage, is still in effect. Flags shown in the photograph are 5 feet by 3 feet, with 13 stripes. They can be bought for only $3, with an Economist newsboy's subscription receipt, and represent a $2 savings.

A second flag for display in windows at home or in a car can be bought for only $2 and an Economist subscription receipt.

The flags can be bought at any of the three Economist offices, which are located at 728 West 65th Street, at 9444 South Western Avenue, and at 1716 East 79th Street. The offices are open week days from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and on Saturdays from 9 a.m. to noon.

THE 21ST ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, AND PROMINENT CROATS AT PREVIOUS COUNCILS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an old, long-time, durable friend in Chicago, an attorney, by the name of Vincent L. Knaus. He is a former president, I believe, of the South Chicago Bar Association. Last year he was very active on the Ecumenical Council Committee of the Illinois Knights of Columbus. He is a past grand knight of the Santa Maria Council No. 1511 of the Knights of Columbus. He is of Croatian descent. The interest he has manifested in community affairs and in the security of his country is one of those things that warms the heart.

Recently he wrote an article for the issue of the Junior Magazine of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America, entitled "Forthcoming XXI Ecumenical Council, Standout Croats at Previous Councils." I am very happy that Vincent Knaus gives so freely of his time to this great work, and I ask unanimous consent that the article may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FORTHCOMING XXI ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, STANDOUT CROATS AT PREVIOUS CONCLAVES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As the whole world, Christian and non-Christian, knows by now, Pope John XXIII has called the 21st Ecumenical Council for 1961–62. The preparations for this great gathering are many, worldwide, and monumental. Our own CFU member, the prominent Chicago attorney, Vincent L. Knaus, has been signally honored by being named as the Illinois State Director of the Ecumenical Council Committee of the Illinois Knights of Columbus. Brother Knaus was good enough to prepare the following treatise for your Junior Magazine.)

CROATS AND THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH

Records show that the first Ecumenical Council in which Croats participated was the XV at Vienne, France, in 1311–12 under Pope Clement V. It condemned crimes and errors imputed to Knights Templars, Franticelli, Beghards, and Beguines; declared soul to be substantial form of the body; issued decrees for reformation of clergy and teaching of oriental languages.

The Croatian participant was blessed Augustine Kazotic O. P. bishop of Zagreb and Lucera, Italy.

John Cardinal Stojkovich, O. P. 1390–1443, participated in the XVII council—Basle-Ferrara-Florence, 1431–45, during the reign of Pope Eugene IV. This council effected a short-lived reunion with Greeks; dealt with extirpation of heresy, peace of Christendom, and reform of the church.

Ivan Stojkovich of Dubrovnik was the first Croat to be elevated to that exalted post—to become a Prince of the Church—Cardinal. He was the Procurator General of the Dominicans and was created a Cardinal in 1440 by Eugenius IV. He presided at some of the sessions of the Council in Basel in 1431. He was particularly effective in crushing the Hussite heresy. For eight mornings he spoke against its doctrines and finally defeated all that was reprehensible in it.

The third Croat prominent in an Ecumenical Council was George Dragisic. He was active in the Lateran Council of 1512–17 during the reigns of Pope Julius II and Leo X. This conclave enacted reform decrees; defended immortality and individuality of the soul; denied that philosophical truth is independent of revealed dogma.

Page 66 of "Znameniti Hrvati" tells us that he was tutor to the sons of Lorenzo de Medici. He was also minister of the Tuscan Province of the Franciscan Order. In 1497 he returned to Dubrovnik and subsequently to Rome where he became first, a bishop and then an archbishop.

Another participant of Croatian extraction or nationality was Simon Kozicic-Begna, 1460–1536. He spoke on the reforms of the church and on the Turkish occupation of his own country.

At the XIX Ecumenical Council held 1545–63 at Trent under the reigning Popes, Paul III, Julius III and Pius IV the errors of Luther were condemned as were other Heresiarchs. The council also issued many important doctrinal and disciplinary decrees. The noted Croat, George Cardinal Draskovic was present and active at this council. For his conspicuous part in this conclave's meetings he received the Cardinal's hat.

Cardinal Juraj Draskovic was a nephew of Cardinal Juraj Utjesinovic. He became bishop of Zagreb and Ban (governor-viceroy) of Croatia. At the Council of Trent he distinguished himself as an orator and signed the official documents of the council in 1562 with the name: "Ego Georgius Draskovitius Croata." He was created a Cardinal by the Croatian Pope, Sixtus V in 1585 (p. 60, A Review of Croatian History).

The fifth standout Croatian at an Ecumenical Council was that illustrious clergyman, statesman and patriot—Josip Juraj Strossmayer. He participated in the XX such conclave in the Vatican 1869–70 during the reign of Pope Pius IX. This council issued decrees on divine revelation and relationship of faith and reason; defined Papal infallibility.

Page 63 of "A Review of Croatian History" has this to say about this great Croat: "A great champion of church unity. * * * The famous Croat churchman of the last century was Bishop Josip Juray Strossmayer, one of the greatest Latin orators and a great advocate of the union of Orthodox churches with the Catholic Church. He built, at Djakovo, a magnificent cathedral which is the most beautiful church in southeastern Europe. He is immortal in Croatian history for his patriotic and educational endeavors. He led the group of bishops and prepared the arguments against papal infallibility and delivered the papers in Latin. He became world famous and was considered the greatest Latin scholar and orator of the 19th century.

The Zagreb University, the oldest and most renowned university in southeastern Europe, opened in 1874, chiefly because of the endeavors of Josip Juraj Strossmayer.

At the Vatican Council he was one of the most notable opponents of papal infallibility and distinguished himself as a speaker. The Pope himself praised Strossmayer's "remarkably good Latin."

After the council Strossmayer maintained his opposition longer than all the other bishops. On December 26, 1872, however, he yielded and published the decrees of the council in his official paper. At a later date he repeatedly proclaimed his submission to the Pope, as in his pastoral letter of February 28, 1881, on Sts. Cyril and Methodius expressing his devotion to the Holy See, at times, in extravagant language.

In politics he was an active supporter of the Croatian National Party and Pan-Slavism.

The theme of the coming XXI Council is Reunion of the Churches and so we may mention George Krizanic and what page 62 of "A Review of Croatian History" has to say about him: "For the Conversion of Russia"—"The Croat Jesuit Juraj Krizanic (1618–1683) was obsessed by a desire to win to the church the Orthodox Russians. He went to Moscow to persuade the Russian Czar to become a Catholic. Shortly after his arrival in Moscow he was exiled to Siberia, where he spent 16 years. When he was freed, he joined the Dominicans in Lithuania and as chaplain joined the army of King John Sobieski to fight the Turks at Vienna, where he was killed in 1683.

THE ARMY BIRTHDAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in an era of rapidly changing technology and with the development of weapons of war that stagger the imagination, too often we tend to forget the men who comprise our U.S. Army and the vital role that they are playing in maintaining peace throughout the world.

Today, June 14, 1960, marks the anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army. For 185 years this Army has maintained a continuous record of contribution to our Nation's security, welfare, and growth. The 145 battle streamers that fly from the Army flag are evidence of the devoted service and selfless duty that have been so characteristic of the U.S. Army during our wars. The navigable rivers and harbors of our Nation are evidence of the continued service of our Army Engineers. The relief to millions of sufferers during periods of disaster are evidence of the Army's close association with the citizens of our Nation.

In war and in peace the Army serves with distinction and pride and, in wishing them well on this 185th birthday, I am sure that I am echoing the sentiments of a grateful Nation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1374, Senate Resolution 279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 279) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe in giving credit where credit is due.

Many of the truly remarkable accomplishments of the executive branch of our Government come from relatively small agencies.

These agencies perform their work year after year with such competence and so little fanfare that sometimes we forget that they exist.

One of these smaller agencies which merits our appreciation and support is the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture.

It was 30 years ago that the Foreign Agricultural Service was established.

This agency is the foreign arm of agriculture.

And as such it develops foreign outlets for U.S. agricultural products; it administers export programs such as Public Law 480 and our food-for-peace programs; it represents the Department of Agriculture at international conferences, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; it analyzes foreign agricultural trade; and it does many other important tasks which I would like to touch on today.

Initially and through most of its life, FAS operated primarily as a fact-gathering and reporting agency. However, in 1954 it broadened its scope and became a dynamic action agency.

The year 1954 is a key date for this agency because of two events. First, the Agricultural Attaché Service was put back into the Department of Agriculture and placed in the Foreign Agricultural Service. Second, Public Law 480 was enacted.

Because Public Law 480 has been well administered it is now considered one of the more successful of the U.S. action programs.

THE AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉ

When responsibility for the Agricultural Attaché Service was transferred back to the Department of Agriculture in 1954, President Eisenhower said that the purpose of the transfer was "to sharpen the effort to find new world markets for our agricultural products" thereby establishing a new role for the agricultural attaché. This activity has received major emphasis since that time.

The agricultural attaché is often referred to as the "eyes, ears, and voice" of U.S. agriculture abroad. Some people call him "the good right arm" of U.S. agriculture abroad. However you describe him, much of what the Foreign Agricultural Service accomplishes depends upon the agricultural attaché.

One of his prime responsibilities is to report on important developments in foreign agriculture which might affect the U.S. farmer and the U.S. agricultural trade. This is "agricultural intelligence."

He reports on the production and consumption of agricultural products, and significant changes that are developing or are in the making; he reports on the agricultural policies of the country, and generally keeps alert for particular trends which the U.S. farmer and the U.S. agricultural trade need to know. He develops his information through a variety of sources.

Few countries maintain crop reporting services of the kind available in the United States. Therefore experience, knowledge, and considerable ingenuity are required if the attaché is to accurately reflect the agricultural situation in the country to which he is assigned.

He must be alert and travel extensively to check crop conditions and marketing movements, and maintain close contact with buyers and sellers of agricultural products within his areas. This firsthand observation of crops and trade situations is vital to the accuracy and timeliness of his information.

The agricultural attaché has the important responsibility of promoting markets for U.S. agricultural products.

This becomes more and more important because of the ability of U.S. farmers to produce abundantly.

Those of us who travel abroad are aware of the many other tasks the attaché must perform. He represents the U.S. farmer and as such must achieve an understanding and acceptance of U.S. agricultural policy among our customers abroad. He arranges contacts and itineraries for businessmen.

He is a key figure in the U.S. Embassy in administering Public Law 480 functions abroad; he participates in the exhibition of commodities in trade fairs; and supervises market development projects which are conducted abroad to expand markets for U.S. products.

I shall elaborate on market development activities later.

We have 76 attachés in 52 posts. They prepare more than 1,000 so-called regular reports and 3,000 voluntary reports annually.

The regular report is one which fits into scheduled official publications on foreign crops and markets.

The voluntary report is one the attaché makes when there are significant developments such as drought, flood, disease outbreaks, or possible government action which will result in a substantial change in the outlook for foreign trade. Time is of the greatest importance on reports such as these, frequently demanding on-the-spot evaluation and use of cable and telephone communication.

The agricultural attachés are not only performing essential work under the wing of the Department of Agriculture where they belong but they also serve as good-will ambassadors abroad. They mingle with people in all walks of life and generally enjoy the confidence of the citizens of their assigned countries.

PUBLIC LAW 480

In 1954, Public Law 480 was enacted as a comprehensive and yet an experimental approach to the use of agricultural surpluses. In almost 6 years of operation, the program has emerged as a major U.S. agricultural program to utilize our agricultural abundance to help the free world. It is among the most successful U.S. programs. The Foreign Agricultural Service has been the key agency in its administration.

The program has moved more than $6 billion worth of commodities at world market prices. In terms of price support costs, this would amount to about $9 billion. We have to convert these dollar amounts into quantities in order to appreciate the magnitude of the program.

One-and-a-half billion bushels of wheat have been exported under Public Law 480. This is about 1½ times our average annual production. It is about

three times the quantity of wheat the American people use every year as food.

Another 630 million bushels of corn, barley, grain sorghums, and oats have been exported; 3 billion pounds of nonfat dry milk and the same quantity of vegetable oil; 50 million bags of rice; and more than 6 million bales of cotton. These are figures to stagger the imagination.

Most of these quantities have been moved under title I of Public Law 480, which authorizes the sale of surpluses for foreign currencies. Foreign currency sales are made largely to friendly developing countries or to countries in poor financial condition and as such have become a vital foreign policy instrument.

In the case of Formosa and Korea, for example, title I sales directly augment the mutual security program. Commodities are moved to these countries to support their economies and most of the currencies generated are used for military assistance.

Title I of Public Law 480 probably has been the major factor in U.S. support to Turkey, one of our strongest allies. The furnishing of wheat particularly has enabled that country to stand firm at the doorstep of the U.S.S.R.

The title I currencies are contributing to the economic development of many South American countries. They are being used to improve highways and ports in Chile, for electric power and steel-manufacturing in Brazil, and for irrigation and land development in Peru.

The classic example of how title I of Public Law 480 works and the greatest demonstration of the use of food for peaceful purposes will be found in India.

The title I agreement negotiated last month with India involves the shipment of 17 million tons of wheat and rice to India over a 4-year period. It means nearly 600 million bushels of wheat and 22 million bags of rice. This is more than the quantity of wheat and rice the United States consumes as food annually. Stated in another way, it means that an average of more than one shipload of 11,000 tons of grain will leave the ports of the United States for the ports of India every day for the next 4 years.

The agreement means more than that, however. It is designed to help this large key country in the struggle between the free world and communism by establishing substantial food reserves.

One-quarter of the wheat and all the rice will be stockpiled in India to help meet any emergency that might arise there—be it a crop shortage or an emergency from drought, food, or other natural disaster.

Also, a large part of the rupees that will be paid to the United States for these commodities will be loaned or granted to the Government of India for economic development purposes to finance essential projects such as power development, irrigation, and industrial works.

It means large direct support to India's third 5-year plan which will begin in March 1961.

Rupees generated under previous title I transactions with India are now being used on a loan basis to expand their economy.

A typical example of this rupee use is the building of a 250,000 kilowatt-hour thermoelectric plant near Calcutta. It will be the largest of its type in India.

Currencies are also being used to help meet construction costs for the Utter Pradesh Agricultural University, a new State agricultural school patterned after U.S. land-grant colleges and universities. It is scheduled to open in July, near Rudrapur.

And Public Law 480 currencies are assisting in the eradication of malaria in India.

Currencies are also being loaned to private business firms, to expand their plants.

Loans to the Indian affiliates of the Goodyear and Firestone tire and rubber companies will give employment to about 1,500 workers. The Goodyear plant will produce about half of India's present requirements for rubber.

Another loan is helping to finance the Hindustan aluminum reduction plant. The capacity of the plant will be 20,000 tons per year which will increase India's aluminum production capacity by two-thirds.

The initial press reaction in India to the new agreement demonstrates the foreign policy aspect of title I agreements.

In the Bombay area, for example, the Bangalore Prajavani stated:

> Present agreement is memorable event in history of Indo-United States friendly relations.

The Times of India said:

> No Government has ever been more generous in dealing with an underdeveloped country than the U.S. administration in negotiating this agreement.

The Industan said:

> In other words, this agreement is a living example of mutual help and cooperation between the two free, democratic, and progressive nations of the world.

Even Communist-oriented local language newspapers concede the tremendous impact of the agreement.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

I was pleased with the President's message of March 17, 1960, concerning the program being developed by the administration to promote the growth of U.S. export trade.

The President said:

> Expanded exports can add substantially to the millions of jobs already generated for our people by export trade.

He cautioned that world markets now are highly competitive, and a more vigorous effort is required by both government and business to expand exports under these circumstances.

The President specifically directed the expansion of the agricultural trade promotion activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture on April 12 announced that the Department was conducting an overall review of current export policies, programs, and activities, in efforts to further expand the agricultural trade promotion activities. At that time he pointed out that much already had been done in the agricultural sector in this respect.

Much of what has been done has been accomplished through the Foreign Agricultural Service. The FAS has been promoting agricultural trade for several years through market development projects financed by title I, Public Law 480 currencies and market analyses made by its commodity specialists. The FAS has pioneered this activity in the agricultural field. It was undertaken in cooperation with U.S. trade and farm groups, in recognition of the fact that responsibility for market promotion rests with these groups.

Since 1955, it has developed 370 such cooperative projects in 40 countries. The equivalent of $29 million is being spent under these projects in cooperation with 60 U.S. trade and farm groups.

The Foreign Agricultural Service has made $22 million available in Public Law 480 currencies, and $7 million has been made available by trade groups as matching funds.

This involves a substantial trade promotion effort.

However, I am convinced that Agriculture should use a greater share of the Public Law 480 currencies in this connection, because one of the primary objectives of the act is to promote U.S. agriculture exports. The Congress emphasized this in the extension of Public Law 480 last year, by inserting a provision that not less than 5 percent of title I sales proceeds and loan repayments should be made available for agricultural market development work. This should assure that the FAS can use increased amounts in its program of cooperation with trade groups to expand markets.

Market development projects involve various promotional techniques—surveys and studies of market potential and needs, advertising campaigns, translation and distribution of promotional and educational leaflets, studies of consumer demand, exchange visits of management and technical personnel of United States and foreign trade groups, and basic promotional techniques, such as contests and public appearances of our dairy "maids" and cotton "queens."

An especially dynamic trade fair program has been developed.

So far, FAS has put on about 50 fairs, reaching 25 million people.

To cite a few, commodities were exhibited at the Fine Foods Fair in Cologne, Germany, to acquaint European buyers and the public with the quality and availability of U.S. agricultural products.

Successful exhibit of the use of U.S. feed grains has been made in several locations in Italy and in Greece.

Exhibits have been held in the Spanish Agricultural Fair in Madrid, showing U.S. soybean products, frozen poultry and tobacco, and included a full-scale recombining plant, making samples of milk and ice cream available to the public.

These projects and trade fairs have made foreign buyers conscious of the quality of U.S. farm products; and the response to these efforts is heartening. Let us look at some results.

One of the most dramatic stories in market development concerns the strides

which have been made in the export of U.S. frozen poultry.

A few years ago exports of U.S. poultry were extremely small. Now the United States is the world's leading exporter of poultry meat.

In Switzerland, for example, exports of poultry rose from virtually nothing in 1955, to more than 20 million pounds last year, with a further increase expected this year. This resulted simply and purely by having the FAS convince Swiss grocery cooperatives to make trial orders of broiler chickens. When Swiss food chains saw how the product was purchased by the Swiss people, orders for frozen poultry grew at a fantastic rate.

The same story was true in West Germany, where again poultry exports rose from nothing prior to 1955 to 50 million pounds in 1959.

Market development projects helped raise exports of soybeans to Italy from a half million bushels in 1954–55 to about 5½ million bushels during the current marketing year.

Market promotion, along with improved processing practices in the United States, has helped maintain tallow exports to Japan at more than 200 million pounds annually.

Tobacco exports have increased to Thailand, through the same type of market promotion.

Similar results are being achieved for other commodities and other markets.

The Foreign Agricultural Service, with the help of the agricultural attachés and U.S. traders and farm organizations, has sales promotion projects for dairy products; breeding stock, including beef and dairy cattle, swine, and sheep; wheat; cotton; soybeans; and the whole gamut of farm products.

The total agricultural export picture reflects the vigor and success of promotion activities put on by the Foreign Agricultural Service. During the 2 years prior to 1954, total agricultural exports fell short of $3 billion each year. The return of the agricultural attachés, aggressive promotion work, and special export programs resulted in rapidly increasing exports.

Agricultural exports have averaged more than $4 billion during each of the past 3 fiscal years.

In the fiscal year which ends June 30, the value of U.S. agricultural exports will total about $4.5 billion.

Of this $4.5 billion, about $3.3 billion is expected to be straight commercial dollar sales which would be close to the best year we've ever had in dollar sales.

From the standpoint of individual commodities, the export situation is bright.

Exports of wheat have been extremely heavy this spring, and will approach 500 million bushels for the marketing year or nearly half the 1959 crop.

Cotton exports should total about six and a half million bales, again nearly half of the 1959 crop.

Exports of soybeans again will set a new record, running at least 20 million bushels ahead of last year when 103 million bushels were moved.

Feed grain exports will also set a new record of about 13 million tons.

Fruit and vegetable exports and most animal products movements are above those of last year.

PUBLICATIONS AND REPORTS

A special word needs to be said about the publications and reports that come out of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

Based on the agricultural attaché reports I discussed earlier, and on visits of marketing specialists, FAS publishes timely and well-written reports and publications dealing with an extremely wide range of subjects.

A typical example is a recent report on the market in Japan for U.S. livestock and meat products.

Another type of report is a competition study made of Russian cotton production, consumption, and trade.

The report shows that these aspects of Russian cotton have increased steadily in postwar years, placing that country second only to the United States in all three categories prior to 1958, when Communist China probably moved into second place.

Along the same line, a study was made of Communist China cotton textile exports indicating that it has made a concerted effort to reenter and expand trade with free world countries.

And with cotton textiles an important item in this trade drive, the volume of Communist China's cotton textile exports has adversely affected U.S. exports of raw cotton to some of our most important customers.

A study was made of Brazil's wheat expansion program to determine prospects for continued expansion and production and other developments likely to affect the future competitive status of U.S. wheat and flour in that market.

Although Brazil increased production sevenfold in the last 20 years, and this is an outstanding accomplishment, the increase was outdistanced by population growth and increased consumer demand.

It is estimated that, at current consumption levels, Brazil will need 4 million tons of wheat annually by 1970.

Other reports include a study of foreign government wheat production and trade policies, the competitive position of U.S. hides in world markets, the position of U.S. hops in world markets.

The mention of some titles illustrates the variety of subjects looked into—"The Greek Raisin Industry," "The Role of Farm Products in U.S. Aid to Spain," "West Africa's Fats and Oils Industry," "The Agriculture of Ceylon."

CONCLUSION

The virtue of the Foreign Agricultural Service that impresses me is the manner in which it operates with its limited amount of personnel and budget expense.

It has about 800 employees, of which about 135 are foreign nationals working with agricultural attachés overseas, and a current budget of about $7 million.

What with the Public Law 480 programs, market development obligations, reporting responsibilities, and many other functions spread out all over the world, it is indeed gratifying that this agency is performing so effectively and efficiently.

While its programs have grown large, Foreign Agricultural Service has made only modest increases in staff, whereas many agencies would mushroom under similar circumstances.

In the brief rundown I have made of this efficient agency, I have not touched on some of its important activities—seeking trade liberalization is one of them.

The agency is hitting hard on the further removal of restrictions against U.S. agricultural exports.

It is studying the Common Market as it relates to farm trade.

In short, it is studying, analyzing, watching all aspects of foreign trade that affect the American farmer and trader.

The Foreign Agricultural Service deserves a vote of thanks from the American people and the Congress.

ENFORCE ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT—PLUG TAX LOOPHOLES—REPEAL OPPRESSIVE EXCISE TAXES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, American people very properly resent paying each month a 10-percent excise tax as telephone users.

This outrageous 10-percent tax has been added to the telephone service charge and to all charges for local and long-distance telephone calls since 1941.

Nearly 20 years ago, while I was serving in the House of Representatives, this tax was introduced and passed as a wartime measure to raise additional revenue to meet the threat of aggression from Adolf Hitler's Germany.

During the last session of the Congress, this unjust tax on telephone use and on local telephone tolls was extended to June 30 of this year. It is my hope that this atrocious tax will be permitted to expire.

I assert, Mr. President, that this 10-percent tax, which, of course, is passed on to telephone users, should not be permitted the sort of permanency that it has. It is a burdensome tax and, in fact, lays the heaviest burden upon people in modest circumstances or persons engaged in business who must necessarily make regular use of telephone service.

An excise tax is, of course, a sales tax. Sales taxes invariably tax those who have the least.

Unfortunately, Eisenhower administration officials have recommended that the tax on local telephone calls be extended for another year. By reason of this recommendation, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has reported to that body a bill continuing this tax for an additional year.

Mr. President, I contend there will never be a better time for the lawmaking body of this country to act in a forthright manner and end this abominable tax, than right now.

I use the word "abominable" advisedly for the reason I feel there are so many other ways in which our Government could obtain more feathers with less squawking than by imposing this sort of a tax which burdens those in modest circumstances.

Mr. President, I have always been opposed to this excise, or sales, tax, which places a heavy burden on persons making telephone calls. Telephone service is certainly a household, as well as a business, necessity.

This sort of excise, or sales, tax is discriminatory. It was imposed on the American people at the same time taxes on luxury items, such as nightclub entertainment, jewelry, expensive furs, and liquor, were imposed. I assert taxing telephone users in the home, factories, and offices is not in the same category as taxing these luxury items. I assert this is an atrocious tax.

Furthermore, admittedly, telephone service is a public utility service. Yet, do other public utilities—water, electricity, and gas—suffer by the imposition of such a discriminatory tax?

The Ohio Bell Telephone Co. and other telephone companies are, in reality, not the actual sufferers from the imposition of this discriminatory tax. The sufferers are the citizens who use telephones. This sort of sales tax, or excise tax, violates every sound principle of just taxation. It is regressive. It burdens most those who have least. It is not in accord with that sound principle of just taxation that taxes should be levied by our Government upon its people based upon their ability to pay.

Mr. President, the urgency of bringing this matter to the attention of the public is heightened and increased by this new proposal to extend this sales, or excise, tax, and by the likelihood of its becoming a permanent burden on those who use telephones.

Here is highlighted one great problem presented whenever the Congress is called on to levy new taxes. Despite statements that such Federal sales, or excise, taxes are only temporary in character to meet a certain emergency, the merciless facts are that once a tax is promulgated and enforced, despite statements to the contrary, it is usually continued on the statute books and remains there as a permanent form of taxation.

As Ohio Congressman-at-large, I voted against the imposition of a sales tax upon purchases made in the District of Columbia. That was many years ago. It was then stated that there was a necessity for a 2 percent sales tax to meet a temporary emergency, and that when the emergency came to an end, the tax would be repealed. The cruel facts are, this sales tax in the District of Columbia—the same as the 3 percent sales tax in Ohio—has become a permanent form of taxation.

Persons who are poor, or in moderate circumstances, spend all of their incomes for living purposes, and they bear a greater burden than do those persons who receive high incomes and save a substantial portion of their earnings.

It is later than we think.

Now is the time to end this unfair, detestable, burdensome, and discriminatory excise tax. If we fail to do this now, it will burden our people for many years to come. In fact, it will, without doubt, burden them permanently.

Furthermore, Mr. President, at this time I give notice that I am unalterably opposed to the imposition of any general Federal sales tax, as has been advocated constantly by the National Association of Manufacturers and by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, let us enforce economy in Government. Economy in Government, like economy in an individual, I apprehend, means going without some of the things we would like to have but do not absolutely need.

The duplication and waste in our Defense Establishment is appalling. This is without doubt the most wasteful branch of Government. It is estimated that $5 billion has been squandered each year during the Eisenhower administration partly because of lack of unification of our Armed Forces.

Only yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] illustrated this point by showing, among other things, that the Navy Department paid $21.10 each for thousands of small lamp sockets which he purchased for 25 cents each in a retail store. He displayed a set of wrenches which cost the Army $29 each and which he purchased for $3.89.

Senator DOUGLAS displayed and discussed numerous other examples of inexcusable waste and inefficiency in the procurement practices of the Armed Forces. For example, a headset cable for which the Air Force paid nearly $11 each and which he purchased at a local electric store for $1.50; an electric delay line purchased in quantity by the Air Force at $250 each which was offered him at $25; a small blower for which the Air Force paid $50 and which was quoted to him at $3.66 each if bought in quantity; an electric plug for which the Air Force paid $11 each and which was appraised at from 25 to 50 cents; and metal gage plugs for which taxpayers, via the Air Force, paid $10 each and which are offered at a Washington machine shop for 50 cents each.

It is evident that the Pentagon procurement system is so wasteful that billions of taxpayers' dollars have been squandered unnecessarily each year during the Eisenhower administration.

The law is clear that negotiated contracts should be utilized only in emergencies and limited circumstances, but this law has been violated and the Air Force, Army, and Navy have in many instances been paying from 6 to 100 times the retail value of many products.

Each branch of the armed services acts as if it alone were the sole savior of the country. Each bids against the other. As a result, contractors benefit and taxpayers suffer.

Here is a place where we can really save taxpayers' money. This administration and any future one would do better to direct its efforts toward accomplishing real unification of the Armed Forces rather than imposing discriminatory excise taxes on the American people.

Mr. President, instead of continuing the telephone excise tax, we should make every effort to utilize to the fullest our present revenue producing laws—in other words, to plug the loopholes in our present tax structure.

Taxpayers who, at present, are struggling under our loophole-riddled tax laws, are entitled to a break.

It is estimated that an additional $1 billion per year could be produced in income taxes by spending a modest amount for more Internal Revenue Service investigators. Slower service to taxpayers entitled to refunds and much lower income tax payments result from present inadequate examination and scrutiny of income tax returns.

Too many recipients of large incomes deduct too much for expenses or "swindle sheets." Deductions for members of the family on so-called business trips, transportation to conventions held in convenient locations abroad, company cars, airplanes, yachts, vacation and hunting lodges in Canada, Florida, and California, and lavish expense accounts at plush nightclubs and theaters are just a few of today's permissible tax dodges.

More investigators and revenue agents will result in bringing in more income taxes, more fair dealing to all taxpayers, and quicker refunds. For each additional $1,000 spent on their salaries, our good Uncle can look forward to receiving $30,000 in increased revenue.

Mr. President, since 1926 oil and gas producers have been permitted to deduct 27½ percent annually as a depletion allowance regardless of the actual depletion involved. There is no loophole in the tax laws so inequitable as the excessive depletion exemptions now enjoyed by oil and gas corporate interests.

If this depletion allowance were reduced from 27½ percent to 15 percent, $500 million would be added to our annual revenue, and in my judgment, no corporation would be dealt with unjustly.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the more flagrant loopholes in our income tax laws. Others could be mentioned, including preferred treatment for dividend income, capital gains formula, loss carryovers, and the withholding of income tax on dividends at the source.

The average hard working citizen should not be burdened with excise taxes on his necessities, including local and long-distance telephone calls. Nor should other taxpayers, individual or corporate, be permitted to make millions through tax loopholes.

Let us plug loopholes in our present revenue laws so as to channel additional taxpayments into the Federal Treasury. At the same time, let us eliminate unfair, unsound, and atrocious excise taxes which tax most those who have least.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question or two?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I gladly yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Ohio for the speech he has just delivered in the Senate. It is a speech that is sorely needed.

Referring to the Senator's comment on excise taxes, is the Senator aware of the fact that as early as 1947 the Committee for Economic Development, at that time headed by Paul Hoffman, a great industrialist, made the first in a series of recommendations that it has since made

proposing the elimination of a good many of our excise taxes and a substantial reduction in most of the others? Is the Senator aware of that position taken by the Committee for Economic Development?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I do recall that position, but I did not realize that, unfortunately for the American people, 13 long years have elapsed since that time.

Mr. MORSE. It was that year, 1947, that the senior Senator from Oregon introduced the first of his bills to reduce excise taxes and the elimination of many of them. My bill merely proposed to put in black and white the recommendation of these very outstanding representatives of business in this country.

That report of 1947 asserted—and the observation has been repeated in subsequent reports—that when excise taxes were levied during the war, Congress pledged that when the war was over it would remove the excise taxes because they were levied for two purposes. One purpose was to discourage civilian production and, of course, excise taxes do so. They discourage production not only in time of war, but also in time of peace.

Discouragement of civilian production has been one of the results of the levying of the excise taxes. Of course, during the war we did not want civilian production. We wanted a minimum of civilian production; we wanted a maximum of war production. They were levied for that purpose.

There were levied for a second purpose, which was to raise some emergency funds based not upon the principle of ability to pay but convenience of collection. Convenience of collection is the best argument that can be made for an excise tax. It is easy to collect, but it is not collected on a fair basis because it does not tax those who have the greatest ability to pay. I know of no tax that is more unfair to the general consumer of the country than an excise tax.

Since 1947 I have sought to get the Senate to act in this field at least seven or eight times, as year after year I offered a series of amendments.

I welcome the help of the Senator from Ohio. I am delighted to associate myself with his remarks today in the Senate. I ask him, in view of the fact that certain politicians made these pledges to which I have referred during the war, if he disagrees with me when I make the observation that politicians ought to keep their pledges, too.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is a great Senator, and who certainly manifested splendid leadership in 1947 and has continued to do so in urging the repeal of these abominable taxes, I say that politicians should comply with the pledges they make and should absolutely adhere to them.

May I add that I am very happy to follow, as a humble private in the ranks, the great leadership of the Senator from Oregon on this subject. In the short time that I have been a Member of the Senate I have found that the judgment of the senior Senator from Oregon is usually excellent.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the very kind remarks of the Senator from Ohio. I always have great respect for political courage. The Senator from Ohio has demonstrated such courage time and time again since he came to the Senate, and he demonstrated it again today.

Great courage is required to stand up against the powerful oil and gas combine of this country, which exercises such a powerful influence in the Halls of Congress that it is able to continue to steal from the American people on a political basis—and that is what it amounts to—the shocking amount of a depletion allowance of 27½ percent.

I hope that the American people will wake up finally. I do not know what more we can do but to point out to the American people how the oil and gas industry robs them year after year. The industry is supported by Members of Congress who do not represent the people of this country, but who really represent the gas and oil interests. It is about time that the people call for an accounting from these politicians who are selling them out by robbing the people with this kind of handout to the gas and oil industry.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate I say, too, that the oil and gas interests of America are exercising an undue influence upon the foreign policy of this Republic, and it is about time that we had an accounting from the oil and gas interests, both in regard to their escapism in avoiding the taxes they ought to pay, and in regard to the undue influence they are exercising in American foreign policy.

Here is one U.S. Senator who would rather leave the Senate than to sit here as a representative of the oil and gas interests of America.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his kind reference to me. Again I say that I agree with the views he has expressed on this vital public issue.

Mr. President, on this matter it is later than we think.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 279) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has some questions on the resolution, although no real objection to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have any objection to Calendar No. 1374, Senate Resolution 279, which I understand is a resolution to augment the regular appropriation of $10,000 made to the Committee on Government Operations. Each standing committee of the Senate is allowed $10,000 per year for its regular investigative operations. I understand that the Committee on Government Operations has expended its regular allowance for this work and wishes to augment that amount by $10,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-sixth Congress, $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1375, Senate Resolution 310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 310) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the purpose of the resolution is merely to augment the regular appropriation to the Armed Services Committee for its operation by an additional $10,000. This money would be used to pay for the regular operations of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is for routine purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 310) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-sixth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

STUDY OF GOVERNMENT LICENSED MEDIA FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1376, Senate Resolution 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 305) providing for a study of the uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 16, after the word "committee", to strike out "from February 1, 1960," and insert "from date of approval of this resolution", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Federal policy on uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and advertising, and the presentation of political candidates; and

(2) a review and examination of information and complaints concerning the dissemination of news by such media.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from date of approval of this resolution to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in support of Senate Resolution 305, I point out that it provides a modest amount of money for the work of the so-called watchdog subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The fundamental objective of the Radio Act of 1927 was to require equality of treatment of political candidates by broadcasters. As a result of that act, certain limitations were placed upon broadcasting stations—in fact, strict limitations were placed upon them—which were applicable equally to TV stations. The requirement was that all candidates were entitled to equal time in the use of the airwaves.

The Lar Daly decision, emanating from Chicago, Ill., held that the equal time provision applied to comments made in radio news broadcasts. It provided that news broadcasting comments relating to one candidate should apply equally to other candidates.

As a result of that decision, Congress, at the last session, passed an act amendatory of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934. It amended the equal-time provision, insofar as it applied to news broadcasters, as follows:

Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any—

(1) bona fide newscast.

(2) bona fide news interview,

(3) bona fide news documentary (if the appearance of the candidate is incidental to the presentation of the subject or subjects covered by the news documentary), or

(4) on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events (including but not limited to political conventions and activities incidental thereto),

shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection

That was the equal-time subsection.

That relaxing of the requirement that candidates receive equal time was very sharply and bitterly debated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There was a sharp discussion of the matter on the floor of the Senate.

At that time, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], pointed out that there were two limitations in the bill. While S. 2424 provided for the relaxing of the equal-time amendment with reference to news broadcasts, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications had placed in the bill sections 2(a) and 2(b). Section 2(a) provided that at the end of a 3-year period following the effective date of the enactment of the act, which was 1959, the law would be reexamined by Congress. The declaration of intent in the law was to ascertain whether the remedy provided by such amendment had proved to be effective and practicable in getting to the people news of the candidates, but not to blackout the news in a race where there were 18 candidates. Knowing from every possible test that one candidate will receive very few votes, it would do away with the requirement that he be given equal time. If there are 18 candidates for office, and 2 candidates get 98 percent of the vote, and 10 get one-half of 1 percent of the vote, if we take the 10 candidates who receive one-half of 1 percent of the votes between them, and give them equal time with the 2 major candidates who are receiving 98 percent of the votes, we will virtually destroy comment about that race by the news broadcasters.

So the second safeguard in the act is a requirement that the Federal Communications Commission shall report to Congress within 15 days after the close of the year beginning on the date of the enactment of this act, and within 15 days after the close of each 2 following years. That is under the requirement of the law that Congress reexamine the amendment to section 315(a) after 3 years.

In a discussion on the floor last year between the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], it was stated that a watchdog subcommittee would be created to observe the effect of the amendment to section 315(a) on a broader scale, and that the watchdog committee would also study the fairness of the dissemination of news by news medium.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, this matter was thoroughly discussed last year when we amended the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Texas stated, there was some objection in the committee itself as to who should police the whole matter. It is my recollection that it was understood that the industry itself would police the matter. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It was stated on the floor at that time, in a colloquy between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Rhode Island, that perhaps a governmental watchdog agency might be created. Immediately following that, in September 1959, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce created the so-called watchdog subcommittee. It had no money with which to operate. As a practical matter, we have been a "paper" subcommittee, having no funds, no staff, and no means with which to operate. We have been in existence, technically, since September 1959, but have not had any funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is an entirely new committee, is it not?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is a new subcommittee of the committee. It was created last September and then ratified by the unanimous vote of the full committee early this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the Senator propose to do with the funds? What will be the duties of the new subcommittee?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The duties of the subcommittee are set forth in the resolution.

It is resolved that it will be a subcommittee—

To examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to

(1) Federal policy on uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and advertising, and the presentation of political candidates; and

(2) A review and examination of information and complaints concerning the dissemination of news by such media.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was not that very purpose carried out last year and the year before by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator from Rhode Island is chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications. The watchdog subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Subcommittee on Communications. There is no conflict between them. We operate under the Subcommittee on Communications and under the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Texas has indicated to us what the subcommittee proposes to do. My question is, Has not the same thing been done by the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The answer is, No; not exactly so.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does it differ?

Mr. PASTORE. In this regard. The legislation which was passed a year ago came about as a result of a decision made by the Federal Communications Commission concerning a rule under section 315 of the law, which has to do with the allotment of equal time to opposing candidates.

A situation arose in Chicago, Ill., where the mayor was exposed on a newscast. At that time an individual named Lar Daly was an opponent of the mayor. He requested equal time, and he was granted equal time.

The minute that that flexibility was given to the interpretation of the law—that is, section 315—a serious question arose. It was felt that if that decision should persist, we would destroy the effectiveness of television and radio exposure of persons who are nominees or who are candidates for elective office. I thought at that time that the Federal Communications Commission was wrong in its interpretation of the law. Be that as it may, that was the interpretation for all intents and purposes, and it was final.

Therefore, in order to correct that interpretation, it became necessary to correct the law. That was done without prolonged hearings. As a matter of fact, I think the hearings took place over a period of a week or two. The committee proposed an amendment to the law. That amendment, in the form of a bill, was reported by the committee and adopted by the Senate.

There was apprehension on the part of many Members of the Senate. It was felt that the door might actually be opened too far; or, conversely, that the door might be closed so tight that equal opportunity for exposure on the part of the candidates of the various parties would be destroyed. Congress amended the law.

In order to give assurance to those who had apprehension concerning the matter, the suggestion was made at that time—it was not made by the junior Senator from Rhode Island—that there be a watchdog committee, whereupon the junior Senator from Rhode Island responded very, very quickly that we were not equipped to assume that responsibility because we had only one staff member; and the subcommittee is quite an involved one, and has an extremely large amount of work to do. The best evidence of that is to be found in the number of bills and other measures it has produced this year.

At that time I suggested that if the job of being a watchdog and checking effectiveness of the enforcement of this law was undertaken, we would have to have an assigned subcommittee set up to do it.

DEVELOPMENT OF WILDLIFE, FISH, AND GAME CONSERVATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations.

STUDY OF GOVERNMENT LICENSED MEDIA FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate Resolution 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 305) providing for a study of the uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me say that as a result of the suggestion of the junior Senator from Rhode Island, it was considered that possibly it would be best to initiate a distinct watchdog subcommittee.

I think the subcommittee has a very purposeful job to do. I believe the amount of money being sought at this time is a rather modest one. We do not now have the staff which must be enlisted if the task is to be done; there is much work to be done by the subcommittee.

In answer to the question the Senate has asked, let me say that last year we did not do this job. All we did was amend the equal-time law; and because it was amended, it was feared my some that we might have gone too far, and that we might have made it possible for the broadcasting companies to discriminate.

That is the genesis of this proposal, which calls for an entirely new task.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I understand that when the law was amended last year, there was an understanding that the policing was to be done by the industry itself.

Mr. PASTORE. No; the purpose of this subcommittee is to police the industry.

Mr. ELLENDER. My understanding was that the industry would police itself.

I wonder what two investigators would be able to do? I understand that it is proposed that two investigators be employed. According to the report, there would be one professional staff member for the majority, and one for the minority. One would be paid almost $15,000 a year. The other would pe paid a little more than $13,500 a year. What is it proposed that those two men do? What would be their function?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. First, in answer to the question of the Senator from Louisiana about having the industry police itself, let me say that would be like saying we will abolish the highway patrol, and will make all the automobile drivers police themselves, as regards observing the speed limit.

In the second place, the staff will be very small. It will be difficult to do the work with so small a staff. But it will be better to have a small staff than none. This subcommittee has been in existence since September, but has been hampered and hamstrung because of a lack of staff. The staff now proposed is the least the subcommittee should have—one for the majority, one for the minority, and a competent secretary. Of course the work will be done partially in connection with the complaints which are received.

I received a very bitter complaint from my State. A young man was elected to the legislature; and once he was elected, the television station began to use him as its "weatherman." On the television programs, he was called Mr. Weatherman. He obtained a great deal of publicity in that way. His opponent complained bitterly, and said the television station had not given fair treatment. The station replied that it had not mentioned the man by name, but had just referred to him as Mr. Weatherman. Nevertheless, in that way Mr. Weatherman received a great deal of publicity, and his opponent never received equal treatment. That case is an example of the complaints we have received.

I understand that in West Virginia a candidate for sheriff had a program on television, and there was complaint as to the time provided and to the lack of equal treatment. He had a weekly program. I think the result in that case was a different ruling, as compared with the ruling in the Mr. Weatherman case; and I think that resulted partly from the criticism in our committee and in the Senate about the Mr. Weatherman ruling, in which it was held that it was perfectly all right for the television station to permit the candidate to partic-

ipate in the broadcasts of the weather reports, in connection with which he was called Mr. Weatherman. But as a result of all the publicity he received in that way, he was reelected.

The purpose of this subcommittee work will be to deal with complaints of that kind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee received any complaints except those from the Senator's State?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The subcommittee has not been able to function.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the subcommittee has been in existence; has it not?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. On paper only. After holding one or two meetings, we could not obtain a staff, and we were hamstrung, and could not do the job we should do. Either the subcommittee should be abolished or it should be given a proper staff. Without a proper staff, what can either committees or individual Senators do?

For instance, I should be at a committee meeting now. All of us need staff members, particularly this year, when we face a great national election. All of us need competent assistants. Certainly it would be a mistake to assume that broadcasters are less fallible than we are. We make mistakes, and so do the broadcasters.

The basic purpose of the subcommittee, in connection with its work, is to see that equal treatment is provided candidates who participate in radio and television broadcasts. All of us know that certain broadcasters have their preferences. Some broadcasters think one candidate is more colorful than the other, and thus they refer most often to the candidate they regard as the more colorful. They are not necessarily trying to elect that candidate, but they simply like his colorful manner, and so they mention him frequently, and neglect the other candidate.

Under section 315 there is a requirement, with respect to certain news broadcasts, that equal time be provided. That requirement no longer obtains, but the element of fairness must receive serious consideration.

Furthermore, we do not have sufficient funds to be able to do the work the Senator has mentioned. We have been seeking grants from foundations in order to do that work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator want the subcommittee to act as a watchdog?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. The candidates' television programs should be monitored; and the only way to know whether equal treatment and fair treatment is given is to listen to the programs constantly.

After one complaint was made, it was found that although the television station said it did not favor a certain candidate, nevertheless, the station arranged to have that candidate appear on the television program immediately following a news broadcast in which the broadcaster had been placing great emphasis on the platform of one of the two political parties; and the platform the broadcaster had been emphasizing "just happened" to be the platform of the particular candidate who then appeared on the program.

In other words, the purpose of this subcommittee is to make sure that there is fairness in connection with the news media.

This resolution calls for a small, timid beginning; but certainly a small beginning is better than none, and certainly some beginning must be made.

It is a fallacy to have a so-called watchdog subcommittee, but not permit it to have any staff. The subcommittee must have a staff if it is to determine whether equal television or radio time is granted to the various candidates and parties.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the Senator knows the evil which would follow from the appointment of a watchdog committee to see to it that all the laws were strictly obeyed, and so forth. If we were to do that, we would have myriads of subcommittees. If fact, we have too many now.

As I understand, the subcommittee is to have until January 31, 1961, to do its work. Is that correct? That is in accordance with the wording of the resolution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is the same base that the other committees have.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the work of the subcommittee can be completed by then?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not think so; I think it will take longer.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the subcommittee would be more or less a permanent one, would it?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not think so. I think the crucial time for the subcommittee is this year, during the great national election.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the view of the Senator that after the coming national election there will be no need for the subcommittee?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Well, in the bill the Congress passed last year, amending the Communications Act of 1934, Congress declared its intention to be to reexamine the amendment of section 315 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, made by the first section of that act, at or before the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of that act. That was last year. So, at some time during the 3-year period, the Congress is to reexamine that question. One year has already passed; 2 years remain. I do not know whether the Congress will wish to wait until the end of the 2 remaining years before it reexamines that question. But certainly the Congress should not wait more than 2 years.

Certainly it would end before the end of the period in which the Congress of the United States has declared it will reexamine the question to see whether there is fairness of treatment in news commentaries, news documentation, on-the-spot coverage of news, or panel discussions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a very unusual resolution. I say that for a number of reasons. In the first place, the public law to deal with section 315, providing for equal-time facilities for candidates, actually became public law in September 1959. That was about 9 months ago. Insofar as I know, there were no elections in September of 1959. I know of no elections in October or November or December of that year, unless they were special elections.

Now a campaign is beginning, and, of course, it has got a rather ardent start—maybe it got an ardent start in 1959—but it is a little amazing, 9 months after this kind of legislation was put on the statute books, that the Senate would undertake to set up a special monitoring committee, with very broad powers, to have authority starting with the date of the approval of the resolution and ending on the last day of January 1961. That will be a period of about 7 months, and certainly it will embrace the period from now on that will be coextensive with the presidential, senatorial, and congressional campaigns.

As I read the language of the resolution, it provides for authority to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to Federal policy on uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, advertising, and the presentations of political candidates.

As I have pointed out, the law has been on the statute books only since September of last year. How many complaints could actually have arisen? And when will the complaints be made, unless they are made after the coming campaign is over? But are we going to have a Senate committee dipping right in the middle of a campaign to determine whether or not Republicans or Democrats were favorites with respect to the use of time on television or radio? Are we going to have a committee, even if it is a small committee, with a clerical staff of three, going around the country, poking into this matter, and, by the very existence of the committee, exercising an influence in the campaign itself? This is just as transparent as a plate glass window, in my book, and it is quite obvious that it has a very definite political purpose.

Somebody may object to that statement, but I let the language speak for itself, and I let the timing speak for itself. The committee is going to last only 7 months. If it were going to be a real oversight committee, it would, after the campaign was over, dispassionately and rather calmly make its finding on the basis of the abuses that may have been brought to light and the complaints that may have been filed.

It is rather interesting that the Federal Communications Commission, for the new budget year, asked for $300,000 for monitoring purposes. That means, of course, monitoring of radio and television. That is the regulatory agency which was created by the Congress for that purpose, and if there is anything wrong with it, then let Congress aim its guns at the regulatory agency, and not set up a political committee that will

have a life of 7 months and end in January, 9 or 10 or 11 days after the inauguration of the new President of the United States.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think everything the Senator from Illinois is saying could truthfully be said about the resolution unless we tied it in or associated it with what transpired a year ago in our Senate history, when we amended section 315 of the Communications Act.

The monitoring the Senator is talking about, with reference to the appropriation, has particularly to do with deception in some of the commercialization in broadcasting that goes out over radio and television, and is not in connection with section 315 of the law, which has to do with equal time.

This resolution was not the idea of the junior Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know it was not.

Mr. PASTORE. But let me say I think it is a good resolution in this respect: Unless we had initiated this sort of watchdog committee, I doubt very much we would have been able, in 1959, to amend section 315 of the Communications Act, as a result of the Lar Daly case, with which the Senator from Illinois is familiar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very familiar.

Mr. PASTORE. Many persons thought we could expect chaos in this particular field if Congress did not amend the law. I think the history of 1959 will bear me out in this statement. There are many present who were rather apprehensive and felt we should not amend the law. The broadcasters took the position that Congress should repeal section 315 entirely. Very frankly, I am inclined to lean that way. I think the broadcasting systems today have reached a position of integrity and good judgment so that they can very well parcel out time without the assistance of any law. But I think the resolution would lean in this direction. There is a question as to how far we should go and whether we have gone far enough. I do not think there is any ulterior motive involved in this proposal. I do not think it is connected with the campaign of 1960 and intended merely to spy on Republicans or Democrats. That was not the purpose of the proposal at all. There was confusion at the time we amended that law in 1959 as to whether or not we might be going in the right direction. The suggestion was made that we should have a watchdog committee. I stated at that time the junior Senator from Rhode Island was not equipped in the subcommittee to undertake that responsibility and do an adequate job. That is the genesis of this particular resolution.

A lot can be said on both sides of the question in connection with what we did in 1959. There is no ulterior motive involved here. There is no intention of spying. The resolution will serve a good purpose because it will clarify the whole question of equal time under section 315.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know where we are going, if we amend the law as we did in respect to section 315 and then, within a few months, set up a watchdog committee, when there are not even any dogs to be watched as yet.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. With a watchdog committee, it is the dogs who do the watching and I know there are a lot of candidates to be watched.

I will say this: The complaints will come. I think this committee will serve a very useful purpose. We will know definitely, when we meet again in January, whether section 315 is necessary at all, whether we have gone too far or whether we have not gone far enough in amending the law. All of this was discussed at the time we amended the law last year.

I repeat: Had the promise not been made to watchdog this whole activity, I doubt very much that we would have pulled ourselves out of the dilemma which the Lar Daly decision put us in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there were no printed hearings on this bill.

I do not know who appeared before the committee. I do not know if the committee heard the members of the Federal Communications Commission. I do not know if representatives of the industry were called in.

I know there are no printed hearings. I know there is no source to which we can go to find some background upon this thing.

I know that this is a request for an oversight committee, for a watchdog committee, to become effective from the day the resolution is approved, even if it is approved today, until the 31st of January, right in the middle of a presidential, a senatorial, and a congressional campaign.

Why should we not wait for the development of some background? Why should we not wait for some complaints? Why should we not wait for some abuses? Why should we not wait to see whether the FCC will do its job as a monitoring agency? Why should we not wait to see whether the industry will impartially, fairly, and equitably carry out the intent, the purpose, and the spirit of section 315, as it was amended?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I should like to ask two questions of the Senator from Rhode Island.

First, what is the expiration date of the resolution?

Mr. PASTORE. It is January 31, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The second question is: Does the Senator think the work contemplated by the so-called watchdog committee can be completed by January 31, 1961?

Mr. PASTORE. I know in saying this I am going to be disagreeing with my distinguished colleague from Texas, but I am inclined to think so. As a matter of fact, if there is anything left which spills over into 1961, I think it can be considered by the regular Subcommittee on Communications.

In answer to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I think the complaints will come during the progress of the campaign. That is the period when one hears from a host of candidates who feel they are not being given equal opportunities. Perhaps next year will be too late to consider the matter. That has been the trouble right along.

Section 315 has led us into an area of tremendous confusion. I think the confusion ought to be eliminated once and for all. I have every confidence that this action will help immensely to do that. I would not want to see the work continued beyond that time. That is my personal feeling. I know others feel differently, and that is their privilege.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, whether it is not correct that the Federal Communications Commission has asked for $300,000 for monitoring services?

Mr. ALLOTT. It is true that in the hearings about a week ago the Federal Communications Commission appeared before the committee and requested that $300,000 be restored of a $315,000 cut made by the House of Representatives, for the purpose of establishing an investigatory area or committee, for the purpose of watching and monitoring radio stations.

I have been waiting to answer the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island. I would not want to say that this is exclusively for one purpose. I would not say this is exclusively for the purpose of political broadcasting, but it is for the specific purpose of monitoring TV and radio broadcasts, to see that the law in all respects—in all respects—is complied with.

Under the showing which was made before the committee, under the showing which was made to us, this type of action would come under the law, as well as all technical and other violations of the Federal Communications Act.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield to me, I do not dispute that statement one single iota. I am more or less familiar with the activities of the FCC, as the Senator from Colorado well knows.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do well know it.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me state the reason behind the monitoring. This all comes about from the quandary of the quiz shows, which have been investigated, and the misleading advertising and deception of the public, which has come to light. These things have given the genesis for the appropriation. I do not think the appropriation is particularly connected with section 315.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not say it is particularly connected with it, but it is not limited to the areas the Senator has indicated.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

Mr. ALLOTT. Under the showing made by the Federal Communications Commission, the authority would include

these actions as well as every other phase of violations of the Communications Act.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with the Senator. I agree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I point out that 26 years ago we created the Federal Communications Commission. I was a Member of the other body when that was done. From that day to this the law has been amended and has been amplified. The functions and responsibilities of the Commission have been expanded.

We created the Commission for the purpose of getting some order out of chaos in the whole communications field. Now do we wish to undertake, by means of a Senate committee, to displace the Federal Communications Commission and its responsibilities under the law which the Congress wrote? The Commission has monitoring responsibilities, and it can carry them out not only in the advertising field but also in this field as well, if the Congress will only supply the Commission with the necessary funds and the necessary personnel with which to do its job.

In addition, this is supposed to be an objective committee. Obviously, this work is going to have to be done in a political atmosphere. How can we escape that? Politics is in the air. It is going to be in the air from now until the last vote is cast and counted in November. We cannot get away from it. The political fever is with us. It breaks out all over the place, like bugs in June.

I simply do not want to see another instrumentality, another weapon to mar the quiet, tranquil political surface which has been maintained so felicitously so long.

I do not want to see this kind of instrumentality created, which is going to frighten the radio and TV people, and is going to make them pull in their horns, and put a micrometer upon the calendar and upon the clock, to see whether we get a little more or a little less time. That is going to be one of the inevitables which will go along with the solemn committee which will send its staff abroad and examine into complaints. Pretty soon it will begin to stir up a rather bitter partisan feud.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. This has all the earmarks of that kind of an instrument.

I yield with pleasure.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not wish to prolong this interchange unduly, but the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows pretty well that the last person in the world who would want to frighten or to upset anyone is the junior Senator from Rhode Island. That is not proposed at all.

It is true that all of this is born in the atmosphere of politics. That is all section 315 deals with—candidates for political office. Section 315 relates specifically to candidates for political office. I do not think we can separate ourselves from this whole atmosphere of politics, if we are talking about section 315, because that is just what it deals with. It relates to the granting of equal time to candidates for political office. Naturally it is shrouded in politics. We cannot escape it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

What is the urgency of this matter? Who has come in with entreaties? Who has come in on bended knee to address supplications to the committee and say, "Please. This is a world-shaking matter, and we have to have it done now. The law must become effective from the day the Senate solemnly places its stamp of approval upon the resolution."

Who has been in to demand this, I want to know?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I repeat that all this information was given in September of last year when we amended the law. Senators, at that time, were quite apprehensive about amending the law, and possibly would not have done so unless a promise had been made that the whole matter would be supervised. Such action gave birth to the idea. I repeat that the resolution is not mine. If the Senator from Illinois is opposed to it, he ought to vote against it, but I have stated the reason for its presentation. We have tried to explain it as candidly as we can.

There is no world-shaking importance to this resolution. We say merely that, in view of the fact that section 315 has caused so much disturbance to so many, the resolution should be adopted. The junior Senator from Rhode Island has not been disturbed. I have never had any trouble with the newspapers; I have never had any trouble with broadcasters. They have always given me equal time. As a matter of fact, perhaps I have often received more than equal time. I am not disturbed about the situation at all. But there are many Senators who feel that whenever the names of their opponents are mentioned, their names should also be on the same line.

I believe to quiet this apprehension on the part of a few we made a promise in 1959 that the whole matter would be supervised. That is the reason for the resolution. That is why the resolution has been submitted. If Senators are in favor of its adoption, they should vote for it; if they are opposed to it, they should vote against it. There is nothing in the resolution which is going to change the destiny of mankind, whether it is adopted or not. But I think that if the resolution is adopted, it will make the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] very happy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure it would. I ask my distinguished friend from Rhode Island to whom the assurance was given.

Mr. PASTORE. To the Senate at large.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not hear any assurance that would be supervision.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois was not here, but the statement appears in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois has been out of the Washington, D.C., area only 1 day since the present session of the Senate convened.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois was not here when we were talking about the promise. It is in the RECORD, and I suggest that if the Senator will look at the RECORD, he will find it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to see the statement.

Mr. PASTORE. All the Senator needs to do is to look it up.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no interest in obtaining the floor permanently.

I rise not to make the junior Senator from Texas happy, although I should be delighted to see him of good cheer at all times. I rise as one who was originally against the resolution and now supports it.

I am not unaware of the political ins-and-outs as affected by the use of television and radio, and I am not unaware of the functions of the Federal Communications Commission and of the application of section 315 as amended.

I had many misgivings about the resolution and the freedom of information subcommittee, but as I am the only member of the minority party to serve on this subcommittee, I have had occasion to attend hearings and to learn of the reasons for the existence of the subcommttee and to keep myself informed as to whether or not this is a good proposal.

The Federal Communications Commission has many powers. The one under discussion I believe is one that it would be most hesitant to make use of, unless we have the benefit of the authority vested in this subcommittee of three. The purpose of the subcommittee is to make certain that equal time will be given to candidates for office this fall, for the office of President in particular, and while I think some of our friends on the other side of the aisle feel that they have at times less time than the Members on this side, in my opinion that is not the case. There is always the accusation that someone is "more equal" than someone else.

I think it is a good thing to monitor this campaign and satisfy everyone of the fairness and of the equal treatment to be accorded to rival candidates, but I changed my opinion with respect to this subcommittee at another time and for another reason, and that had to do with the auxiliary committees which appear frequently, well financed, for the purpose of advocating the election of one candidate or another to the Presidency. I have in mind citizens' committees, business advisory committees, committees of COPE, the agency of the AFL-CIO, and committees representing various other labor organizations.

There has been litigation on that question, notably in a famous case in Michigan, in which the Supreme Court to my mind came very close to deciding, and may yet decide, that under the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution there can be no limitation whatsoever on corporations or labor unions in the expenditure of money in behalf of the election of candidates.

I think perhaps that might be an unfortunate extension of the freedom of speech provisions of article I, but the

Supreme Court has certainly given indications that it is at least leaning in that direction, in view of the obiter dicta which occurred in the opinions of certain of the justices. Therefore, I am anxious to see that none of the auxiliary organizations which I mentioned advocating any particular candidate for the Presidency gains an unfair advantage over the other political party and its auxiliaries.

In other words, when a group appears on television and says, "We advocate the election of So and So," the time ought to be charged to that presidential candidate, whether it be used by a business group or a labor group. When they say, "We advocate the election of the other fellow," the argument equally applies. With great deference to my leader—and he knows I rarely disagree with him, and that I appreciate his reasoning and particularly enjoy his humor and his oratory—I hope he will forgive me for my deviation. But I did want to make the statement that I hope the resolution will pass. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my heart is suffused with nothing but charitable impulses as I see my friend persist in a pathway of error.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall return to the good sheep in due time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not wish to disturb the tranquillity of a presidential campaign. I do not wish the caliper to be used to measure the time that may have been given to the President of the United States since the first of January to see if paragraph 9 on page 4 had any political implications, and whether, perhaps, some time ought to be given to the other side.

If, as my friend indicates, all manner of broadcasting is to be investigated, even when it is done by a labor organization or some other organization that has a preference for a candidate, I can see nothing but disturbance and difficulty before we get through.

So I hope that the Senate in its wisdom will not give its approval to a watchdog committee until there is some "doggery" to be watched. I leave the subject at that point. I have spoken my piece.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. SCOTT. My concern is there may be some "sleeping doggery" around which ought to be observed.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

On page 3, line 10, I propose to change the figure of $45,000 to $28,000.

It is apparent from what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island stated that this subcommittee will probably be able to complete its work by January 31, 1961. Since there are 7 months remaining for the committee to do its work, and since the budgeted expenditures are a little under $4,000 a month, I believe that the sum of $28,000 would be sufficient.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is proposed to hire only three persons: One professional staff member for the Democrats, one professional staff member for the Republicans, and a clerical assistant at a salary of under $5,000. There being only 7 months remaining, it strikes me that the sum of $28,000, or perhaps $30,000 to get an even figure, would be sufficient.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Will the Senator make the amount $35,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps $30,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am thinking of the expenses that will be involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to provide for $35,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I will accept the amendment calling for $35,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the budget of the committee, appearing at page 3 of the report, be incorporated in the RECORD.

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

Budget of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce providing for a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, etc., pursuant to S. Res. 305, for the period of Feb. 1, 1960, through Jan. 31, 1961

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Professional staff member	1	$8,000	$14,979.45	$1,248.28	$14,979.45
Professional staff member (minority)	1	7,200	13,671.57	1,139.29	13,671.57
Clerical staff: Clerical assistant	1	2,040	4,499.50	374.95	4,499.50
Total	3				33,150.52
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					2,154.78
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					121.68
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					300.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, and postage)					1,200.00
Newspapers, magazines, and documents					200.00
Contingent fund					1,873.02
Total					11,849.48
Grand total, S. Res. 305					45,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1163, Senate Joint Resolution 170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withhold it.

A TIME OF DECISION

Mr. KENNEDY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator from Massachusetts does not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, May 17, 1960, marked the end of an era—an era of illusion, the illusion that personal good will is a substitute for hard, carefully prepared bargaining on concrete issues, the illusion that good intentions and pious principles are a substitute for strong creative leadership.

For on May 17, 1960, the long-awaited, highly publicized summit conference collapsed. That collapse was the direct result of Soviet determination to destroy the talks. The insults and distortions of Mr. Khrushchev and the violence of his attacks shocked all Americans, and united the country in admiration for the dignity and self-control of President Eisenhower. Regardless of party, all of us deeply resented Russian abuse of this Nation and its President, and all of us shared a common disappointment at the failure of the conference. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we, as a nation, rise above our resentment and frustration to a critical reexamination of the events at Paris and their meaning for America.

I do not now intend to rehash the sorry story of the U-2 incident. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has raised, in a constructive manner, the questions which must be raised, if we are to profit from that unfortunate experience. Nor do I wish to exaggerate the long-range importance of the U-2 incident or the Khrushchev attacks in Paris.

For the harsh facts of the matter are that the effort to eliminate world tensions and end the cold war through a summit meeting—necessary as such an effort was to demonstrate America's willingness to seek peaceful solutions—was doomed to failure long before the U-2 ever fell on Soviet soil. This effort was doomed to failure because we have failed for the past 8 years to build the positions of long-term strength essential to successful negotiation. It was doomed because we were unprepared with new policies or new programs for the settlement of outstanding substantive issues. It was doomed because the Soviet Union knew it had more to gain from the increasing deterioration of America's world position than from any concessions that might be made in Paris. Only Mr. Khrushchev's intransigence and violent temper saved the United States from an embarrassing exposure of our inability to make the summit meaningful.

Trunkloads of papers, I am told, were sent to Paris, but no new plans or positions were included. Our unwillingness to go to the summit had changed, but the steady decrease in our relative strength had not changed. Our allies and our own people had been misled into believing that there was some point to holding a summit conference, that we were prepared to say more than what changes in the status quo we would not accept, that by a miracle of personal charm and public relations the Russians could be cajoled into yielding some of their hard-won positions of strength, that we had some conception of alternative settlements that were both acceptable to us and possibly acceptable to the Soviets.

But the truth of the matter is that we were not prepared for any such negotiations and that there was no real success which the summit could have achieved, for words and discussions are not a substitute for strength—they are an instrument for the translation of strength into survival and peace.

We are, in short, in a sense, fortunate that the violent manner in which the Soviets carried out their determination to wreck the summit made it clear to the world that the blame for the collapse of the conference rests on Mr. Khrushchev. And we shall also be fortunate if the violence of the Paris encounters shocks American leaders and the American people into a renewed awareness of the perils we face, the sacrifices we must make, and the urgency of our need for leadership.

This is the real issue of American foreign policy today, not the ill-considered timing of the U-2 or the inconsistent statements of our Government. The real issue—and the real lesson of Paris—is the lack of long-range preparation, the lack of policy planning, the lack of a coherent and purposeful national strategy backed by strength.

This is an issue worthy of a great debate, a debate by the American people through the media of their political parties—and that debate must not be stifled or degraded by empty appeals to national unity, false cries of appeasement, or deceptive slogans about "standing up to Khrushchev." For the issue is not who can best "stand up to Khrushchev" or who can best swap threats and insults. The real issue is who can stand up and summon America's vast resources to the defense of freedom against the most dangerous enemy it has ever faced.

If the 1960 campaign should degenerate into a contest of who can talk toughest to Khrushchev, or which party is the "party of war" or the "party of appeasement," or which candidate can tell the American voters what they want to hear, rather than what they need to hear, or who is soft on communism, or who can be hardest on foreign aid, then, in my opinion, it makes very little difference who the winners are in July and in November, the American people and the whole free world will be the losers.

For the next President of the United States, whoever he may be, will find he has considerably more to do than "stand up to Khrushchev," balance the budget, and mouth popular slogans, if he is to restore our Nation's relative strength and leadership. For he will find himself with far-flung commitments without the strength to meet them or to back them up. He will inherit policies formed largely as reactions to Soviet action, their limits set by budgeteers without regard to world conditions or America's needs, their effectiveness often undercut by overlapping or competing agencies. He will inherit membership in alliances of uncertain stability and in international organizations of obsolete structure. He will inherit programs which have been frequently administered by shortsighted, unsympathetic men opposed to the very programs they are administering, awaiting their own return to private industry, and so lacking in compassion for our domestic needs as to be incapable of compassion for the desperate needs of the world's peoples. He will face a world of revolution and turmoil armed with policies which seek only to freeze the status quo and turn back the inevitable tides of change.

To be sure, we have, in 1960, most of the formal tools of foreign policy: We have a Defense Establishment, a foreign-aid program, a Western alliance, a Disarmament Committee, an information service, an intelligence operation, and a National Security Council. But, except for the brilliant legislative inquiry being conducted by the subcommittee of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] we have failed to appraise and reevaluate these tools in the light of our changing world position. We have failed to adapt these tools to the formulation of a long-range, coordinated strategy to meet the determined Soviet program for world domination—a program which skillfully blends the weapons of military might, political subversion, economic penetration, and ideological conquest. We are forced to rely upon piecemeal programs, obsolete policies, and meaningless slogans. We have no fresh ideas with which to break the stalemate in Germany, the stalemate over arms control, the stalemate in Berlin, and all the rest. We have as our grand strategy only the arms race and the cold war.

Our conferees have consistently gone to the international bargaining table ill staffed, ill prepared, and ill advised. Coordinated efforts—with all agencies and all allies—have faltered without strong direction from the top; and strong direction from the top has often faltered because the President was not kept fully informed. The fact of the matter is that long-range problems in foreign affairs cannot be faced effectively by a party which is unwilling to face long-range problems at home. The destinies of a fast-changing world cannot be shaped effectively by a party traditionally opposed to change and progress. Coherent direction and purpose for the free world cannot be provided effectively by a party which does not provide them for our own people.

As a substitute for policy, President Eisenhower has tried smiling at the Russians; our State Department has tried frowning at them; and Mr. NIXON has tried both. None have succeeded. For we cannot conceal or overcome our lack of purpose and our failure of planning, by talking tough; nor can we compensate for our weaknesses by talking smoothly and by assuming that the righteousness of our principles will ensure their victory. For just as we know that might never makes right, we must also remember that right, unfortunately, never makes might.

Thus, neither our smiles nor our frowns have ever altered Mr. Khrushchev's course, however he may alter his expression. His real goals have remained unmoved, his interests unchanged, his determination unending. And so long as Mr. Khrushchev is convinced that the balance of world power is shifting his way, no amount of either smiles or toughness, neither Camp David

talks nor kitchen debates, can compel him to enter fruitful negotiations.

So let us abandon the useless discussion of who can best "stand up to Khrushchev," or whether a hard or soft line is preferable. Our task is to rebuild our strength and the strength of the free world—to prove to the Soviets that time and the course of history are not on their side, that the balance of world power is not shifting their way—and that, therefore, peaceful settlement is essential to mutual survival. Our task is to devise a national strategy—based not on the 11th-hour responses to Soviet created crises—but a comprehensive set of carefully prepared, long-term policies designed to increase the strength of the non-Communist world. Until this task is accomplished, there is no point in returning to the summit—for no President of the United States must ever again be put in the position of traveling across the seas, armed only with vague, speculative hopes, in order to provide an occasion for public humiliation. And unless this task is accomplished as we move into the most critical period since the founding of our Nation, our national security and our survival itself will be in peril.

The hour is late, but the agenda is long.

First. We must make invulnerable a nuclear retaliatory power second to none—by making possible now a stopgap air alert and base-dispersal program—and by stepping up our development and production of the ultimate missiles that can close the gap and will not be wiped out in a surprise attack—Polaris, Minuteman, and long-range air-to-ground missiles—meanwhile increasing our production of Atlas missiles, hardening our bases, and improving our continental defense and warning systems. As a power which will never strike first, we require a retaliatory capacity based on hidden, moving, or invulnerable weapons in such force as to deter any aggressor from threatening an attack which he knows could not destroy enough of our force to prevent his own destruction. And we must also critically reexamine the farflung oversea base structure on which much of our present retaliatory strength is based. We must contribute to the political and economic stability of the nations in which our vital bases are located—and develop alternative plans for positions which may become untenable.

Second. We must regain the ability to intervene effectively and swiftly in any limited war anywhere in the world, augmenting, modernizing, and providing increased mobility and versatility for the conventional forces and weapons of our Army and Marine Corps. So long as those forces lack the necessary airlift and sealift capacity and versatility of firepower, we cannot protect our commitments around the globe—resist nonnuclear aggressions or be certain of having enough time to decide on the use of our nuclear power.

Third. We must rebuild NATO into a viable and consolidated military force capable of deterring any kind of attack, unified in weaponry and responsibility. Aiming beyond a narrow military alliance united only by mutual fears, a return to mutual consultation and respect—and a determined American effort to create a free world economy—can help overcome schismatic economic rivalries between the Continent and Britain, and the Common Market and the Outer Seven, as well as other Western differences in military and political policy. We need a common effort to protect vital international reserves, to adopt more consistent tariff policies on both sides of the Atlantic, and—perhaps most important—to merge Western contributions to the underdeveloped areas.

Fourth. We must, in collaboration with Western Europe and Japan, greatly increase the flow of capital to the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America—frustrating the Communist hopes for chaos in those nations—enabling emerging nations to achieve economic as well as political independence and closing the dangerous gap that is now widening between our living standards and theirs. Above all, it is vital that we aid India to make a success of her new 5-year program—a success that will enable her to compete with Red China for economic leadership of all Asia. And we must undertake this effort in a spirit of generosity motivated by a desire to help our fellow citizens of the world, not as narrow bankers or self-seeking politicians. Our present foreign aid programs have neglected the great, visionary, partnership principles of the Marshall plan and point 4—they have been subordinated to narrow, expedient, and temporary ends. Money has been poured into military assistance programs, and in many cases has been wasted, at the expense of vitally necessary economic development. The next President will have to devise an entirely revamped foreign aid program which will make the long-term commitments essential to successful planning—a program whose administration will not be hampered by waste and mismanagement or by unsympathetic and unqualified administrators. And part of this program must be a new and expanded effort to use our food surpluses to feed the world's hungry, storing these surpluses in "food banks" abroad.

Fifth. We must reconstruct our relations with the Latin American democracies, bringing them into full Western partnership; working through a strengthened Organization of American States, increasing the flow of technical assistance, development capital, private investment, exchange students, and agricultural surpluses, perhaps through the large-scale "operation Pan-America," which has been proposed by the President of Brazil, and pursuing practical agreements for stabilizing commodity prices, trade routes, and currency convertibility. A return to the good neighbor policy is not enough. Dollar diplomacy is not enough. A patronizing attitude, taking for granted their dedication to an anti-Communist crusade, is not enough. We will need a whole new set of attitudes and emphasis to make the nations of Latin America full partners in the rapid development of the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. We must formulate, with both imagination and restraint, a new approach to the Middle East—not pressing our case so hard that the Arabs feel their neutrality and nationalism are threatened, but accepting those forces and seeking to help channel them along constructive lines, while at the same time trying to hasten the inevitable Arab acceptance of the permanence of Israel. We must give our support to programs to help people instead of regimes—to work in terms of their problems, as well as ours, and seek permanent settlement among Arabs and Israelis based not on an armed truce but on mutual self-interest. Guns and anti-Communist pacts and propaganda and the traditional piecemeal approach to the Middle East are not enough—refugee resettlement and a regional resources development fund in full partnership with the Middle Eastern nations, are all parts of a long-range strategy which is both practical and in the best interests of all concerned.

Seventh. We must greatly increase our efforts to encourage the newly emerging nations of the vast continent of Africa.

And, as chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, let me remind the Senate that in a few years, the countries of Africa will control one-quarter of all the votes in the General Assembly of the United Nations. We must greatly increase our efforts to persuade them that they do not have to turn to Moscow for the guidance and friendship they so desperately need—to help them achieve the economic progress on which the welfare of their people and their ability to resist Communist subversion depends. We can no longer afford policies which refuse to accept the inevitable triumph of nationalism in Africa, the inevitable end of colonialism, and, fortunately, colonialism will end, not only in Africa, but, in the long run resistance to colonialism and the rise of nationalism will be the basic influence which will undermine the great Communist colonial empire. Nor can we afford policies which refuse to accept the unyielding determination of the new African states to lift their people from their age-old poverty and hunger and ignorance. The case history of the newly formed country of Guinea is a warning of what can happen to other countries of Africa if the United States remains indifferent to their pressing needs. We must answer the critical African need for educated men to build the factories, run the schools, and staff the governments, by sending a growing stream of technical experts and educators to Africa—and by bringing far greater numbers of African students—future African leaders—to our own universities for training.

Agricultural experts must be sent into areas where the land is unproductive and where modern methods of agriculture are unknown in order to raise subsistence levels of farming and insure adequate supplies of food—and while this is being done we must use our own food surpluses to prevent hunger. We must establish a multination economic development loan fund—a full working partnership between the nations of the

West and the nations of Africa—to provide the capital necessary to start African economic growth on its way.

And finally, if our policies toward Africa are to be effective, we must extend this aid in terms of America's desire to bring freedom and prosperity to Africa—not in terms of a narrow self-interest which seeks only to use African nations as pawns in the cold war.

Eighth. We must plan a long-range solution to the problems of Berlin. We must show no uncertainty over our determination to defend Berlin and meet our commitments—but we must realize that a solution to the problems of that beleagured city is only possible, in the long run, in the context of a solution of the problems of Germany and, indeed, the problems of all Europe. We must look forward to a free Berlin, in a united Germany in a Europe where tensions and armaments have been reduced—where perhaps the suggestions of General de Gaulle and Premier Adenauer requiring Soviet withdrawal behind the Urals can be accepted. Such a solution is far from a reality today—but both our good faith and our will to resist are dependent on our willingness to face the total problem of tension and conflict in this section of Europe. We must remain precise in our determination to meet our commitments until a change in Soviet policy permits a constructive solution. In the meantime, we should explore how the moral authority of the U.N. could be used to strengthen the security presently provided to the people of West Berlin.

Ninth. We must prepare and hold in readiness more flexible and realistic tools for use in Eastern Europe.

Such tools are contained in the legislation sponsored by the Senator from Vermont and myself which the Senate passed last summer, and which would provide the President with discretion to give economic aid to disaffected Iron Curtain countries. The policy of liberation, proudly proclaimed 8 years ago, has proved to be a snare and a delusion. The tragic uprising in East Germany, in Poland, and in Hungary demonstrated clearly that we had neither the intention or the capacity to liberate Eastern Europe and the false hopes raised by our promises were cruelly crushed. We must now begin to work slowly and carefully toward programs designed to encourage discontented Iron Curtain countries to permit the spread of what Thomas Jefferson called the disease of liberty—to nourish the seeds of liberty in any cracks appearing in the Iron Curtain by reducing economic and ideological dependence on Russia.

There are already opportunities in Poland for greater American initiative, aid, trade, tourism, information services, student and teacher exchanges, and the use of our capital and technology to advance the standard of living of the Polish people. Closer relationships can in time be offered in other so-called captive nations as well—showing a creative interest, not a closed mind, by the nation that represents their one great hope for freedom.

Why should we permit the Soviet Union to work, night and day, to subvert the determination of the people of Africa to remain free, while at the same time our policies make it impossible for us to carry out any effective relationships with the countries of Eastern Europe—the most vulnerable part of the Soviet Empire? To give Soviet Russia a free hand in her vulnerable areas, while Russia is permitted to move unhampered in Africa, Asia, and South America, both is shortsighted and unwise.

Tenth. We must reassess a China policy which has failed dismally to move toward its principal objective of weakening Communist rule in the mainland—a policy which has failed to prevent a steady growth in Communist strength—and a policy which offers no real solution to the problems of a militant China. We need to formulate proposals for a reduction of tension in the Formosa Straits—at the same time making clear our determination to defend that island and to meet our treaty commitment. We must act through an Asian regional development organization to stabilize the nations of non-Communist Asia both politically and economically, so as to strengthen their resistance to Communist pressures. And, although we should not now recognize Red China or agree to its admission to the United Nations without a genuine change in her belligerent attitude toward her Asian neighbors and the world—and regrettably there is evidence that her belligerence is rising rather than receding—we must nevertheless work to improve at least our communications with mainland China. Perhaps a way could be found to bring the Chinese into the nuclear test ban talks at Geneva, for if we reached an agreement which did not bind Red China, then atomic tests could be continued on the mainland of China without inspection—and Red Chinese possession of atomic weapons could drastically alter the balance of power. If that contact proves fruitful, further cultural and economic contact could be tried. For only in this way can we inform ourselves of Communist activities, attempt to restore our historic friendship with the Chinese people, and—perhaps most important—make sure that we are not plunged into war by a Chinese miscalculation of our determination to defend all of free Asia. Today we have no affirmative policies—only an attitude of negative resistance in the face of a growing danger of hostile action resulting from mutual miscalculation. This cannot last in a world where the Red Chinese are increasingly important, increasingly menacing, and increasingly impossible to omit from effective international agreements on subjects such as arms control.

Eleventh. We must begin to develop new, workable programs for peace and the control of arms. We have been unwilling to plan for disarmament.

We have had less than 100 people working in the entire administration on the subject of disarmament, and we have always left the initiative in the hands of the Russians. An Arms Control Research Institute—or a Peace Institute, as suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] could undertake the technical studies needed before we can detect and monitor the vast and complex weapons systems of modern warfare. The entire world hopes that the collapse at the summit has not destroyed man's hope for a nuclear test ban. But if such a ban is achieved, it must only be the first step toward halting the spiraling arms race which burdens the entire world with a fantastic financial drain, excessive military establishments, and the chance of an accidental or irrational triggering of a worldwide holocaust. At the same time, we must move toward the eventual rule of international law by working to strengthen the United Nations and to increase its role in resolving international conflicts and planning for international scientific and economic development.

Twelfth, and finally, we must work to build the stronger America on which our ultimate ability to defend ourselves and the free world depends. We must increase our own scientific effort—not only by strengthening and revamping existing research programs in all fields, including the exploration of space—but by building an educational system which can produce the talent and skill on which our future strength and progress depends. We must work to create an America with an expanding economy, where growth is not dissipated in inflation, and consumer luxuries are not confused with national strength—an economy capable of supporting our massive needs and our new programs. And we must also work to create an America of equal opportunity and economic justice for all men of all ages, races, and creeds—an America which will be, as this country was intended by the Founding Fathers to be, a living example of freedom to the world.

This is a large agenda—a challenging agenda—and yet I do not pretend that it is, in any sense, complete. For if there is one certain thing in a world of change, it is that the coming years will bring new problems, undreamed-of challenges, unanticipated opportunities.

The next President will confront a task of unparalleled dimensions. But this task will not be his alone. For just as he must offer leadership and demand sacrifices, the American people must be willing to respond to these demands.

I realize also that the length of this agenda is in sharp contrast with the rosy reassurances of the administration. "America is today," the Vice President told his national committee Saturday, summarizing our position in the world, "the strongest country militarily, the strongest country economically, with the best educational system and the finest scientists in the world, over all." To feed that kind of diet to the American people during the coming months—to confine our national posture to one of talking louder and louder while carrying a smaller and smaller stick—is to trade the long-range needs of the Nation and the free world for the short-term appearance of security.

For all America—its President, and its people—the coming years will be a time of decision. We must decide whether we have reached our limit—whether our greatness is past—whether we can go no further—or whether, in the words of

Thomas Wolfe, "the true discovery of America is before us—the true fulfillment of our mighty and immortal land is yet to come."

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the maturity and courage he has shown in his speech today, a maturity and courage which he has also consistently shown in the field of domestic policy as well.

I think the Senator is to be commended also for the realism and the honesty with which he has addressed the Senate on this occasion, pointing out the fact that for years to come, if not for decades, we face a period of extreme tension.

I am glad also that the Senator brought to light once again the use of terms in this country of ours—such terms as "the party of war," "the party of appeasement," and so forth and so on. I will say that neither party is the party of war, and neither party is the party of appeasement.

The Senator has also pointed out that the inheritance of the next President, to use the Senator's words in that respect, is going to be a difficult one indeed, and that the sooner we as a Nation and as a people face up to the difficulties the better off we are going to be. It will take sacrifices. It may require more in the way of taxes. It may result in fewer radios, TV sets, and automobiles. However, I think we ought to face up to the realities of what the world really is, and not look back to the kind of world we wish it were.

I will say also that, wide ranging as was the Senator's speech, it left much ground, as the Senator recognized, still uncovered.

I compliment and commend the Senator from Massachusetts for taking the floor this afternoon, and I also wish to compliment the Senate for giving him its sober attention on this occasion.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Montana. As the Senator suggests, the dialogue in the coming debate, if it is going to serve a useful national purpose, should be concerned with how we can develop sufficient national strength to meet our goals and to protect our security. It should not be confined to heaping invective upon either party.

As the Senator has said, neither party is the party of war or appeasement. No Member on this side of the aisle, when the President invited Mr. Khrushchev to meet with him at Camp David or when he agreed to attend a summit meeting, made charges that the Republican administration or the President was soft on communism or that the Republican Party was the party of appeasement. We applauded the President's effort to work out a solution to the very difficult problems which mark the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States.

It seems to me that the debate of this campaign should relate to how we can strengthen our country. We should not attempt to mislead the American people by suggesting that any party or any group of Americans is less determined to protect our security and to meet our commitments than any other party or group.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the address he has delivered represents the kind of comprehensive, integrated thinking on foreign policy and national security policy which is required for a nation with our responsibilities.

I have heard the Senator from Massachusetts address himself to these topics individually and sometimes in groupings on many occasions, and the points which were outlined by him, without necessary detail, but in their broad scope, represent the kind of totality of thinking that is necessary for the formulation of overall national strength. I compliment the Senator.

I believe, as the Senator from Montana has said, that the greatest compliment the Senator from Massachusetts has had today is the attention of Senators on both sides of the aisle and the fact that the galleries are filled with people who are interested not only in the Senator from Massachusetts, but in his message.

I believe the Senator will agree with me that the one subject which commands the attention of the American people, regardless of political party, regardless of geographical location, and regardless of cultural or ethnic background, is the subject of our national security, the subject of our national policy, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in characteristic fashion—and I say that because of the speeches he has made on such controversial subjects as Algeria, for example—has again pointed out some of the leads we need to follow. We need a reexamination of our China policy, for example.

There is also the question of Berlin and its relationship to central Europe. His speech outlined long-range American policy. It was a good speech, a thoughtful one, and it is surely one which I can embrace and find very reassuring, and, at this moment of our history, very helpful.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for his generous statement, which is the kind of statement he always makes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has spoken of the flow of American investments to underdeveloped countries. I believe the Senator knows that the administration made proposals to encourage the flow of capital into such areas as early as 1953, but failed to fight for them. At the present time, there is before the Senate Finance Committee a bill passed by the House, the so-called Boggs bill, which would seek to take a stride in that direction. Support of that measure, however, has been so ineffectual, and there has been such lack of faith in the measure, that it appears the bill will hardly move at all.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not believe that we should make direct foreign investments in the extracting industries, such as oil and minerals. Second, we should not encourage American capital investment abroad merely as a device to avoid labor costs at home.

This kind of investment is not productive of the kind of development which is needed. And private investment is needed because, regardless of the size of the Development Loan Fund, it could not provide enough capital to the underdeveloped portions of the world to meet all their needs.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator upon his thoughtful address. In the concluding paragraph of his speech the Senator said that we must decide whether we have reached our limit and whether our greatness is past. The able Senator has addressed most of his remarks to international relations. Unquestionably those dangers are acute. Unquestionably those problems are pressing. But if the question is to be answered as to whether our greatness is past, and if it is measured in comparative terms, does not the Senator think equal emphasis must be placed upon education, the rate of economic growth, and the fruition of freedom in the United States?

Mr. KENNEDY. Definitely. As I said, in my address:

> We must work to build the stronger America on which our ultimate ability to defend the free world depends.

Obviously, unless our economy achieves a greater rate of growth—so we can afford to do the things which need to be done to build our strength abroad and meet our needs at home—then quite obviously we are going to fall behind in the 1960's.

I believe that last year our economic growth was lower than the rate of growth of any other major industrialized society in the world. I believe that is one of the facts which greatly influences the countries to the south of us, and the countries of Africa and Asia, which are attempting to determine whether a free society is an effective way of mobilizing their resources, and developing their economy.

The reason for Franklin Roosevelt's great success in foreign policy, was the domestic policy which he carried out—a policy which gave the impression of a vital society in the United States and which served as a magnet to the people around the world who were attempting to decide what road they should travel. If we are not vital at home, we give the impression that the future belongs to the Communist world rather than to the free world.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Freedom itself is one of the most revolutionary political concepts that has come to mankind. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that if its vitality and fruition can be demonstrated, its appeal will be made stronger.

I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question relating to the question and the remarks of the able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts think that the next administration, whatever its identity, will early in its term of office face the vital and pressing necessity of a reassessment of foreign economic policy—including tax incentives which may or may not serve the foreign policy objectives or economic interests of the United States, international trade, foreign aid, military policy, and, indeed, the whole complex of economic relationships between the United States and the nations of the world, including the balance of payments?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. Economic policies everywhere are interrelated. For example, there is strong evidence that the major effect of the Common Market in Western Europe is going to be felt not in the United States but in Latin America. There may be an increasing shift in western European purchases from Latin America to Africa because of the Common Market policies aspect of Europe. Such a shift will greatly increase the problems facing the United States in maintaining vital economies in Latin America.

The Senator is correct in saying that the problems he mentioned will be at the top of the agenda of the next President. They concern many matters of domestic policy in which the Senator from Tennessee has been particularly interested—the problem of balance of payments, the whole question of interest rates, and all the rest.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to express my enthusiasm for the masterful and comprehensive presentation of this tremendous subject by the able Senator from Massachusetts, and its proper placing in focus of the failures and errors that have characterized our foreign policy in recent years. I note particularly with approval his statement that the next President will have to devise an entirely new approach to the foreign aid program.

I believe that much opposition to foreign aid stems from the poor way it has been administered and the lack of true consultation and cooperation with the Congress. It has been too much of an executive proposition, without collaboration with the legislative branch of Government that really has the constitutional authority to provide the funds for that purpose. Traditionally, in foreign affairs, the Senate merely advises and consents, and that has been a more or less perfunctory performance, of giving approval to treaties and approval to foreign service and State Department appointments. However we have in recent years witnessed an entirely new instrument of foreign policy, the using of tremendous sums of money. That never occurred before the initiation of the foreign aid program.

There is the place where I believe Congress has fallen short of its duty and to which the next President as well as the Congress will have to give their fullest consideration. I share the views which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has expressed in his colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that the great success of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's foreign policy was that he set an example with his domestic policy. He did not insist that the one was sacrosanct and that the other for our own resource development was wasteful and unnecessary.

I believe that the 12th and last proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts, that we must build a stronger America and must develop our own natural resources, points to one of the great failures of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. It is naturally difficult to convince the American people that Federal aid to education, that legislation to remove the pollution of our rivers, for adequate housing, and our natural resource conservation and development programs, are inflationary, extravagant, wasteful, and unnecessary and will unbalance the budget, as the administration contends, whereas identical projects in foreign countries it proclaims are absolutely essential. That is applying a double standard. The same standard should at the very least be applied to both the foreign aid program and the domestic programs for our own people.

This is why I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on his excellent presentation, which I believe sets a new high standard for the debate that is bound to come in the coming months.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I, too, wish to join my colleagues in the Senate in commending the Senator from Massachusetts for the excellent address he has made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. The Senator has very well documented the proposition that American power has been suffering a serious decline. That is not a partisan proposition. An eminent Republican, the Governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller, said as much only a few days ago.

I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that in addition to the question of American power there is also at stake the question of American prestige in the world. We live in a time when the world is not only in upheaval, but is increasingly polarized about two gigantic adversaries, the United States and the Soviet Union. If it is true that the Soviet Union is communism on exhibit, is it not also true that the United States is necessarily the showcase of democracy?

This is an age of science, where men tend to equate national excellence with scientific achievement.

It is ironic that the United States, which has been unquestionably the most highly industrialized and technologically advanced country in history, could ever lose out in a competition that was based upon technological achievement. Yet does it not have to be admitted that in the past 8 years this is precisely what has happened to us? Somehow we have lost and have never recaptured the Russian lead in the conquest of space. The Russians were the first to launch a satellite. They were the first to strike and photograph the backside of the moon. They were the first to orbit the sun.

I believe that we underestimate the impact of these triumphs at our own peril. Public opinion pollsters in our own newspapers, having taken the necessary surveys abroad, state that the average man on the streets of Paris, Cairo, Bombay, or Tokyo is of the opinion today that the Soviet Union has become the leading scientific country of the world. In the primitive and underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia, where men's hopes for a better life depend solely upon the promise of modern science, what could constitute a more grievous blow to American prestige? Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator, in view of this, how can the American people possibly conclude that those who have been most closely associated, during the past 8 years, with what has become a growing debacle, could be best fitted to direct American affairs in the coming 4 years?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will let the Senator from Idaho answer that question.

Mr. CHURCH. My answer is the same as that of the Senator from Massachusetts. The American people will not accept that argument, and that is the reason why I believe they are going to elect a Democrat at the next presidential election.

Mr. KENNEDY. I may say to the Senator that the points he makes are excellent indeed. The Senator will recall that Mr. Khrushchev's description of the United States, which he gave at his meeting with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—and which he repeated later on his visit to China—was that the United States was a sick, dying, faltering horse, and was about to collapse.

Therefore, I would say that what we do in the United States—the national vitality which we demonstrate—is really the best answer to Russian insults and propaganda.

In concluding my remarks, I would say that, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said, there are many other areas of our foreign policy which could profitably be discussed in the coming months. There are other subjects which might hold our attention. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is about to speak on the Middle East and suggest policy changes there. It is my hope that we may devote our energies to these vital questions, so that whoever is successful in the election in November will be equipped as President, to invoke a new policy for the preservation of freedom and maintenance of peace. And I hope that neither party will engage in invective and personal abuse of one kind or another, which will not advance either the political interests of a party, or the interests of the American people.

The suggestions which I have made may be wrong, and I would be delighted to hear alternate suggestions put forward by Members from the other side of the aisle. But I would be reluctant and most dismayed if their responses were—

as they have been on recent occasions—in the form of charges that one Member or another is not as interested as they are defending American commitments and strengthening the security of the United States. This debate should be on the basis of how we can advance the security of our country, make our country stronger, and bring peace to the world. We will not solve that problem by questioning the loyalty of any Member of the Senate.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. Is it not a fact that practically all the problems that have been confronting this administration for the last 8 years, such as the Berlin situation, the East German situation, the cold war, and all the problems that the able Senator from Massachusetts has discussed in his speech were inherited by the present administration, which has been endeavoring to solve the problems which existed 8 years ago?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I agree that the problem of Berlin was inherited. I would also agree that nothing has been changed, except a diminishing of the ability to bring about any difference in the status of Berlin and to insure greater security to the people.

My basic criticism of the administration's policy is that the real power and strength of the United States, militarily, scientifically, and in terms of economic production, has declined in relation to the Sino-Soviet bloc. Therefore, our ability to enforce agreements and to meet our commitments has been impaired during the past 8 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not find, anywhere in the able Senator's speech, where he said he would correct that. Was he not merely calling the attention of the American people and the Senate to that which they already knew?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Indiana and I have been around and around in this situation. I recall when the Senator from Indiana requested that the Senate galleries be cleared when I suggested that the United States might move into a period of a missile gap from 1961 to 1963. The Senator from Indiana said that I revealed information beneficial to the Soviets. As a matter of fact, what I said was information which had already been revealed in General Gavin's book, which had been published a week or two before, and which had appeared in Life magazine.

I know that it struck the Senator from Indiana with the force of a thunderbolt; but the information had been public information for many months and had been the subject of many investigations.

I may say to the Senator from Indiana that the dialog in the coming debate should be a discussion between the two parties as to how we can strengthen the United States. I have suggested certain policies designed to strengthen the nation. That was the purpose of the speech. If the Senator from Indiana will read the speech with care, I am confident that he will see that some situations have changed in the past 8 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am one who for many years has felt that we pay entirely too much attention to Russia. We put information into Russia's hands with which she propagandizes us and hits us over the head. That is why I have objected to the speeches to which the Senator referred a moment ago. I have objected also to things which the administration has done in that respect.

I do not find anything in the Senator's speech which is particularly new. I do not particularly find anything which he said that was not a problem 8 years ago, following the recognition of Russia in 1933, the conferences which were held at Tehran and Yalta, and the concept of an administration which created the situation in which Berlin now is. Part of the control of Berlin was given to the Communists, and the entire city of Berlin was surrounded by East Germany, which is controlled by the Communists.

Those are things which were accomplished by former administrations. The present administration has tried to do something about them for 8 years. Frankly, I will admit that the efforts of this administration have not been very successful.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know of anyone at the moment who has any idea how to handle them.

I cannot quite compliment the Senator from Massachusetts, as some Senators did, upon his speech. I think he covered the entire waterfront. I think he promised something to everybody in the world. He covered the entire field.

I do not know where we would get enough money to do the things he talks about. I do not know how we could do them. Frankly, I believe that kind of speech leaves false hopes in the minds of the world. I think that is what has got us into trouble today. We have made so many, many promises and speeches of this kind that the people of the world have listened to and read about that now they are disappointed because we do not have the resources and the ability to follow through and keep the many promises which have been made. Therein lies one of our great weaknesses.

In my opinion, we ought to quit promising a world with a fence around it to the people of the globe. I do not believe we have the resources to do that. We do not have the money or the resources.

If I understood the Senator's speech correctly, he was promising everything to Latin America, to Africa, to India, and to nations all over the world. He was going to solve the problems of those people. I think that leaves false hopes. It does more harm than good.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand. In fact, I am complimented by the fact that the Senator from Indiana has not complimented my speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts upon what I believe to be a forthright declaration. The Senator has taken a position on a great number of issues and has made direct recommendations concerning what he proposes to do about them.

I hope the Senator's program would not involve an increase in budgetary spending, so far as the balancing of income and payments is concerned, because there are certain areas in which a great amount of effectiveness can be achieved without additional spending.

One item of that kind relates to the fantastic amount of duplication and triplication and interservice rivalry which exists among the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Also, even now, in the Space Agency, certainly fantastic amounts could be saved if we could ever achieve what has been declared to be the purpose of the Government for a great many years, namely, the true unification of all the services which relate to defense.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct. So far as additional expenditures are concerned, I think a greater effort should be made in the missile field. The Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Minnesota, and I, 2 years ago sponsored an amendment which we hoped would strengthen the Development Loan Fund, which we hoped would become the major agency of the Government for the administration of foreign aid on a loan basis.

A third point was that I hoped the Western European countries themselves would play the role which we have a right to expect them to play in assisting the underdeveloped countries with the solution of their urgent economic problems. These countries have not yet met this responsibility.

The Senator from Indiana said that I promised the world everything. If the Senator from Indiana will reread my speech with the attention that we have come to expect from him, he would see that that is not my intention. My promise, in a sense, is a promise to the entire free world, and the burdens of maintaining our freedom are mutual.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As an example of things that can be done, we have three ranges for firing missiles. The expense of maintaining them is tremendous. The ranges have to be many thousands of miles in length. In matters of that kind, we are trying to eliminate overlapping functions, particularly in the Defense Establishment, where the Army wants one, the Navy wants one, and so does the Air Force. In matters of that kind, tremendous savings could be achieved.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution to the discussion.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have heard many speeches on the floor of the Senate, but this is one of the most constructive, positive, specific speeches I have heard. There was a series of 12 recommendations. In some cases they were fresh proposals. In all cases, they were carefully documented.

Contrary to the position expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from

Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I should say that the speech by the Senator from Massachusetts was unusually constructive. Not only did it call upon the American people for sacrifice, and point out that we cannot be providing the kind of America that the world must have, if we are to achieve peace, unless we are strong; but it seems to me that the speech delineated very precisely our goal when it emphasized, in point 11, that we must work and work much harder toward peace. The speech did not simply say that in general terms; it was precise.

The Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that we have less than 100 people now working on what is one of the most important and most troublesome problems in the world, the achievement of peace in a nuclear world. He proposed an arms control research institute. He pointed out that unless a test ban is achieved a holocaust of nuclear destruction is a terrible prospect for the world.

It seems to me that this is one of the most constructive and useful speeches I have heard in a long time. I am sure it will be widely read. I enthusiastically congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts upon having delivered it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I was wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] in referring to promises, was not referring to the promises to liberate the enslaved satellites, to unleash Chiang Kai-shek, and to use massive retaliation. Those were pretty reckless promises. They were never fulfilled; but, as I recall, they were made by the Senator's own administration. If I am incorrect, I hope the Senator from Indiana will correct me.

Mr. KENNEDY. The journeys which the President has taken in the last year of his administration to India, Pakistan, Latin America, Africa, and Western Europe are trips which have raised the hopes of the people involved that American action will be more convincing. I wish those trips had been taken by the President earlier in his administration, so that they could be followed with action. Instead, only hopes have been raised. The same hopes which have been raised, fortunately, for more than 150 years. The United States has always represented the center of hope for the people of the world.

I do not share the view of the Senator from Indiana that by raising hopes we shall disillusion the people of the free world. We stimulate hope that they, too, can both be free and maintain a vital economy. Our function in the 1960's is to try, by cooperative effort, to make those hopes come true.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Unless the hopes of the uncommitted one-third of the world's humanity can be vested in the United States, what hope is there for maintaining American leadership?

Mr. KENNEDY. Exactly. I think the Senator is quite correct. I regard the statement by the Senator from Indiana as pointing out a very important point—perhaps by inadvertence—namely, that we do represent the hope of these people. Some people may say it is unfortunate that they have hope in us; others may say that is a source of strength for us. I hold the latter view. However, we often observe modern Americans are rarely quoted by the people of the emerging and developing nations; but they quote Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. I hope in the future we shall once again provide the leadership and vision which will offer hope to the world.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield again to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able senior Senator from Indiana stated that the problems which the able junior Senator from Massachusetts has discussed today faced the country 8 years ago. Undoubtedly the threat of communism existed 8 years ago, and undoubtedly it exists today. But there is a difference between the approach which the junior Senator from Massachusetts has suggested and the record of the administration for the past 8 years.

There are some other differences. Eight years ago we had not embarked upon haphazard and dangerous personalized summitry; the world had not witnessed the worst diplomatic debacle which human experience affords; the credibility of the United States of America had not been held up to scorn by a whole series of official falsehoods; we had not fallen behind in the exploration of space, to which the junior Senator from Idaho has referred; the Soviet Union had not outstripped the United States for a period of years in economic growth; not to mention a number of other differences.

The Senator has stated that the next President will inherit problems of gigantic importance, some of which unfortunately have been the result of unplanned and unwise policies; other have resulted from lack of coordination and lack of realistic administration.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON EXECUTIVE E, THE TREATY WITH JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate following the session today, the Committee on Foreign Relations be given leave to file its report on Executive E, the treaty with Japan.

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

Subsequently, Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following favorable report:

Executive E, 86th Congress, 2d session. A Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan, signed at Washington on January 19, 1960 (Ex. Rept. No. 8).

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) 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.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senate Joint Resolution 170 is now the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ray Wolfinger, who has been associated with my office, and has worked closely in connection with the pending measure, may be permitted the privilege of the floor during this debate.

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

THE ADMINISTRATION'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY: WORDS THAT ARE NULLIFIED BY ACTIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am very happy to yield to my good friend, the junior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the future Democratic keynoter, the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, one of the crucial areas of tension and turbulence which threaten the peace of the world lies in the Middle East. It arises wholly from the determination of the Arab countries to destroy Israel.

The fact is that little Israel is the one true democracy in the Middle East.

The fact is that it is a free country and its people are free people.

The fact is that it is an oasis of civilization in a desert of backwardness.

The fact is that it has established itself as such by qualities and actions that should have earned not only the admiration and respect of the free world, but also its active support, and especially that of the United States, whose basic professions and principles Israel embodies more than does any country outside of North America and Europe, for the enlightened philosophy and attitudes of Israel coincide with those of our own "land of the free and the home of the brave." And the Israelis, likewise, are not only free, but also brave. They have so demonstrated this by resisting successfully to date, with tremendous efforts, all-out sacrifices, and constant

vigilance, the lethal menace of hostile forces 20 times more numerous and occupying an area 50 times as large.

The Israelis further demonstrated their bravery and, indeed, their prowess in their brief, masterful, and victorious reprisal for Nasser's aggression and seizure of the Suez Canal—a triumph of arms unfortunately nullified by the action of the Eisenhower administration before the United Nations, which converted what had been a crushing defeat for Nasser into a victory for him, and thereby resurrecting his dictatorship. The least that could properly have been expected of U.S. action at that time—an action taken in great haste, not only against Israel, but also against our traditional and stanchest allies, Britain and France—would have been to insist, as a quid pro quo for our action and that of the United Nations, which followed, upon an unequivocal guarantee of freedom of passage through the Suez Canal for all nations. The United States did not effectively seek or secure such a guarantee. The result has been contained and mounting tension and a condition which the Arab dictators frankly declare to be a state of war between their countries and Israel.

The situation is thrown into relief at this moment by the publication of a letter, from Vice President NIXON, which has been made the subject of a press release from Washington, and therefore has become generally known. It was reported in the New York Times of June 13, under the heading: "NIXON Gives Aims of Mideast Policy," and with a subhead: "Says the United States Must Promote Arab-Israel Accord and Free Access to Suez."

Vice President NIXON's views on this important question were contained in a letter, dated June 7, to President Label A. Katz, of B'nai B'rith. In the course of this letter, the full text of which I shall ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, the Vice President said:

> It is the policy of our Government to protest discriminatory acts in international trade which militate against American citizens and American shipping. With regard to the matter of the Suez Canal, the United States has unequivocally affirmed its support of the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the canal for all nations, including Israel. This policy has been enunciated publicly and repeatedly. I believe that we must continue to press for the effective implemention of the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to international waterways, and the protection of the interests of American seamen and shipping now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy.

Mr. President, no one can quarrel with the sentiments expressed in the Vice President's letter. The difficulty, it seems to me, is that here, as in so much else under this administration, there is a wide disparity between word and deed. These worthy utterances come from on high; but the actions taken by the same high administration officials, or the actions not taken, nullify the effectiveness of their spoken words.

Only a few months ago, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development made a loan of $50 million to Nasser, for improvements on the Suez Canal. No words by any representative of the administration could begin to equal or even to approach in the way of policy this striking action. I made inquiry at the time about the justification for this action, so contrary even at that time to the administration's professions, and received from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, of the Department of State, a letter which I shall also ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The State Department admitted that the United States was not unmindful that restrictions placed on Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal might call into question the propriety of proceeding with the loan, and added:

> I can assure you this consideration was given full weight in the U.S. Government's decision to support favorable action on the loan. We have consistently upheld the principle of freedom of transit through the Suez for all nations, and the Secretary of State reiterated this support at the United Nations General Assembly on September 17.

Here, Mr. President, we have, in two successive sentences, a perfect illustration of the administration's double standard. Here, we have a typical example of action negating words. We have, says our Government, consistently upheld the principle of freedom of transit, but on the other hand it has turned over millions of American taxpayers' dollars to the man who is principally responsible for violating and nullifying that principle of freedom.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is allegedly an international agency, but there can be little question that if the United States wished to exercise its influence in matters of high policy in regard to loans on which it felt keenly and involved a matter of high principle, its views would carry great weight and would no doubt be effective. We note that the president, the three vice presidents, and the treasurer of the Bank are all American citizens. But while decisions are made by a majority of the 18 executive directors and alternates, who represent a variety of countries, the fact is that the American representatives all voted for the loan. A simple word from the White House to the Bank's officialdom indicating that it was policy not to grant such a loan without a commitment on the part of the Egyptian Government to allow free passage to the ships of all nations, would have been accepted at least by the U.S. officials. Either the commitment to allow freedom of transit would have been made, or the loan would not have been made. Would there have been anything unreasonable or improper for the United States to make such a request and to take such a position? I cannot conceive such a request to have been other than reasonable, proper, and in accord with our declared purposes.

It is difficult to conclude that such a position would not only have been fair and reasonable, but would have furnished evidence to a listening world that the United States means what it says; that it tries to implement its words with actions; and that there is something more to its policies than, to quote the Vice President's words: "to unequivocally affirm its support of the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the canal for all nations, including Israel."

Moreover, when the Senate, with a worthy desire and purpose to implement such professions, inserted a moderate statement to that effect in the foreign aid authorization bill a few weeks ago, we in the Senate were informed, in no uncertain terms, that the administration violently opposed such a statement. What was this statement? I quote it:

> (f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—
>
> (1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and
>
> (2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;
>
> assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application.

Fortunately, despite the administration's efforts to reverse this action, this expression of the sense of the Congress stayed in the Mutual Security Act. But let it be noted that it is not even binding on this administration, for its concluding sentence states:

> These principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What the Senator is describing is clearly what I believe to be a fair example of economic aggression, where there is an international waterway and a treaty commitment to make it available for use by the entire world. Is that not correct?

Mr. GRUENING. That is entirely correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So far as I know, the United States has no such commitment with regard to the Panama Canal, but we have followed the principle that any ship of any nation can go through the canal. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. We do follow that principle.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is not that policy completely at variance with what Communists and Communist sympathizers would call economic aggression in this hemisphere, when this Government possibly proposes to buy more sugar from nations that are more friendly to it than other nations are?

Mr. GRUENING. The Communists would call it economic aggression, but they would not label these acts of their Arab allies or sympathizers in the Middle East as aggression, nor their own acts in their satellite countries as aggression, although clearly those are aggressive acts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The fact is that we have no treaty with regard to our purchase of sugar or coffee. We have complete freedom to buy sugar from whomever we might want to buy it. Yet Mr. Castro would have us believe it would be economic aggression if we, having no treaty obligation and no executive agreement, merely undertook to buy more sugar from our friends.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator knows, of course, that not only are these acts against Israel acts of economic aggression, but that economic aggression reaches into our own country and tells us whom American companies doing business in the Middle East shall employ, carrying this dictation sometimes to the second and third degree. In addition, these Arab countries frankly declare that they are at war with Israel. Consequently, it seems to me the policy of the United States should be crystal clear and that these noble declarations of high principle should be buttressed by action, which we are capable of taking, due, in large part, to the right to spend or loan our American taxpayers' dollars where we wish. The President is given discretionary power to withhold such grants or loans. We can expect he will not heed the wishes of Congress; that we shall continue to hear high-sounding statements by the Vice President and other administration officials about principles, but we may fear that no action will be taken to carry out those principles.

Mr. LONG of Lousiana. As one Senator who previously voted against the amendment which stated it was the sense of the Senate that no loan should be made to Egypt so long as she denied the ships of any country free passage through the canal, I must say had the matter been pinpointed as clearly as the Senator from Alaska has done in his speech, I would have been compelled to vote the other way.

Mr. GRUENING. One is always grateful for a convert.

How simple, therefore, if the administration means what it says and the Vice President wishes to square actions with words to see that this policy is strictly carried out and that there be no aid to nations engaged in what they declare to be a war, an integral tactic of which is the denial of the use of the international waterway called the Suez Canal, to whose owners the United States recently helped give $50 million. I repeat that that action, authorized and sanctioned by the administration, speaks far louder than any words, no matter how often uttered or affirmed.

It should be noted also that in the mutual security appropriation bill—not the authorization bill passed by both Senate and House and signed by the President to which I have referred, but the mutual security appropriation bill—over in the House, dated June 13, section 113 says:

> It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

It will be observed again that, as in the wording of the Senate authorization bill, the carrying out of this sense of the Congress is left to the determination of the President.

Mr. President, the United States is dedicated to peace. It has it within its power, by actions wholly consonant with our traditions, with our longstanding professions, with our oft declared purposes, to achieve peace with justice for the world, to put an end to this Middle East war, in which a number of nations have banded together to destroy one little people, in large part composed of refugees from persecution and even from extinction elsewhere, whose purpose, whose existence, and whose very life hang in the balance.

The two Houses of Congress have affirmed their views on the subject, at least as unequivocally as has the Vice President, but, in addition to affirming them, have indicated a policy which might make that affirmation a tangible reality. It will be interesting to see whether the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, which is making an all-out claim for a total appropriation of $4,150,000,000 for foreign aid, will carry out the declared mandate of the Congress, eliminate the wide disparity between words and action, and make the most important contribution to peace in an important and crucial section of the world than can possibly be made.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to, which appeared in the New York Times of June 13th; the letter of Vice President NIXON to Mr. Label Katz of B'nai B'rith; an article from the Reporter magazine, entitled "The Noose Around Israel," which deserves reading because it makes clear the far-reaching character of the attempt to strangle the Republic of Israel, and the extent to which this effort reaches into American lives and interferes with the normal functions of American business concerns, both at home and abroad; an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "The Clamp on Suez"; an editorial from the New Bedford Standard Times entitled "Money Without Morality"; an article from the San Francisco Chronicle, entitled: "Suez Breach of Faith"; an article from the Oakland Tribune by Raymond Lawrence, entitled: "Blockade of Suez Canal"; and the letter from the Department of State dated December 22, 1959, signed by the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Mr. John S. Hoghland 2d, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1960]

NIXON GIVES AIMS OF MIDEAST POLICY—SAYS THE UNITED STATES MUST PROMOTE ARAB-ISRAEL ACCORD AND FREE ACCESS TO SUEZ

WASHINGTON, June 12.—Vice President NIXON said in a letter made public today that the United States, while seeking to promote a mutually acceptable Arab-Israeli settlement, must keep on pressing to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping and to protect American interests from Arab boycott and blacklisting.

The Vice President also spoke of the need to attempt "with diligence and patience" to change the situation in Saudi Arabia, where American servicemen of Jewish background are excluded from the U.S. installations at Dhahran airfield.

The Vice President's letter, dated June 7, was to Label A. Katz of New Orleans, president of B'nai B'rith. Mr. Katz made it public in a speech at Chicago today before the annual convention of B'nai B'rith's District Two. The organization released it here also.

ANSWER TO LETTER

Mr. Katz had written the Vice President following a meeting he and Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president of the Jewish service organization, had had with Mr. NIXON several months ago. They met again with Mr. NIXON last week.

Mr. NIXON reiterated U.S. policy, which, he said, recognizes "that the independence and integrity of Israel and the Arab countries of the area are of vital concern to the United States."

Mr. NIXON wrote:

"Our Government must continue to use every suitable occasion, both within and outside the United Nations, to facilitate progress toward a mutually acceptable solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, based on amity and recognition of each other's existence and independence."

He said that the Government had "unequivocally affirmed," "publicly and repeatedly" its support of freedom on Suez Canal transit for all nations, including Israel.

CITES FREEDOM OF SEAS

"We must continue to press for the effective implementation of the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to international waterways, and the protection of the interests of American seamen and shipping now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy, he said.

This is a boycott at Arab ports of ships that have stopped or are bound for Israel ports.

"The United States," Mr. NIXON said, "neither recognizes nor condones the Arab boycott. Consistent with this policy, he said, "we must, by every available and effective instrument, continue to pursue every means to restore and protect completely private American interests in international commerce."

Mr. Katz, in his letter to the Vice President, contended that the Government had taken "no resistive action" to discriminatory practices imposed by Arab States on Americans of the Jewish faith.

"Moreover," Mr. Katz wrote, "there have been disclosures in recent months that agencies of the Federal Government had acceded to these discriminatory policies in an affirmative manner."

SEES CAPITULATION

The B'nai B'rith leader said there had been "persistent capitulations of the State and Defense Departments" in surrendering to Saudi Arabia's discriminatory demands in the Dhahran agreement.

The Vice President described the Dhahran airfield issue as "an unsatisfactory state of

affairs—one which we cannot merely accept as unavoidable, and one which we shall continue, with diligence and patience, to try to correct."

Although use of the airbase leased from Saudi Arabia is "vital from the standpoint of our national security," Mr. NIXON acknowledged "a serious drawback in the arrangements" in that American troops assigned to Dhahran require visas, which Saudi Arabia denies to Jewish servicemen.

Mr. Katz told the 900 delegates at Chicago that he "welcomed the Vice President's forthright expression of his views on these critical matters."

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington D.C., June 7, 1960.

Mr. LABEL A. KATZ,
President, B'nai B'rith,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZ: I very much appreciated the opportunity I had recently to visit so pleasantly and constructively with you, and it was very thoughtful of you to follow up our conversation with your candid letter setting forth your position in detail with respect to the matters we discussed.

As I indicated in our conversation, I share fully your firm conviction that any discriminatory practices on the grounds of race or religion are entirely inconsistent with the fundamental principles upon which our Nation was founded, and which represent in essence the greatness of America. When I visited Poland last year, I had occasion to lay a wreath at the memorial marking the remains of the Warsaw Ghetto. More than ever, on that occasion, I recognized that racial or religious discrimination ends in the destruction of human values by which our civilization must live if it is to endure. For this reason, I shall never be satisfied until peaceful and workable measures have been found and adopted to eliminate every trace of such practices against our citizens, and I shall continue to devote my efforts wholeheartedly toward that goal.

I think you will agree with me that the problems encountered in combating discrimination become even more difficult and complex when they present themselves in an international context. Our use of the Dhahran Airfield is a good case in point. Clearly the operational privileges we have there through an executive agreement are vital from the standpoint of our national security. We have to recognize however, that there is a serious drawback in the arrangements, arising from the fact that American servicemen assigned to the base must have valid Saudi Arabian visas. As a result, while nothing in the agreement excludes American servicemen of Jewish faith, in fact the Saudi Arabian Government has done so indirectly, in exercising its sovereign right to control internal matters, by refusing to issue them visas. This is admittedly an unsatisfactory state of affairs—one which we cannot merely accept as unavoidable, and one which we shall continue, with diligence and patience, to try to correct.

It is the policy of our Government to protest discriminatory acts in international trade which militate against American citizens and American shipping. Our Government's concern and good intentions in this area are demonstrated in the matter of the "Haifa Clause" which, until recently, the Navy included in its shipping contracts. The use of this clause, which was designed to assure the efficient operation of the fleet, was discontinued in February 1960, lest it be misconstrued as acquiescence in the Arab boycott.

Similarly, in the matter of transporting Public Law 480 cargoes, we note with approval that no agency of our Government is a party to such discriminatory contracts.

Consistent with the policy that the U.S. Government neither recognizes nor condones the Arab boycott, we must, by every available and effective instrument, continue to pursue every means to restore and protect completely private American interests in international commerce.

With regard to the matter of the Suez Canal, the U.S. Government has unequivocally affirmed its support of the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the canal for all nations, including Israel. This policy has been enunciated publicly and repeatedly. I believe that we must continue to press for the effective implementation of the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to international waterways, and the protection of the interests of American seamen and shipping now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy.

As I know you are aware, the U.S. Government has been most directly concerned with the problems of peace, security, and economic development in the Middle East. We have recognized that the independence and integrity of Israel, and the Arab countries of the area are of vital concern to the United States. I believe that our Government must continue to use every suitable occasion, both within and outside the United Nations, to facilitate progress toward a mutually acceptable solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, based on amity and recognition of each other's existence and independence.

Again I want to tell you how much I enjoyed the welcome opportunity I had to talk over with you personally matters of mutual interest and concern, and to express my appreciation for the devoted efforts which you and the members of your organization are making to eliminate discriminatory practices against any group of Americans.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

[From the Reporter magazine, Apr. 14, 1960]

THE NOOSE AROUND ISRAEL

(By William S. Ellis)

BEIRUT.—On a narrow, sun-washed street just off the Bay of St. George, in Beirut, a wealthy Palestinian refugee dismissed his chauffeur and climbed two flights of stairs in a dumpy, gray-white building. Entering the office from which he directs a successful retail furniture and household appliance business, he deposited a string of clear blue prayer beads on the desk and then adjusted a glass-framed sign on one of the walls.

Its single line of characters looked like an advanced mathematical formula, but in Arabic it expressed the Arab world's major weapon against Israel: "The noose gets tighter and tighter and tighter."

"I won't take that sign down until I am able to return to my home in Palestine," the furniture dealer said.

The strands of the hanging rope are clearly marked—Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Republic, and Iraq; in short, the nations of the Arab Middle East. The noose has been tied by nations noted for their bickering. The long end of the rope is in the hands of the Arab League's Boycott Israel office, and there the standing order is "Pull, pull, pull." Israel admits that the rope is being drawn tighter day by day.

Flushed with success, the boycott office decided some time ago to widen its activities. It did so with ostentatious bluff and bluster, but the Arabs seemed to be making headway when the U.S. Navy began to penalize tankers under contract to supply it with fuel for any delays caused by their being held up by the Arabs for having called at Israeli ports—thus effectively discouraging such calls. Recently the Navy has rescinded this clause in its contracts.

As much as U.A.R. President Nasser likes to boast of the military strength of his forces in Egypt and the First Army in the Syrian region, he knows full well that intraleague rivalries tend to undermine it.

In any case, the economic blockade has done what two Arab armies failed to do: strike hard and effectively at small, enemy-locked Israel. It is not possible to gage the damage of the boycott to Israel's economic development, but a conservative estimate would be many million dollars.

From central headquarters in Damascus, Dr. Karim Aidi, general commissioner of the boycott, directs the operation. Driven by a dedication bordering on fanaticism, Dr. Aidi, considers everything from ships to movie stars fair game. He plays no favorites, and when it comes to tackling such giants as International Business Machines, he goes about his business unimpressed by the company's reputation in American financial pages.

IBM was, in fact, placed on the boycott list in February. That same day another American firm, Helena Rubinstein, was told that it also was banned from selling its products in Arab countries. The reason given for both actions: "Violating the Arab boycott-Israel regulations," which could mean anything from Thomas Watson, Jr., having lunch with Premier Ben-Gurion to a performer at an Israel bond rally wearing a certain type of lipstick.

PROFIT OR LOSS

The action, while seemingly harmful only to the companies, usually follows a course reserved for Arab winners in the race for influence between Zionism and Nasserism. IBM, it is figured, will have to look to its books and start tallying the figures. If more typewriters and calculating machines are sold in Israel than in the U.A.R., Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia combined, then the boycott might gather dust in the bluff and bluster file. But if the reverse is true—as it usually is—the company will either have to abide by the boycott rules or lose money. Arab officials like to believe that IBM is a concern more dedicated to sound business habits than to a national Jewish homeland.

France's Government-owned Renault automobile company turned to its books after the boycott struck and found that from an economic standpoint, it was better to mollify the Arab States. In 1955 Renault had signed a 3-year contract with the Kaiser-Frazer company for the assembly of its cars in Israel. Notice of cancellation of the pact was given in September 1958, according to Renault's president Pierre Dreyfus. Dreyfus said the decision to stop assembly operations in Haifa was strictly business. He added that the Arab boycott was a consideration. Renault agreed to abide by the boycott rules and the ban was lifted.

In Israel, meanwhile, Efraim Ilin, chairman of Israeli Kaiser-Frazer, was preparing to bring suit for $2 million against Renault, charging breach of contract. Even if judgment is awarded it may well be that Renault will still stand to gain, for the basic fact in the matter is this: In 4 years Renault sold fewer than 4,000 cars in Israel, while in Lebanon alone sales of cars just for private use average more than 300 a month. "The decision by Renault," said Nadim Hallak, chairman of the boycott office in Beirut, "represents a major victory for Arab countries and for the idea of the boycott."

The boycott covers the high seas, too. Hardly a day goes by when the Arab press fails to carry lists of freighters newly assigned to the fleet of the banned.

The classic case of shipping boycott is, of course, the *Inge Toft*. The Danish freighter has sailed now, but not before it lay moored in the inner basin of Port Said for 9 months. The vessel's cargo of potash, cement, and copper, which was taken aboard at Haifa last May, was unloaded. The boycott office again sounded its victory yell, and Egyptians,

watching the ship slip out of the basin, laughed and pointed at the seaweed and barnacles clinging to the hull.

Rules for getting on the shipping blacklist—and getting off it—have been drafted so as to give the captain or the ship's agent several choices of action. Full blacklist membership is available, along with half blacklist membership. Finally, there are the rules to be followed if a ship wishes to move from full blacklist to half blacklist, and from both to a ban-free status.

A vessel is placed on the blacklist if it:

Carries materials to be used to strengthen the "Israeli war effort."

Calls at an Israeli port and at an Arab port during the same voyage. This does not apply to ships carrying passengers only, in which case the vessel has to call at the Arab port first and furnish the regional boycott office a complete statement of arrival and departure times at the ports.

Is chartered by Israeli companies or organizations (this was the case with the *Inge Toft*).

Carries immigrants to Israeli.

Had originally been of Israeli nationality and was sold to another country (such a vessel has no hope of ever getting off the blacklist).

Carries Israeli industrial, agricultural, and commercial products.

Refuses to submit within 15 days the certificates and manifests requested in respect of previous voyages.

There is one other method of getting on the full blacklist, and that is by infringing the rules for the second time after removal from the list. There is no third chance.

To be placed on the half blacklist, it is necessary for the vessel's agent to submit a statement to the effect that infringement of the boycott rules will not occur again. Freedom from both lists comes when the agent promises the ship will never deal with Israel again.

Penalties for breaking the rules include depriving the ship from loading, discharging, and bunkering, and from taking on water supplies and other provisions. No member of the crew is allowed to disembark at any Arab port, and the vessel is not allowed to take on crew members at Arab ports. Ships on the half blacklist are given just enough provisions to allow them to continue to the next port of call.

With an average of 51 ships passing through the Suez Canal each day, the boycott office is aware that the vessel blacklist is the nuclear weapon in its anti-Israel economic arsenal. "No matter how hard Hammarsjkold tries to convince Nasser that the Suez Canal should be isolated from politics, the boycott will continue, and Israeli cargoes will not pass," a high-ranking official of the Lebanon Government said.

Nasser himself reconfirmed his stand on Suez during his visit to the Syrian region of the U.A.R. in mid-February. He asserted that not only would the ships be stopped but that the cargoes would be confiscated and donated to Palestinian refugees.

MISS MONROE IS TABOO

Back on land, Arabs, who like movies almost as much as they do soda pop, are finding one activity of the boycott office extremely annoying. More and more film stars are being placed on the blacklist, and as a result, theater owners are finding their choice of presentations being narrowed down to bad Egyptian films starring, more often than not, an ex-girl friend of Farouk, and productions from Russia that the Peking Government would call "films representing a step forward."

Elizabeth Taylor is banned, and the boycott office is not impressed by the fact that she has been named to star in "Cleopatra." Films featuring Danny Kaye can no longer be shown in Arab states. The list stretches on and on—Edward G. Robinson, Eddie Fisher, Marilyn Monroe (and she was a big favorite with the Arabs), Jerry Lewis.

Most of the stars were banned for participating in rallies for the sale of Israel bonds. In the case of Louis Armstrong, it was first reported that he had been banned because he was "a spy for Israel." When the absurdity of the allegations finally struck home, the reason was altered to read "aiding the cause of Zionism." What had actually happened was that Armstrong had simply performed in Israel.

"Ben Hur" will not be shown in Beirut or in any other Arab city. The reason: Haya Harareet, who once won the title of Miss Israel, has a role in the production.

When asked what he thought about the film ban, Spyros Skouras, president of 20th Century-Fox, who was in Beirut recently, said, "Well, I'm against mixing art and politics." The ironic thing is that the majority of Arabs, especially those living in Lebanon, agree with him.

Lebanon is regarded as the weak sister in the anti-Israel boycott campaign. The Government denies that, of course, but there were many red faces when Monaheem Saadi, a Beirut merchant, was arrested for importing a brand of watches made by a blacklisted factory. And then there was the time, late last year, when 256 Italian motor scooters made by a factory that deals with Israel were seized in Beirut.

When the ban against Danny Kaye was announced, a theater owned in Beirut, who was showing a Kaye film at the time, took the position that the ban doesn't become effective until our schedule calls for a change of films.

Beirut blushed again recently, but this time it was because of a bit of anti-Israel strategy seemingly calculated to evoke disgust. Even the boycott office forbore to take credit for the action. An apparatus for artificial breathing had been shipped from New York to Israel. Before it left New York, however, a Lebanese official in the United States (the government was careful not to reveal his name) somehow convinced the shippers that the apparatus was to be channeled through Beirut. When it got to the Lebanese capital it was, of course, confiscated.

Two young men who work as translators for a newspaper in Beirut were discussing the matter the day after the confiscation was announced. One, a Lebanese from a village near Tripoli, said, "We certainly have nothing to be proud of as far as this is concerned." The other translator is a Palestinian refugee. He said: "In war, everything is fair game."

The two remarks tell the whole story of the boycott simply and briefly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 23, 1960]

THE CLAMP ON SUEZ

The owner of an international waterway is under something of a public duty to keep it open to the commerce of the world at large. In the light of history this is especially true of the United Arab Republic and the Suez Canal.

When Secretary General Hammarskjold of the United Nations finds, as he recently has done, that an action of the Cairo government "goes against" the principles of the UN Charter, one may be sure he has ground for doing so. He had reference to the stopping of the Greek freighter Astypalea and the confiscation of a cargo of cement from Israel.

In view of the intensity of feeling behind the Arab boycott of Israel, it may be too much to expect that the U.A.R. should permit passage of Israeli ships through the canal. But it does seem that there should be, in Mr. Hammarskjold's phrase, "workable practices" to allow goods which are the property of non-Israelis to be shipped through the canal in vessels of other nations even though going to or from an Israeli port. It was assumed that such arrangements had been made when the Astypalea set out.

Through international agencies the United States assisted financially in reopening the Suez Canal to traffic. Various forms of American technical assistance are being extended in Egypt and Syria, with every desire to help the people of these areas. However, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has proposed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which would authorize the President to take into account the interests of economic cooperation and freedom of navigation in administering foreign aid. The United States can hardly afford to subsidize a restriction on international trade.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, May 5, 1960]

MONEY WITH MORALITY

The Eisenhower administration sustained what may prove to be an important defeat in connection with Senate passage of new foreign-aid spending authority. By a vote of 45–39, the Senators overrode State Department protests and approved an anti-Arab declaration in the bill's policy statement.

The disputed amendment gives the President discretionary authority to withhold mutual security assistance to the United Arab Republic if the UAR continues to boycott Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal.

In opposing this amendment, Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said it presented a test between "the best interests of the U.S. foreign policy and a pro-Israel pressure group."

Douglas Dillon, Acting Secretary of State, in a letter supporting FULBRIGHT's position, declared the declaration would be interpreted as "demonstrating favoritism for Israel, an attempt to tie strings to U.S. economic aid, and a threat to use aid as an instrument of political coercion."

Dillon added everybody already knew the United States favors free transit in the canal, and the amendment would not make the Arabs end their boycott against Israel anyway, but would just make Nasser angrier.

Why did the Senate approve the amendment in the face of these arguments?

Since 1957, Cairo has been under a pledge to the United Nations to permit free transit of the canal and to keep canal operations "insulated from politics." The United States is committed to seeing this policy enforced.

But Egypt has gone back on its promise. It denies use of the canal to Israeli shipping, in an action legally and morally indefensible and motivated by politics.

As Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois noted, "the State Department wrings its hands and says, 'Oh, yes, we stand for free access,' but it does nothing."

The United Nations, which has primary responsibility in this situation, also does nothing.

So the U.S. Senate did something, moved by DOUGLAS' plea, "Are we to go on with conversations, or are we to try to get some sense that there are moral laws in the world?"

It's a good question, and now that the Senate has established the fact that the United States does not have to give its taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to everybody who asks—saint or sinner, friend or enemy—a new era may have begun for foreign aid.

Perhaps from now on, American help will go exclusively to those nations that share with us a belief in the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It may be that Congress is ready to take a more critical look at those countries opposed to everything American except U.S. handouts.

Surely it is better to "tie strings" to such aid than to subsidize tyranny, opportunism, and irresponsibility, to the detriment of those whom we profess to be helping.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, April 14, 1960]

SUEZ BREACH OF FAITH

The repeated refusal of the Nasser government in the United Arab Republic to let Israeli ships use the Suez Canal is well known. Equally well known, we think, should be President Nasser's recent flouting of his own agreement for the passage of a Greek ship carrying a part-Israeli cargo. He had made this agreement with the Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, and his breach of it therefore is not a slap at just Israel but also at the world authority.

The Greek ship is the *Astypalea*. She sailed from Haifa last December with 400 tons of Israeli cement bound for Djibouti. This news was hushed by the Israelis to comply with the Hammarskjold understanding, but the *Astypalea* was nevertheless halted at Port Said by the Egyptians. In January, Hammarskjold went to Cairo to press for the release of the ship and her cargo, but without effect. Early this month the owners of the *Astypalea* gave up hope, and after unloading her cement cargo the ship turned about and sailed back toward Greece.

This development, Hammarskjold has observed, "goes against the principle upheld by the United Nations." It is another faithless act of the Nasser government in pursuit of its long and tedious legalistic controversy about the existence of a state of war with Israel.

[From the Oakland Tribune, Apr. 17, 1960]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BLOCKADE OF SUEZ CANAL

(By Raymond Lawrence)

The United Nations faces a challenge from Egypt on the Suez Canal that strikes at the Organization's authority and prestige.

Once more Egypt has refused permission for a ship bearing an Israeli cargo to travel through the canal.

The voyage of the Greek vessel which had loaded cement at Haifa was kept secret and the first news to the world at large came from Cairo when it was announced the *Astypalea* had been halted at Port Said and its cargo confiscated.

The United Nations is directly involved not only because of the original Suez convention, but because U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold had made a special trip to Cairo to work out free passage arrangements with President Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

AGREEMENT VIOLATED

The Secretary General was given definite promises by Nasser that Israeli-originated cargo would be allowed passage. That agreement was reached on Mr. Hammarskjold's personal trip in January of this year. It has thus been flagrantly violated on Nasser's orders.

This is not the first time that Israeli cargoes have been stopped. The blockade was instituted at the beginning of 1959 after several years of partial stoppage.

The whole business is a violation of the Security Council's resolution adopted in 1951.

One of the recent ships was the Liberian freighter *Captain Manolis*. Its Israeli-originated cargo was confiscated by the Egyptian authorities.

Then in March 1959 the West German ship *Lealott* was held up at Port Said and the cargo confiscated. In May the Danish ship *Inge Toft* was detained and held up for 9 months because the captain refused to acquiesce in the demand of the Egyptian authorities that he should unload his cargo, which eventually was confiscated.

FREE PASSAGE PACT

Under both the international convention and the resolution of the U.N. Security Council, the United Arab Republic is required to allow Israeli ships to pass through the Suez Canal.

Also, under the United Nations action in respect to the Palestine war, Egypt is required to make peace with Israel. This has not been done, despite repeated peace gestures on the part of the Israeli Government.

This kind of calculated piracy ought to give pause to the Western governments that have since last December lent $56 million to the U.A.R.

ACTION BY CONGRESS

Reaction to the U.A.R. blockade of the canal was reflected in Congress when the House Committee on Foreign Affairs approved an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which opposes aid to nations that wage economic warfare such as boycotts, blockades, and restrictions on the use of international waterways.

This is not a categorical ban, since the amendment leaves it up to the President to decide whether we should subsidize the Suez blockade with millions in surplus foods and loans.

Congress thus has laid down a principle about which the President must report regarding its application.

It is one that should cause some serious thinking in Cairo about the need for intelligent and constructive efforts to settle the central problem of the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1959.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Recalling your previous expressed interest in the question of a loan by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to the United Arab Republic for the purpose of effecting improvements on the Suez Canal, I should like in this letter to review considerations which led to our Government's support of this proposal when the matter was brought before the IBRD Board of Directors. The Bank acted favorably on the proposal on December 21, 1959.

The following factors prompted the U.S. Government's attitude toward the Suez Canal loan:

(a) The project is sound technically. It has been planned for a number of years. Studies undertaken by the International Bank confirm that, from an engineering standpoint, the proposals which envision the deepening and widening of the canal represent a sound and feasible program for improvement of the canal as an international waterway.

(b) It is a sound project economically. Canal receipts in foreign exchange are and will be more than adequate to service a loan. It is clearly a bankable development project of precisely the type for which the IBRD was established.

(c) The project has international benefit. The canal improvements will be of value to the world trading community, and in particular the Western European nations for whom the canal is almost an indispensable artery.

(d) The IBRD is an international lending agency whose loans are granted primarily on a basis of usefulness economically and soundness financially. The injection of noneconomic considerations into the Bank's assessment of the credit-worthiness of an application would, in our view, impair the Bank's integrity as an international financial institution, particularly in the eyes of the less fully developed nations of the world whose needs the Bank is primarily designed to serve. To maintain the IBRD's well-deserved international prestige it is, in our opinion, important to avoid circumstances which would expose the Bank to allegations that it is a political instrument rather than a bona fide international lending agency devoted to the promotion of economic development for the welfare of the peoples of the world.

(e) Sound economic development should be encouraged. The Suez Canal development project is regarded by the United Arab Republic as an important element of its total development program. It is clearly in the free world's interest to try to be helpful in such cases rather than, by default, to furnish an opportunity to be exploited by the free world's enemies.

In recognizing the merits of the foregoing considerations, the U.S. Government was not unmindful that restrictions placed on Israel's shipping in the Suez Canal might call into question the propriety of proceeding with the loan. I can assure you this consideration was given full weight in the U.S. Government's decision to support favorable action on the loan. We have consistently upheld the principle of freedom of transit through the Suez for all nations, and the Secretary of State reiterated this support at the United Nations General Assembly on September 17.

You may be sure that our Government will continue its efforts to do what it appropriately can to facilitate a solution to the problem which still confronts Israel vis-a-vis the Suez Canal. In this connection, we understand that the United Nations Secretary General has been closely following developments connected with the recent incident involving a Greek-flag vassel and is continuing his efforts to assist in bringing about a resolution of the transit problem. It remains our hope that the good offices of the United Nations, which are energetically being addressed to this problem, will bear fruit. The constructive action which the IBRD has taken with respect to the Suez loan may itself provide example and encouragement for progress toward ultimate solution of Near Eastern problems.

In view of your past inquiry regarding this question, I thought you might be interested in the foregoing outline of the attitude which our Government adopted. Having regard for all factors, we believe this attitude to be in the best interests, not only of our own Nation, but of the free world as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. HOGHLAND 2d,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to my able and distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. First, I apologize to the Senator from Alaska for having to leave the Chamber a few moments during his speech. The Senator knows I asked that he send for me at the Committee on Foreign Relations meeting when he took the floor, since I wished to hear him speak, because I had received an advance copy of the Senator's statement. His office was very kind in making it available. I thank the Senator for that.

The Senator has made a cogent statement of a most difficult problem, and it is a sincere and honest statement of what ought to be an honest policy on the part of our Government, namely, the fulfill-

ment of commitments in terms of the free access to international waterways, including the use of the Suez Canal and, indeed, the necessity for the executive branch of our Government to acknowledge what has been the firm resolution of the Congress, as was pointed out by the Senator in his recitation of the action of the other body in respect to the mutual security appropriation bill, section 113, where the House of Representatives expressed the sense of the Congress relating to the protection of personal and commercial access and other rights of U.S. citizens. I shall not read the particular section, for it is in the RECORD.

I am sure the Senator knows that many of us in this Chamber for a long time have been deeply concerned over what appears to be a double standard in American policy.

Mr. GRUENING. That is quite true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator so aptly describes it in his address today, on the one hand it is stated, as the Vice President stated in his letter of June 7 to the president of B'nai B'rith, Label A. Katz, concerning the policy of our Government to protest discriminatory acts in international trade which militate against American citizens and American shipping:

> With regard to the matter of the Suez Canal, the United States has unequivocally affirmed its support of the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the canal for all nations, including Israel.

After having made this rather pious pronouncement the follow-through on the part of the administration leads one to an interpretation of a contrary policy.

I have been one of those in the Senate who have felt and who have said repeatedly that the State of Israel is here to stay. It is a sovereign nation. It was established by the United Nations. It has been recognized by the United States and by a majority of the nations of the world. It has demonstrated its capacity for self-government. It has fulfilled many of the objectives we have laid down as the better characteristics of a nation; namely, a capacity to defend itself, a capacity and a willingness to improve the lot of its citizens, a willingness to enter into international responsibilities and negotiations and to fulfill those responsibilities, and a willingness to share in the responsibilities of international law and order.

Since Israel has that kind of a record, it seems to me the least our Government can do is to stand steadfast for the principles we believe to be sound and reasonable and to insist that these principles be applied.

I happen to believe that the executive branch of the Government in this matter has been weak, uncertain, and indefinite, and has not really exercised the influence and power of the United States of America. I have reason to believe that we have all too often been more concerned with some commercial interests in the Middle Eastern area than we have been concerned with sound international principles of law, of decency, and of justice.

The Senator from Alaska, with his characteristic candor and his personal and public integrity has again laid the issue on the line and has exposed for all to see what on the one hand is a fine, noble, high-sounding statement of principle and on the other hand is a weak, tired, vacillating policy which leads only to confusion and doubt among friends and foes alike. The Senator has done a good job for the country today. I commend him.

Mr. GRUENING. I greatly appreciate the kind remarks of my friend from Minnesota. I would say that if the administration wants to pursue the correct policy, instead of—perhaps "conniving" is too strong a word—not opposing these boycotting actions which aim at destroying a free people, it would say to these backward countries, "Why not emulate little Israel? Irrigate the deserts. Build up industries. Educate your people. Improve their condition. It is a wonderful example Israel is giving to the surrounding countries."

Instead of following that example set by Israel these nations wish to destroy Israel.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota, it is distressing to hear the pious proclamations of high principle and to see the same administration following a course of action which is directly opposite in character.

I think when the history of this administration is truly written it will go down in history as the administration of piety, pollution, and payola.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hesitate to ask the Senator to yield on the fine note which he has uttered, but another factor which has to be taken into consideration, I am sure the Senator would agree, is the fact that the Members of the Congress of the United States as representatives of the American people, have repeatedly expressed their will with respect to the policy which should be followed. For example, I remember the proposed amendment of the former U.S. Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, to the Mutual Security Act, relating to discrimination which was being practiced by certain foreign nations against Americans of the Jewish faith. I remind Senators that those nations were not even permitting an American in the uniform of the U.S. Armed Forces to set foot in certain countries, even though we had diplomatic, military, and commercial relations with those countries.

We expressed the will of Congress. We said to the administration that it should do what the late William Howard Taft as President of the United States did. I would have the Senate remember that when Czarist Russia refused to grant certain privileges and rights to Americans of a particular faith under a treaty that had been signed between the two nations, the then President of the United States, Mr. Taft, abrogated the treaty and said that the treaty was null and void, taking the stand that American rights, which had been made a part of the treaty were to be recognized and respected.

Congress knows this. We on the Foreign Relations Committee have considered this subject a half dozen or more times, and we have tried to express the intent and the will of the representatives of the people. We have always been told by the State Department, however, that it cannot be done. I suggest that the State Department tell certain conferees that, "We are sorry, but though there are some things that we as diplomats might want to do, those fellows in Congress say, 'No.'" Congress has the right, the privilege, and the duty to express the conscience of the American people. That is what we are here for.

When we express our policy in a manner which is desirable, decent, and wholesome, the least that can be done, particularly when it is in the tradition of our country, is that those who are responsible for the execution of that policy or its administration should follow it.

But what happens? A press release and a pious pronouncement by letter follow, and then the diplomats who work overseas and those who are carrying out the day-to-day duties of Government say, "The administration has satisfied the Congress. We have written a letter to Mr. Katz; we have written a letter to Mr. Jones. We have issued a press release to the New York Times. We have taken care of everything." They then proceed as they did before.

What the Senator from Alaska has said is that we insist that those who are in Washington writing letters to American constituents should also write a letter to the State Department, or send it duplicate copies of letters, saying, "This is the policy to be followed."

Mr. GRUENING. Can the Senator from Minnesota imagine how differently a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, would have handled this situation? The Senator will remember that in one of his statements to one of the Arab States which had kidnapped a naturalized citizen of Greek origin, Perdicaris, who had been kidnapped by a bandit named Raisuli, Theodore Roosevelt sent a curt ultimatum: "Perdicaris living or Raisuli dead." He got results.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Theodore Roosevelt was a great President. He spoke in a language the world understood. Americans understand, as the Senator from Massachusetts said today, that the administration talks loud. However, Theodore Roosevelt used to say, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." The administration now says, "Talk loudly and saw the stick off."

The Senator put his finger on the point again by alluding to Theodore Roosevelt, whose memory is celebrated, but whose policies, I regret to say, have been placed in cold storage.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Alaska has merited the congratulations and appreciation of his colleagues for his able and thoughtful speech. Only about an hour ago I heard the Senator engage in colloquy with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on a different subject. During the forenoon I listened to the able junior Senator from

Alaska testify before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in an able, attention-gripping manner on a treaty relating to Antarctica. Because of these observations in 1 day of the activities of the junior Senator from Alaska I wish to compliment him upon his ebullience, upon his intellectual curiosity, his inquisitiveness, his concern for the many problems facing our people, and his willingness to contribute from the wisdom that he possesses, from his judgment, from his vast experience, and, most of all, from his mental capacity and scholarly attainments.

Mr. GRUENING. I certainly would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation for this very gracious and undeserved tribute. I am very grateful that the able Senator from Tennessee has these views and has been willing to express them. I thank him.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly cannot top what the Senator from Tennessee has said, but I have tried again and again to convert the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on one or two of the very few points upon which we differ, with no success. The Senator from Alaska has done a magnificent job of converting him, and I think that speaks volumes for his eloquence and the persuasiveness of his excellent speech this afternoon on this particular issue.

I should like to clarify one point in his speech which puzzled me. I thought it was a fine speech, and I approve of it wholeheartedly. The Senator from Alaska points out that in 1956, at the time of the Suez crisis when we entered the conflict to save Nasser, we failed to secure an unequivocal guarantee of passage through the Suez Canal. I wish to make sure that the Senator from Alaska is not implying that there was not an ample precedent in international law.

In fact, there was triple precedent in international law for freedom of passage. There was the 1888 Suez Convention; there was the 1951 decision of the Security Council; and there was the assurance of Nasser at the time of the nationalization of the canal that there would be freedom of passage. So we have ample basis for insisting on freedom of passage through the canal.

What we need is exactly what the Senator from Alaska is calling on us for, namely, action by our Government to make international law meaningful, and I think he made an exceedingly forceful, vigorous, and effective plea for that kind of action.

I wish to underline this point by saying that the Senator from Alaska is performing a real service in not letting this subject die. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, by an overwhelming vote, which I think was 19 to 3, voted for this kind of resolution. The Senate voted against the administration and against the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee by a smashing majority in favor of the resolution, and it seems to me we should hammer it home over and over again that it is the position of the U.S. Senate, including an even greater majority, now that we have the junior Senator from Louisiana on our side, that international law should be lived up to, and that when we make a loan or a gift to a country, at the very least we should insist on compliance with international law and of fair dealing with another good friend and good ally of real democracy in this country in the Republic of Israel.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Louisiana has been thinking over the designation of the Senator from Alaska of the situation as one of piety, pollution and, if I recall the third, payola. I know the Senator from Alaska wants to be fair. This administration did not create pollution; it merely refused to do anything about it and blocked all efforts to do something about it.

Mr. GRUENING. As in the case of the Suez Canal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it was not the administration which created the pollution. It found the condition that way and has tried its dead level and earnest best to keep it that way.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask the Senator from Alaska if pollution is the same problem in Alaska as it is in a State such as Louisiana, where we have a relatively larger population and vast streams flowing through our most populated areas.

It was my impression that pollution could not possibly be the problem in Alaska that it is in most other States of the Union, inasmuch as most areas in Alaska have not experienced the development and therefore have not experienced the pollution that exists in other parts of the Nation.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct; we are a much less developed part of America and we are still a frontier. Our great rivers, like the Yukon, Kuskokwim, and Susitna do not run through industrial centers or urban communities where pollution originates and is carried downstream, as is the case with the Mississippi River which runs through the Louisiana Senator's State.

However, we are desirous that that situation should not come about in Alaska, and would like to have the administration cooperate with the States in eliminating pollution in other parts of the country. We do not have such a provincial or parochial feeling that we are not in favor of pollution control in other parts of our country because it is not a problem in Alaska. We believe that what is good for the whole Nation is good for Alaska, and vice versa.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, if we complete consideration of the Defense appropriation bill tomorrow, it is anticipated that we will take up the mutual security treaty with Japan on Thursday.

THE RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on May 23, 1960, there was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts purporting to be documentation from the Maine grassroots on the attitude of the people of Maine toward the President of the United States. The following day I made a statement in the Senate challenging that claim and recording my disagreement with it. I stated that it was my opinion that the overwhelming majority of the people of Maine supported rather than condemned the President of the United States.

I want to report to the Senate the response made by the people of Maine to my speech of May 24, 1960, defending the President of the United States and expressing my belief that the overwhelming majority of the people of Maine support him. I do so by quoting from the letter which I wrote on June 10, 1960, in response to letters I received from Maine.

My mail is evidence of this. You will be interested in the following analysis of my mail. Prior to my speech of May 24, 1960, I had received 10 letters from Maine residents expressing themselves on the U-2 affair and the summit meeting. Of those letters, six were critical of the President and four were commendatory of him.

Subsequent to my May 24, 1960, speech defending the President of the United States against these slurs, I have received 78 letters. Of this number 76 praised the President of the United States and my defense of him against such slurs—and only 2 condemned the President and my defense of him. These letters came from 15 of Maine's 16 counties.

When the slurring expressions were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 23, 1960, at page 10794, they were represented and offered as documentation from the Maine grassroots as the Senator who placed them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD stated: "The documentation which I now offer the Senate is from the grassroots—from the Maine grassroots."

Subsequently, the newspapers reported that the office of the Senator making this representation stated that at the time he had received a total of four letters.

I would not presume the role of authoritative documentation "from the grassroots of Maine" even on the total of the 88 letters I have received. But I do believe that a total of 88 letters from 15 of Maine's 16 counties is somewhat more representative than a total of 4. And the division of the overall 88 letters I received shows an 80-to-8 margin in favor of the President. With such a 90 percent recorded approval of the President and recorded condemnation of slurs charging that he had disgraced the United States and reflecting upon his mentality, it is difficult to conclude that the claimed "documention * * * from the Maine grassroots" made on May 23, 1960, is a justified claim.

AUTHORITY FOR BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO FILE ITS REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight to file its report on the housing bill.

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

Subsequently, Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 3670) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, and sub-

mitted a report (No. 1575) thereon; which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, during the debate on the wheat bill—S. 2759—last Thursday, I was unable to be present for a vote on one amendment and the vote on final passage of the bill. I should like to have the RECORD show that I would have voted "yea" on both of these rollcalls. The first vote was on the amendment identified as "6-8-60—H," submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The amendment provided that wheat price supports be reduced from the 80 percent called for in the bill to 75 percent over the next 3 years, as fixed by law; and in return the acreage be cut 20 percent. In addition, the farmer will receive 50 percent payments in kind for the wheat he would have produced on the 20 percent of acreage cut.

Mr. President, I would have preferred the adoption of the first price support Ellender amendment (No. "6-8-60—G"), which would have provided that the price support shall be 75 percent of parity for 1961, 70 percent of parity for 1962, 65 percent of parity for 1963, and all succeeding years. However, since this amendment was defeated, I then would have voted for the compromise approach represented by the second Ellender price support amendment.

I also wish to be recorded as favoring final passage of the bill. The bill is not all that I would have desired in the way of wheat legislation, but I think it represents the best bill we could hope to get from this Congress. I thus wish to be recorded as favoring final passage of S. 2759.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. 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. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

COMPARISON OF SOVIET AND WESTERN DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which I have had prepared as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament.

This table compares three comprehensive disarmament proposals: the Soviet proposal of September 17, 1959; the Soviet proposal of June 2, 1960, which modifies the September 17 proposal; and the Western proposal of March 15, 1960. The table describes the types of weapons, and the suggested reduction and control measures, which are contemplated in each proposal and in which of three stages the reduction and control would occur.

It is my understanding that neither the Western plan of March 15 nor the Soviet statement of June 2 has been offered on a take it or leave it basis. Both papers are presented as documents for negotiation.

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

DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS—COMPARISON OF SOVIET PROPOSALS SEPT. 17, 1959, AND JUNE 2, 1960; AND WESTERN PROPOSAL, MAR. 15, 1960

SOVIET PROPOSAL, SEPT. 17, 1959	SOVIET PROPOSAL, JUNE 2, 1960	WESTERN PROPOSAL, MAR. 15, 1960
1st stage	*1st stage*	*1st stage*
Armed forces reduction: To reduce under appropriate controls the strength of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R., United States, and Communist China to the level of 1,700,000, and 650,000 each for United Kingdom and France; to reduce the forces of other states to appropriate levels.	Armed forces reduction: (Removed to 2d stage and only U.S.S.R. and United States specifically mentioned.)	Armed forces reduction: Initial force-level ceilings to be 2,500,000 for United States and U.S.S.R. and agreed appropriate force levels for certain other states. Collection of information on present force levels.
Armaments reduction: To reduce armaments to the extent that the remaining quantity would correspond to the determined level of armed forces.	Armaments reduction: Joint study to effect cessation of production of chemical and bacteriological weapons and on destruction of stockpiles of such types of weapons.	Armaments reduction: Each state shall store in its own territory under international supervision agreed types and quantities of conventional armaments specified in the agreement.
Missiles and other delivery systems: (No mention.)	Missiles and other delivery systems: All means of delivering nuclear weapons to be destroyed and their manufacture stopped including: strategic and tactical missiles; pilotless planes of all types; all military aircraft capable of delivering nuclear weapons; surface warships capable of being used to carry nuclear weapons; submarines of all classes and types; all artillery systems and other means of carrying nuclear weapons. The penetration of warships beyond the limits of territorial waters and the flights beyond limits of their national territory of military aircraft capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction shall be prohibited.	Missiles and other delivery systems: Joint study to assure compliance with an agreement on prior notification of missile launchings. Joint study of measures to give participating states greater protection against surprise attack including aerial inspection, ground observers, overlapping radar, notification of aircraft flights.
Nuclear weapons: (No mention.)	Nuclear weapons: Joint study to effect cessation of production of nuclear weapons and on destruction of stockpiles of such weapons. States having nuclear weapons shall not transfer them or information necessary for their manufacture to states which do not possess such weapons. Nonnuclear powers shall refrain from manufacturing nuclear weapons.	Nuclear weapons: Joint study to effect cessation of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes under proper controls. Study of ways to effect transfer of fissionable material from weapons stockpiles to peaceful purposes.
Withdrawal of foreign troops, dismantling of bases: (No mention.)	Withdrawal of foreign troops, dismantling of bases: All foreign troops shall be withdrawn. Foreign bases and depots shall be abolished.	Withdrawal of foreign troops, dismantling of bases: (No mention.)
Outer space: (No mention.)	Outer space: Space vehicles shall be launched only for peaceful purposes in accordance with agreement on inspection of launching sites. Launching into orbit or placing in outer space of special devices shall be prohibited until after final destruction of all means of delivering nuclear weapons.	Outer space: Prior notification to IDO (International Disarmament Organization) of proposed launchings of space vehicles and the establishment of cooperative arrangements for communicating to the IDO data obtained from available tracking facilities. Joint study of measures to assure compliance with agreement that no nation shall place into orbit or station in outer space weapons of mass destruction.

DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS—COMPARISON OF SOVIET PROPOSALS SEPT. 17, 1959, AND JUNE 2, 1960; AND WESTERN PROPOSAL, MAR. 15, 1960—Con.

SOVIET PROPOSAL, SEPT. 17, 1959—CON.	SOVIET PROPOSAL, JUNE 2, 1960—CON.	WESTERN PROPOSAL, MAR. 15, 1960—CON.
1st stage	*1st stage*	*1st stage*
Control measures: (No mention.)	Control measures: International on the spot control shall be established over the destruction of missiles, military aircraft, surface warships, submarines and other devices which could be used to carry atomic and hydrogen weapons. International inspection teams to be sent to military bases and troops on foreign territories to supervise elimination of these bases and withdrawal of troops to within national boundaries. Destruction of missile launching sites except for peaceful purposes. Control also established at airports and harbors. Right of inspection of all plants, factories, and shipyards involved in military production. By mutual agreement, permanent control groups may be set up at certain plants and installations. Right of inspection teams to examine rocket devices being launched for peaceful purposes and to be present at time of launching. Inspectors shall communicate with control council through existing channels of communication.	Control measures: Joint studies on all aspects of control. Establish International Disarmament Organization (IDO).
Keeping the peace: (No mention.)	Keeping the peace: (No mention.)	Keeping the peace: Joint study of means of preventing aggression and preserving world peace and security, as national armaments are reduced, by an international organization, to be an organ of, or linked to, the United Nations.
2d stage	*2d stage*	*2d stage*
Armed forces reduction: Completion of the liquidation of armed forces retained by the states.	Armed forces reduction: Reduction of the armed forces of all states to agreed levels, United States and U.S.S.R. reduced to not more than 1,700,000.	Armed forces reduction: Force level ceilings for all military significant states and appropriate inspection and verification measures to go into effect simultaneously with the establishment of force level ceilings of 2,100,000 for the United States and U.S.S.R. Conference with other states to include their acceptance of force level reductions, etc.
Armaments reduction: (No mention.)	Armaments reduction: Conventional weapons released by force reduction to be destroyed or used for peaceful purposes and destruction of all stockpiles. Prohibition of chemical and biological weapons production.	Armaments reduction: Participating states shall agree to place in storage depots agreed types and quantities of arms in agreed relation to force level ceilings.
Missiles and other delivery systems: (No mention.)	Missiles and other delivery systems: (No mention in 2d stage.)	Missiles and other delivery systems: Prior notification to IDO of proposed launchings of missiles and declarations of locations of launching sites and places of missile manufacture. Establishment of measures to protect against surprise attack.
Nuclear weapons: (No mention.)	Nuclear weapons: Complete prohibition, cessation of production, and destruction of existing stockpiles of all nuclear weapons.	Nuclear weapons: Cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes immediately after establishment of control system. Agreed quantities of fissionable material from past production to be transferred under international supervision and control to nonweapons purposes.
Withdrawal of foreign troops and dismantling of bases: Liquidation of all military bases on foreign territories. Troops and military personnel to be withdrawn from foreign territories to their own territories and are to be disbanded.	Withdrawal of foreign troops and dismantling of bases: (No mention in 2d stage.)	Withdrawal of foreign troops and dismantling of bases: (No mention.)
Outer space: (No mention.)	Outer space: (No mention in 2d stage.)	Outer space: The prohibition against placing into orbit or stationing in outer space vehicles capable of mass destruction to be effective immediately after the installation of agreed control system.
Control measures: (No mention.)	Control measures: Inspectors shall verify destruction of existing stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons. Rights to inspect all production of atomic materials or atomic energy. Inspection by military specialists of disbanding of troops. Control organization to have free access to all material on military budgets.	Control measures: Establishment of measures to verify budgetary information. Further progressive development of the IDO. Inspection and verification measures on force levels, nuclear weapons production and outer space launchings.
Keeping the peace: (No mention.)	Keeping the peace: Joint study on measures to insure compliance with the treaty on general and complete disarmament after all measures provided for in treaty have been completed. Joint study on measures to maintain peace and security in accordance with the U.N. Charter. Control organization to report on progress toward disarmament to U.N. Security Council and General Assembly.	Keeping the peace: Initial establishment of the international organization to preserve world peace.

DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS—COMPARISON OF SOVIET PROPOSALS SEPT. 17, 1959, AND JUNE 2, 1960; AND WESTERN PROPOSAL, MAR. 15, 1960—Con.

SOVIET PROPOSAL, SEPT. 17, 1959—con.	SOVIET PROPOSAL, JUNE 2, 1960—con.	WESTERN PROPOSAL, MAR. 15, 1960—con.
3d stage	*3d stage*	*3d stage*
Armed forces reduction: War ministries, general staffs, all military and paramilitary establishments and organizations shall be abolished. All military training terminated. Military education unlawful. All forms of military services abolished.	Armed forces reduction: completion of the disbandment of the armed forces of all states. States shall retain only agreed upon police (militias) with small arms for internal law and order.	Armed forces reduction: Reduction of national armed forces and armaments for progressive safeguarded steps to levels required for internal security for fulfillment of obligations under U.N. Charter to the end that no single nation or group of nations can effectively oppose enforcement of international law.
Armaments reduction: All stocks of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the possession of states shall be removed and destroyed under international control. Scientific research for war purposes and the development of weapons and war materials shall be prohibited.	Armaments reduction: All remaining conventional arms whether held by armed forces or in stockpiles shall be destroyed or used for peaceful purposes. Military production shall be wound up except for limited output of small arms to be retained by states after completion of program of general and complete disarmament.	Armaments reduction: Reduced to levels required by states for internal security and fulfillment of obligations of U.N. Charter. Prohibition of chemical and biological weapons production.
Missiles and other delivery systems: Liquidation of materiel of Air Force.	Missiles and other delivery systems: (No further mention.)	Missiles and other delivery systems: Control of the production of agreed categories of military missiles and existing national stocks and their final elimination.
Nuclear weapons: Destruction of all types of nuclear and rocket weapons.	Nuclear weapons: (No further mention.)	Nuclear weapons: Prohibition of production of nuclear weapons. Further reduction of existing stockpiles, further transfer for peaceful uses, further steps to achieve elimination of these weapons.
Withdrawal of foreign troops, dismantling of bases: (No mention.)	Withdrawal of foreign troops, dismantling of bases: (No further mention.)	Withdrawal of foreign troops, dismantling of bases: (No mention.)
Outer space: (No mention.)	Outer space: (No further mention.)	Outer space: Measures to insure the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only.
Control measures: To control the implementation of measures on general and complete disarmament, there shall be established an international control body. The scope of control and inspection shall correspond to the extent of the phased disarmament of states. Control organization may set up a system of aerial observation and aerial photography over territories of states. Upon the attainment of complete and general disarmament the international control body shall have full access to all objects under control.	Control measures: Control organization can send inspectors to verify abolition of military establishments. As necessary, institute a system of aerial observation and aerial photography over the territory of states. Shall have right to send mobile inspection teams to any point and to any facility in the territories of states.	Control measures: Control over production of all remaining types of armaments to insure production is limited to that required for internal policing and obligations under U.N. Charter. Control of missile production. Control over military budgets.
Keeping the peace: (No mention.)	Keeping the peace: Measures to maintain peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the U.N. shall be carried out. States shall undertake to place at the disposal of the Security Council, when necessary, formations from the contingents of police (militia) retained by them.	Keeping the peace: Completion of the establishment of international organizations and arrangements to preserve world peace.

THE PEOPLE'S STAKE IN CONSERVATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, America has had such an abundance of natural resources throughout our history that the possibility of exhausting these resources is really quite difficult for us to imagine. But water, energy, forests, and even the air we breathe can be either used up or polluted in such a brief time that our Nation could be one of the "have-not" nations within 50 years. This is the point of an excellent brief summary of our natural resources balance at the moment prepared by the Public Affairs Institute for its "Washington Window" column dated June 10, 1960.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "The People's Stake in Conservation," a survey of our present resources picture and recommendations for the future, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PEOPLE'S STAKE IN CONSERVATION

It's one thing to know that we are using up our natural resources so fast that in many ways we will be a "have-not" Nation within 50 years. It's another thing to do something about it.

Only as we put conservation to work in specific projects can we make the future look right for the next generation. For the big squeeze is on between the demands of our rapidly growing population and dwindling natural resources, and conservation holds the key to our future.

Here are some of the main problems, and what we can do about them:

1. Water: We are now using over two-thirds of our available fresh water for drinking and domestic uses, and to meet the demands of agriculture and industry. The experts tell us that within 20 years the East and Midwest will be using all available water, and be forced to reuse it, too. Unless we find ways to increase the supply and control the use of fresh water, many millions of people will be forced to use, and even to drink, purified sewage water.

Practically everything that can be done to change this situation is in the hands of government—local, State, regional, or national. Here they are:

Develop new supplies of fresh water and bring it to the places needing it. This means laws, engineering projects, finance running into billions, determination of best uses between industry and agriculture, river basin compacts because natural boundaries don't fit neatly into man-made county and State lines.

It means a program to desalt sea water to meet the needs of coastal cities, getting the costs down to where this is practical. It means, too, a rapidly expanding program of pollution control. Now the Federal Government puts up $1 for every $5 the cities invest in sewage treatment plants, but this doesn't even allow making any serious inroads on the immensity of the pollution problem, and contamination of our rivers and lakes is gaining ground.

With local tax sources overburdened, despite the President's veto of the antipollution budget, more Federal money is needed badly now. All these matters not only concern all citizens, but they can do something about them in an election year when candidates have to state their position on such issues.

2. Recreation has become a No. 1 conservation problem. It is a multimillion-dollar business, too, as people find their leisure time hanging heavy on their hands and the great outdoors beckons. Boating, fishing, hunting, hiking, camping, bird watching, golfing, picnicking, horseback riding—the whole range of healthful outdoor recreation is vitally important not only to us but to the next generation to follow. It has to be planned for now.

Already overcrowded facilities and natural recreational sites giving way to industry make costs mount while raising the issue of providing more space and perserving more natural beauty for the enjoyment of all the

people regardless of their ability to own them individually. But with another 100 million people joining us in the next 40 years, the demands on our public outdoor recreational facilities will be staggering.

What is needed right now is a well coordinated and properly financed program to acquire local, State and national parks, to establish and operate more public picnic and camping facilities, to create wilderness areas where nature can have its way. An inventory of the sand dunes, forests, lakes, sea and river shores has been made. If the public does not acquire them now, commercialization and speculation in such properties will drive the price up high. Even a slowly conservative, step-by-step effort to buy these natural recreation sites has met with the stubborn and successful resistence of a budget-minded President. The U.S. Park Service wanted $86 million in 1960 to begin the program, but the administration cut the figure to $16 million even before allowing the proposal to go to Congress. Here again the voters can have their say in the election year 1960.

3. Forests are at the crossroads where sawtimber is fast becoming scarcer and costlier as demand increases and we pay the price of the cut-and-get-out policies of the past. It is only a matter of a few years now before the cost of constructing tens of millions of new homes leaps skyward just because of scarce lumber.

Right now we need a national program of constructing access roads through forests to get out the mature and down timber, and to protect new and standing growth from fires and other hazards. We need to get started planting the 50 million acres of forest land now carrying too few or inferior trees.

A system of arranging long-term, low-interest-bearing loans to forest farmers which will be paid back out of the increased trees production requires Federal legislation. Most of our remaining forest reserves are on farm lands, presently little or poorly managed. We need to give these farmers both the technical and financial assistance that will produce sound conservation practices which will keep the country green and help us keep our living costs down.

4. The air now becomes a problem of major concern. Air pollution by factories, refineries, auto exhausts, trash burning, furnace smoke, is proving harmful to humans and animals, to plants and trees. Its control reaches beyond local communities, on even to the Federal Government level. New laws and new enforcement procedures are required.

5. Energy sources are poorly distributed and increasing in cost. There is still four-fifths of the hydroelectric power potential of our falling waters needing development. Yet no new starts have been undertaken by this administration during its almost 8 years in office. And the development of our energy resources has been held back a full generation. The failures of the Federal Power Commission to act in behalf of the consumers in regulating natural gas and electricity can cost the consumers millions of dollars. Already the mayors and Governors have protested to the Congress that the only consumer-minded member of the FPC was refused reappointment by the President.

Here are five big areas of conservation, all needing the attention of the voters in this election year. Here are concrete, practical proposals requiring your attention.

HEALTH FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has favorably reported House Joint Resolution 649, a modified version of Senate Joint Resolution 41, the health for peace bill, which this body approved in May 1959.

The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Health for Peace," published on June 7, 1960, the day the House committee was to consider the bill, strongly urged its approval not only because of the need for a broadened world program of health and medical research but also because the area of health cooperation is "one of the few remaining areas of United States and Soviet agreement"—a communications link which should be maintained.

However, the Times failed to give proper credit for initiation and development of the health for peace idea to our great colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Certainly more than any other person, LISTER HILL gave inspiration, purpose and finally a legislative framework to the idea of cooperative international research in health, medicine and rehabilitation. Admittedly, the administration has supported this idea, but the imagination and determination—the moving force—behind the plan were provided by our good and respected friend, LISTER HILL.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, a most outstanding leader in health research in our Nation, last week released a report pointing out that disease and disability take an annual toll of $35 billion which is 88 times the amount spent on medical research by the Federal Government. That means that we spend only pennies for prevention in contrast to the cost in dollars to American citizens who are ill and disabled.

Certainly, to achieve the great objectives of international cooperation and good will and the relief of human suffering, it is imperative that health for peace be made a national policy and program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of June 7, 1960, entitled "Health for Peace," be printed in the RECORD.

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

HEALTH FOR PEACE

Today the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is scheduled to vote on House Joint Resolution 649. This resolution would broaden U.S. support of international research in health, medicine, and rehabilitation. It is the House version of the Senate's health-for-peace bill, approved 63 to 17 in May 1959.

The bill's objections are to encourage and support research, the exchange of information on research, the training of research personnel, and the improvement of research facilities throughout the world. It has been enthusiastically endorsed by our Nation's top scientific leaders and by all voluntary health agencies. The Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House committee approved it unanimously.

The health-for-peace bill is a direct outgrowth of President Eisenhower's proposals in his 1958 state of the Union message. His proposal was welcomed by Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Since the disastrous and short-lived summit meeting in Paris, the health-for-peace program is one of the few remaining areas in which there is United States and Soviet agreement. It is imperative that the House of Representatives committee take affirmative action today on this legislation and so maintain this link of communication.

ARMY ANNOUNCEMENT IMPLEMENTING HUMANE SLAUGHTER ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last Friday on the floor of the Senate I called attention to an announcement by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency that it would require certification of compliance with the provisions of the Humane Slaughter Act only in contracts exceeding $2,500.

As the sponsor of this legislation, I was disturbed to learn that the Army was attempting to exempt certain suppliers from the strict provisions of the act. I pointed out to the Senate that the act most explicitly provides that there are to be no exceptions or exemptions. All suppliers of livestock products to Federal agencies are required to certify that they are in accord with the law—subject to criminal penalty for making a false statement.

This morning, I am pleased to report I received a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army—Logistics—Courtney Johnson, informing me that the Army intends to comply with the act, and that the "Notice to the Trades" as published by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency was being amended so as to remove the exemption for contracts under 2,500.

I commend Mr. Johnson for his prompt action in correcting this notice once it was called to his attention. I ask unanimous consent that the original "Notice to the Trades" as issued by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency on June 1, together with the letter I received today from Mr. Johnson, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, they were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

HEADQUARTERS,
MILITARY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLY AGENCY,
Chicago, Ill., June 1, 1960.

Headquarters Notice No. 20(60).
Subject: Humane methods of livestock slaughter.

NOTICE TO THE TRADE

GENTLEMEN:

1. All contracts after June 30, 1960, will be made under the provisions of the act entitled "Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter," title 7, United States Code, sections 1901–1906. Section 1903 of said act concerns itself with Government contracts and is as follows:

"SEC. 1903. The public policy declared in this chapter shall be taken into consideration by all agencies of the Federal Government in connection with all procurement and price-support programs and operations, and after June 30, 1960, no agency or instrumentality of the United States shall contract for or procure any livestock products produced or processed by any slaughterer or processor which in any of its plants or in any plants of any slaughterer or processor with which it is affiliated slaughters or handles in connection with slaughter livestock by any methods other than methods designated and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) pursuant to section 1904 of this title: *Provided*, That during the period of any national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, the limitations on procurement required by this section may be modified by the President to the extent determined by him to be necessary to meet essential procurement needs during such emergency. For the purposes of this section a slaughterer or processor shall be deemed

to be affiliated with another slaughterer or processor if it controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, such other slaughterer or processor. After June 30, 1960, each supplier from which any livestock products are procured by any agency of the Federal Government shall be required by such agency to make such statement of eligibility under this section to supply such livestock products as, if false, will subject the maker thereof to prosecution, section 287 of title 18."

2. In implementing the act, the Military Subsistence Supply Agency will include a new contract clause in all contracts for articles of food derived from livestock products. The clause is attached as exhibit 1. The clause will appear in all notices of intent to purchase scheduled for closing after June 30, 1960. Contractors are required to submit the signed statement, exhibit 2, to each regional headquarters with which it desires to contract, prior to June 30, 1960, in order to remain on the active mailing list of that headquarters as a source of supply. As contractors qualify by submitting a signed statement they will be placed on the mailing list.

The statements will be retained by each regional headquarters and it will be unnecessary to submit further statements for each contract. The contract clauses and the statement have been designed to make the statement applicable to each subsequent contract awarded and to claims presented thereunder. Invoices submitted are claims.

3. The act is broad in scope and many different situations may arise where interpretation is necessary. As a guide and until more authoritative interpretations are available the Military Subsistence Supply Agency intends to interpret the act as follows:

(a) The words "livestock products" are defined to mean any article of food, or any article intended for or capable of being used as food, for either humans or animals, which is derived or prepared in whole or in part, from any portion of any cattle, calf, swine, sheep, goat, horse, or mule. Supplies, the animal product portion of which is less than 5 percent by weight of the net unit weight, are not included in the above definition.

(b) The product delivered must under all conditions emanate from livestock which have been slaughtered by a complying slaughterer.

(c) A slaughterer complies only when it slaughters all species of livestock humanely in all of its plants and its affiliates do likewise.

(d) A multiplant slaughterer complies only if all of its plants slaughter all species humanely even though some of its plants are not under USDA jurisdiction or inspection, and are not concerned with production of the items to be delivered.

(e) A slaughterer-processor which slaughters in compliance with the act cannot deliver a product slaughtered by a slaughterer which does not comply.

(f) A slaughterer-processor which does not comply is not eligible even though it processes for delivery a product, the components of which were obtained from a complying slaughterer.

(g) A slaughterer-processor which slaughters all species humanely may process products from a nonhumane slaughterer, not an affiliate for non-Government business, and still comply, so long as these products are not furnished the Government.

(h) A nonslaughtering processor or other source of supply must deliver a product emanating from a complying slaughterer.

(i) A nonslaughtering processor may process products from a nonhumane slaughterer, not an affiliate, for non-Government business and still comply, so long as these products are not furnished the Government.

(j) The requirements of the act do not apply to livestock products emanating from livestock slaughtered outside the United States, its territories, possessions, and Puerto Rico.

(k) In determining whether a slaughterer complies with the act, only those slaughtering operations conducted by the slaughterer and its affiliates which take place within the United States, its territories, possessions, and Puerto Rico will be considered.

4. The Secretary of Agriculture has designated humane methods of slaughter. This designation is set out in part 180, title 9, Code of Federal Regulations. These regulations have been published in the Federal Register as follows: 24 F.R. 1549, March 3, 1959; 24 F.R. 4952, June 18, 1959; and 24 F.R. 6434, August 11, 1959.

5. Contractors are seriously warned to consider the full effect of signing the required statement. The act quoted above required that false statements be made subject to prosecution under section 287 of title 18, United States Code. The statement and contract clause have been prepared so as to provide for such prosecution. Section 287 of title 18 provides as follows:

"Whoever makes or presents to any person or officer in the civil, military, or naval service of the United States, or to any department or agency thereof, any claim upon or against the United States, or any department or agency thereof, knowing such claim to be false, fictitious, or fraudulent, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Statements should be signed by authorized persons only after careful consideration of the act and the particular circumstances of the signer's business.

6. Your cooperation is earnestly solicited so that there will be a minimum of interruption with this agency's supply mission. This agency will be pleased to answer any questions which you may have insofar as it is able. It must be recognized that in the absence of judicial interpretation there exists an area of uncertainty in interpretation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. DILLON,
Lieutenant Colonel, QMC,
Chief, Purchasing Division.

CONTRACT CLAUSE

Humane methods of livestock slaughter (applicable to contracts in excess of $2,500):

(a) In compliance with the act entitled "Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter," title 7, United States Code, section 1901–1906, no livestock products delivered in performance of this contract shall have been produced or processed by any slaughterer or processor which in any of its plants or in any plants or any slaughterer or processor with which it is affiliated, slaughters, or handles in connection with slaughter, livestock by any methods other than methods designated and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to section 1904 of the said act.

(b) The contractor shall have furnished the Military Subsistence Supply Agency a statement of eligibility before award of this contract and such statement is hereby incorporated by reference. Such statement shall be considered in connection with, and as a part of, any and all claims by the contractor, under this contract, upon or against the United States or any department or agency thereof as required by section 1903 of said act.

(c) The words "livestock products" are defined to mean any article of food, or any article intended for or capable of being used as food, for either humans or animals, which is derived or prepared in whole or in part, from any portion of any cattle, calf, swine, sheep, goat, horse, or mule. Supplies, the animal product portion of which is less than 5 percent by weight of the net unit weight, are not included in the above definition.

(d) A slaughterer or processor shall be deemed to be affiliated with another slaughterer or processor if it controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such other slaughterer or processor.

STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY

In accordance with the provision of the act entitled "Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter," title 7 United States Code, section 1901–1906, and in particular with section 1903 thereof:

(Name of contractor)
of ---
(Address of contractor)

states that any livestock products delivered under contracts entered into after June 30, 1960, with the Military Subsistence Supply Agency, except contracts not in excess of $2,500, will not have been produced or processed by any slaughterer or processor, which in any of its plants, or in any plants of any slaughterer or processor with which it is affiliated, slaughters, or handles in connection with slaughter, livestock by any methods or other than methods designated and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to section 1904 of said act.

--- hereby
(Name of contractor)

agrees that this statement is to be incorporated by reference in each of such contracts and agrees further that it is to be considered a part of each and every claim by ---
(Name of contractor)

upon or against the United States or any department or agency thereof arising under these contracts.

This statement is made with full knowledge that it will be relied upon by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency in entering into contracts for livestock products and in payment of claims thereunder.

(Name of contractor)
By ---

Title

Address
Witness: ---

(NOTE.—In case of corporation, witnesses not required but certificate below must be completed. Type or print names under all signatures.)

Warning: Section 1903, title 7, United States Code, expressly provides that statements of eligibility will be such that, if false, the maker will be subject to prosecution under section 287 of title 18, United States Code which provides as a penalty for false, fictitious, or fraudulent claims a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CERTIFICATE

I, ---, certify that I am the --- of the corporation named as contractor herein; that --- who signed this statement on behalf of the contractor was then --- of said corporation; that said statement was duly signed for and in behalf of said corporation by authority of its governing body, and is within the scope of its corporate powers.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have noted your comments regarding the Army implementation of the Humane Slaughter Act in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 10, 1960.

I assure you of our full cooperation in the implementation of this law. Consequently the Department of the Army circular which is being published implementing the law makes no provision for any exemption of purchases of livestock products under $2,500. Purchases of all dollar amounts, which are made in the United States and its possessions, are subject to this law insofar as the Department of the Army is concerned.

I have taken the necessary action to have the notice to the trade which was published by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency amended to comply with the policy I have stated above.

Sincerely yours,

COURTNEY JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics).

AWARD OF SCHOLARSHIP TO SHARON PAULSEN, HOOD RIVER, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article published in the Oregon Legionnaire of June 1960, announcing the award of a scholarship to Miss Sharon Paulsen of Hood River, Oreg.

Miss Paulsen has received a $1,000 scholarship from the National American Legion Auxiliary and is the recipient of one of 10 such awards throughout the Nation. Miss Paulsen plans to attend Willamette University in Salem, and I am delighted to know that she hopes to becomes a schoolteacher.

As this story indicates, these scholarships are available only to daughters of deceased veterans.

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

HOOD RIVER STUDENT WINS AUX NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP

Sharon Paulsen of Hood River is the State winner of the National President's scholarship of $1,000 given by the National American Legion Auxiliary, Dorothy Oswald, education and scholarship chairman announced.

Miss Paulsen has been a top scholastic student in her 4 years at Wy'east High School in Hood River. She was chosen valedictorian of her class and has been in several activities in her school including vice president of the Honor Society, Latin Club, Girls League, president of the Future Teachers of America, German Club, and Student Council. She attends the Odell Methodist Church where she teaches Sunday school.

Miss Paulsen plans to go to Willamette University in Salem. She will major in English or history. Her desire is to become a schoolteacher.

Her application was submitted by the Department of Oregon of the Auxiliary to the Western vice president for judging. There are two $1,000 awards given to each of the five divisions in the Nation. This scholarship is open only to daughters of deceased veterans.

Virginia Whiting of Oregon City placed first in the Oregon contest and will receive $300. Second place winner is Miss Rosemary Suckow of Grant High School, Portland, and will receive $150.

Judges for the scholarship were five faculty members from Willamette University, with Mrs. Robert Ewalt, chairman. Character, Americanism, leadership, scholarship, and basis of need were the qualifications for the selection.

PURCHASE OF FURNITURE BY STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make some response to my very lovable friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who on yesterday took umbrage and said some things about the Secretary of Commerce.

One point the Senator from Wisconsin made yesterday was that the Secretary of Commerce is one of seven members of the so-called Foreign Service Buildings Commission, which was established by act of Congress in 1926. However, the important thing he did not say—and I feel certain he did not know it—is that the Commission has not actually met in the last 10 years. So, notwithstanding the membership of the Secretary of Commerce on the Commission, it could have no effect if the Commission never met.

I point out also that the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman and ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs are members of the Commission.

Then I point out that by the President's Reorganization Plan No. II, effective July 1, 1939, all the functions of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission were transferred to the State Department, except advisory functions. But since the Commission has not met in 10 years, obviously it could have no influence; it could have no effect. That is the first item which deserves emphasis.

The second item in the statement made by my esteemed friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, is that the furniture for the American Embassy at Caracas was purchased without proper legal authorization. The Department of State possesses this authority, because in Public Law 547, 79th Congress, approved July 25, 1946, the pertinent language reads:

> Sums appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations of the above acts, except that there shall be no limitation on the amount to be appropriated in any one year and that expenditures for furnishings shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

That is the provision which calls for competitive bidding. But the Comptroller General evidently had reference to the 1926 act, not to the 1946 act.

As to the third item which was emphasized—namely, that competitive bids were not solicited in connection with the procurement of furniture for the Embassy, in violation of established practice and the law—the State Department points out that it first checked with four additional American firms, for prices on comparable items of basic office furniture, to establish that the prices quoted by the Mueller Metals Corp. were competitive. The Department of State says, further, that its records in this transaction indicate that this check was made during July 1959.

The fourth item which the distinguished Senator pointed out was that the Foreign Service Buildings Commission granted nine contracts to the Mueller Metals Corp. for furniture. The fact is that the Commission did not grant any contracts. The contracts were granted by the State Department; and it does confirm that nine such contracts were made, totaling $89,400, of which $60,000 was for the Embassy at Caracas.

The fifth item is that the operator of the company, Mr. Frederick Mueller, was flown to Caracas at Government expense. In part, that is true, in the sense that he flew the furniture on Flying Tigers Airline from Grand Rapids to Caracas, to assemble and to install the furniture. The Department of State did pay for the return trip by a commercial airline.

The sixth item is that the Department incurred excessive transportation costs on the furniture shipment to Caracas. The basic fact is that the new Embassy building was ready for occupancy on November 1, 1959. The Department was committed to pay $11,000 a month rental on the building, through the lease-option to purchase. Having concluded with the private owner the contract under which the building was constructed, and when faced with the necessity to transport, assemble, and install 35 tons of office furniture in Caracas, and with a longshoreman's strike in progress, these alternatives were presented to the State Department: First, wait out the strike, and run the risk of having a brand new building stand idle, at a cost of $11,000 a month, and continue to pay rent on the old properties at $3,796 a month; or, second, incur extra costs of shipment by air, in the amount of $7,785, and obtain full benefit of the new building at the earliest possible date.

The seventh item was that the furniture should have been acquired from Venezuelan firms. The fact of the matter is that we have no Venezuelan currency and no credits. Venezuelan money is hard money; as a matter of fact, it is at a premium, so far as I know, insofar as the American dollar is concerned. When the State Department is confronted with a situation of that sort, it likes to acquire furniture and furnishings from American firms, when prices and delivery schedules and other considerations are reasonable.

It is recognized that costs in Venezuela are among the highest in the world. And if the furniture had been bought there, its cost would have exceeded the $2.45 per square foot which my distinguished friend from Wisconsin mentioned with respect to furniture from Denmark and Sweden.

So, Mr. President, it is apparent that the junior Senator from Wisconsin was mistaken in his facts with regard to the transaction.

I think it behooves each Member of Congress to be meticulously careful in ascertaining all the facts, before making serious charges involving a member of the President's Cabinet, although I must say for the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that he did say the Secretary of Commerce had no fiscal or other iden-

tity with the Mueller Metals Co. But I think a careful scrutiny of all the facts involved shows that the State Department did exercise good judgment in the matter, and that there is no apology to be made.

I emphasize this one very essential fact: The Secretary of Commerce has only nominal identity with the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, which has not met in 10 years; and I do not know why it exists, except in an advisory capacity. So obviously, there could be no connection between the Secretary of Commerce and the State Department's procurement of this furniture for the new Embassy in Caracas.

So that is the rest of the story, and I think it puts the matter in far better light.

I will not say that my friend is not meticulous, because he had his statement delivered to my office at exactly 11:51 a.m., yesterday; and I know that whoever brought it there asked that my office sign for it and indicate exactly the hour and minute when it was delivered; and that was 9 minutes before the session on yesterday convened. I do not quarrel about that; the Senator was under no obligation to send me the statement.

I have only one interest in the matter, and that is that the whole story be told.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has disputed me on seven specific points. I think I can show my statement yesterday was correct on every single one of them.

The first point was in regard to the membership of the Secretary of Commerce on the Foreign Service Buildings Commission. What I was insisting on—and I did so consistently—was that he was a member of the Commission, which still has the legal responsibility under the law for furnishing embassies. That has never been changed. It is true that the Commission has not met for a long time. But the point is that the Secretary of Commerce has been the number 1 hatchet man of the administration in attacking waste and spendthrifts. He has the responsibility and the authority by law to act in this particular field. I pointed out that when the State Department purchased furniture from his son's company and flew it to Venezuela, for $30,000—the furniture itself was worth $70,000—the Secretary of Commerce, who has been so much interested in economy, had an opportunity to show his interest in economy, and to show it responsibly, because he has this legal power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point is that the Commission has no power; it can act only in an advisory capacity. And it has not met for 10 years. So what can the Senator make out of all that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I make out of it the fact that the Commission can meet and can exercise its functions. And certainly Mr. Mueller as a member of the Commission, and as Secretary of Commerce can protest and I am sure correct this extravagance so close to home, his home.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Commission has no power.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the Commission can use the authority it has by law.

The next point of the minority leader was that my charge that competitive bids were not solicited in the procurement of the furniture for the Embassy at Caracas, was wrong; that the State Department was not in violation of established practice and the law, that the Comptroller General had overlooked the 1946 law passed by the 79th Congress, and had reference to the 1926 law.

The fact is that the Comptroller General in his letter to me specifically cited the law of 1946, when he wrote to me as follows:

> 5. The Department cites Public Law 547, 79th Congress, which amended the Foreign Service Buildings Act of May 7, 1926, as the authority of the Secretary of State to deviate from established rules of competitive bidding. As we stated in our letter of May 6, 1960, we find nothing in this act or in the pertinent appropriation act which would authorize the Department to negotiate contracts for the purchase of furniture; and we are not aware of any reason for the deviation by the Department in this case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Comptroller General should adjust his bifocals, because the language I read a moment ago, from the appropriation bill, is as clear as crystal that there is an exception to the basic statute 3709.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure there may be an exception.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the point of the Comptroller General—and it is a completely valid point—is that in this particular case that exception apparently did not apply; in this particular case there is no reason why the State Department should not have sought competitive bids. There are many hundreds of manufacturers of steel furniture in the United States, and there may be some in Venezuela; but no attempt was made to find whether they could supply this furniture to the Embassy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Department checked with them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The State Department and the Comptroller General tell me they did not check, and that there was no effort to check with firms in Venezuela.

The Senator knows that four additional United States firms were checked.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. For I put that information into the RECORD.

The very interesting point is that they checked only on five or six items; and on most of them, the Mueller Co. was high, not low.

In connection with the State Department's selection of the four firms, the Department was able to find that on only two items the Mueller firm was low. It seems to me it is a very weak argument, on that basis, to say that competitive bids in this case were not necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask my friend—and this question tends to put him on the spot a little—when we have no Venezuelan credits——

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the fact is that we do have Venezuelan credits. I have just checked with the State Department, and, as of May 31, 1960, they had $138,000 of Venezuelan bolivars under Public Law 480.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But are they not limited?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This was a transaction with Mexico.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I give the Senator their language:

> No Venezuelan currency or credits were available to the Department of State in Venezuela for the purchase of office furniture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. According to the Comptroller General, no attempt was made by the State Department even to determine whether they could purchase it there.

The fourth point made by the Senator from Illinois is that the Foreign Service Buildings Commission granted nine contracts. The fact is that the State Department granted them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, it did.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The State Department granted nine contracts to Mueller Metals Corp.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Foreign Service Buildings Commission has no jurisdiction or authority to grant contracts at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The State Department granted those contracts since Mr. Mueller came into the Government as a top official.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the rationalization for the payment of $30,000 in air freight on $70,000 worth of furniture? I read in the press the Senator's remarks relating to this interesting instance of extravagance. I was visiting with a group of businessmen in my city of Minneapolis. When they learned that $30,000 was paid for air freight they were a little surprised. They wondered what was the rush for furniture to the point of shipping it by air freight, when there seem to be good ocean connections. There are many ships traveling from the United States to Venezuela. Will the Senator take time again to tell us a little about that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Department says the situation was that it had to get the furniture to Caracas as of November 1, because there was the threat of a longshoremen's strike. It said, because of that threat there might be some danger the furniture could not be transported there by ship. The fact is that the longshoremen's strike ended by October 9. The furniture did not have to be down there on November 1. It did not have to be down there until November 30. The fact is that the Department had a contract to continue to occupy

the old building until November. It did not have to be vacated until November 30. There was not a penny of saving by getting the furniture down there at the end of October. It could have gone down there by the end of November, there was no saving to the Federal Government not a nickel in getting the furniture down to Venezuela quickly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know how long it takes to transport furniture by ocean freight from a port in the United States to Caracas?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It takes a matter of days, not a matter of months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Could it be done in 2 weeks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator mean furniture can be gotten from Grand Rapids to Caracas in 2 weeks?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was a matter of getting it there in 7 weeks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. More likely, it might have taken 2 months, but the State Department emphasizes the fact that the building was ready for occupancy on the first of November. There was a longshoremen's strike. To be sure, it was settled. But the Department could not wait until the last minute in order to make provision for the furniture. In the meantime, there was an empty building on which we were paying $11,000 a month, and $3,700 a month on the old building. Those were the alternatives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Here are the facts. On October 9 the longshoremen's strike ended. The first batch of furniture was not put on the plane and flown to Caracas until October 15, and the second until October 22. What is the matter with the State Department on October 9 when the strike is over cancelling the air flight and sending by boat?

Mr. DIRKSEN. How could the Department tell when the strike was going to end?

Mr. PROXMIRE. After October 9 it had ample time in which to cancel the order. It is very easy. That happens all the time in business. Any business concern would make the saving. It is the efficient and obvious way to handle it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was the monthly charge on the old building?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Three thousand seven hundred dollars.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And on the new building?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Eleven thousand dollars a month.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So even if the Government had paid the rent for a month and left the furniture there, the rent would be less than the cost of the shipment of the furniture by air freight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Several alternatives faced the Department. The question was what to do in order to get the quickest possible occupancy of the Embassy building with the longshoremen's strike in process at the time these arrangements were being made. It could not tell when the strike was going to end, but there was a building it could not occupy. It added up all of the considerations in terms of dollars and cents, convenience, and everything else, and said, "This is the proper thing to do."

Mr. PROXMIRE. There was not one single penny saved by flying the furniture down to Caracas. The fact is that the Department had to occupy the old building until the end of November. It was just as easy to occupy the old building until the furniture could come down by ship. Instead of that, the Department chose to fly the furniture down. It had ample time, after October 9, to cancel the flight by plane. It did not choose to do that. It incurred the additional cost of flying the furniture down.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, I talked with the public buildings official in the State Department and had him come to see me. He is a very reliable and honest sort of person. I think, faced with those alternatives, a perfectly proper judgment was made in the circumstances. So that is the whole story.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has said that the son of the Secretary of Commerce was flown to Caracas, at Government expense. He went there to install the furniture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, he was flown there with the furniture. I flew with furniture once in Asia. I will never do it again as long as I live.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The final two points made by the Senator from Illinois, thanks to the Senator from Minnesota, have now been cleared up. The assertion was made that some $11,000 was saved by flying the furniture to Caracas. I should like to point out that not a penny was saved by flying the furniture there. The rent still had to be paid on the two buildings during all this time. The fact is that it was an excessive cost.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think yesterday the Senator from Wisconsin did pretty well with an extremely weak case.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I know of no man in the country who can do more with no case at all than can the distinguished minority leader. Anyone who could be minority leader of the Republican Party for the past 2 years, in view of the record of this administration, and do the magnificent job the Senator from Illinois has done deserves the profound thanks of the country, as well as of the Republican Party; it is an amazing performance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's case might have been more appealing yesterday, but when one takes the case he has made today and contrasts it with the evidence put forth by the Senator from Illinois as submitted by the State Department, the case of the Senator from Wisconsin looks like the Rock of Gibraltar—solid. It is like Prudential itself.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, as we conclude the discussion, let me point out there was no attempt to secure competitive bids; and, in the judgment of the Comptroller General, that is at variance with the law. This viewpoint may be disputed, but the fact is there were no competitive bids.

Second, the furniture was flown to Caracas unnecessarily and at highly excessive cost. As compared to the cost of similar furniture in similar Embassies, the cost of the furniture was much higher.

Third, the president of the furniture company which sold the furniture to the Government without competitive bidding is the son of a very high, very influential official of the Government, a powerful critic of Democratic waste.

THE U-2 INCIDENT AND SUMMIT FAILURE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, over the past few weeks, there have been several references in the RECORD relative to the reaction of my constituents to the U-2 incident and the summit failure. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, my latest newsletter, which deals with this subject.

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

NEWSLETTER FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, JUNE 8, 1960

What consideration should a Senator give to letters which he reecives from constituents?

It has been my policy always to read them thoughtfully, whether or not they expressed points of view different than my own, whether or not they were critical of me in whatever degree, and whether or not the writers expressed themselves in ways pleasing to me.

This will continue to be my policy because I have found it to be a useful one. It has been useful for at least the following reasons:

1. Such letters have drawn my attention to points of view which might otherwise have escaped my attention.

2. They have shaped or influenced my judgment on pending legislation.

3. They have indicated the extent and depth of concern felt by Maine citizens on given public questions.

4. They have injected a healthy sense of humility in this Senator's views of his own actions and judgments.

I continually learn valuable lessons from these letters. An experience of the past 2 weeks is a case in point.

Following the failure of the summit meeting in Paris, the initial letters I received from Maine constituents were unanimously and rather harshly critical of the President's handling of our affairs before and after the U-2 incident.

I considered them carefully and, on what appeared to be an appropriate occasion, shared some of them with my colleagues in the Senate in order to indicate the depth of the concern felt by at least some of my constituents.

Subsequently I received other letters, at least equally harsh in their criticism of me for giving such attention to the first group, and quite vehement in their defense of the President.

Neither group of writers was large, and one or two in each group wrote with moderation; but the remainder in each group wrote in what could hardly be described as the language of restraint. Nevertheless, I felt that the writers, in both groups, were entitled to use language which, in their judgment, would adequately convey their feelings, even though I might prefer a more moderate approach.

Apparently they are not always inclined to be as tolerant of each other; and it is

not safe for a Senator to let one group know what the other group is saying to him.

Constituents ought to know and appreciate the fact that, however strongly they may hold a point of view on an issue, there are probably other constituents who are equally vehement on the other side of the issue, and that a Senator feels dutybound to listen to both.

Moreover, if a constituent writes to his or her Senator, I assume the intent is to influence, not only that Senator, but, through him, other Senators. More than once I have conveyed the views of constituents to other Senators, to Senate committees, and to executive agencies, at times at the explicit request of the constituent, and at other times because I felt the constituent made his own case best in his own words.

Returning, for a moment, to the U-2 incident, let me state my own views, lest they be confused with those of my correspondents.

First, some general comments:

1. Espionage, or intelligence, activities are a fact of modern national life which we have no choice but to accept. Maximum precautions in the interests of national security and survival require it. It is the grossest kind of cynicism for the Russians to pretend otherwise.

2. With respect to use of the "spy plane" as an instrument of such activities, the value of intelligence obtained by such means must be weighed against the risk that such a plane, appearing as an unidentified "blip" on a Soviet radar screen, might trigger Russian missiles and the start of that nuclear war which nobody can win. How would we want our continental defenses to react under similar circumstances? Have we, or the Russians, had an effective means of determining whether such an unidentified plane or planes are armed with nuclear weapons about to be fired in anger?

It should be noted that Malinovsky, Soviet Defense Minister, recently announced that he has ordered immediate rocket strikes at the takeoff base of any such spy plane. Fortunately, this policy does not appear to have been in effect over the past 4 years.

And, of course, the President has now ordered a discontinuance of such flights.

3. It is reasonable to conclude that the Russians were happy to have the U-2 incident as an excuse for wrecking the summit conference. It is not as easy to judge whether they would have found one as satisfactory as a coverup of Soviet intransigence if this incident had not occurred.

4. Khrushchev in Paris was crude, brutal, arrogant, and completely cynical because he thought the weight of world opinion would hold that he was justified in the light of the U-2 incident. Fortunately, from our point of view, he overplayed his hand and the effect was to solidify the Western Allies.

5. We should leave no doubt in the Soviet mind that Americans are united in the face of the Soviet threat, whatever form it may take.

6. The President is quite right in saying that, notwithstanding the recent setbacks, we must continue to seek ways to eliminate points of friction and to reduce tensions. Negotiations through traditional diplomatic channels are likely to be the principal instrument for this purpose through the foreseeable future. I sense that most Americans, including official Washington, share serious doubts that a trip to the summit should again be undertaken.

7. A rather grim sort of satisfaction to be drawn from the current state of affairs is that we need no longer debate whether Soviet smiles are sincere or not. There are no smiles. This is a harsh world, and perhaps a more realistic one than the one we knew during the "spirit of Camp David" period.

If the foregoing comments are valid, what remaining questions are there to be asked and answered? In order to maintain the national unity to which I have referred, we should ask and seek answers only to those questions which meet one of the following tests:

1. Does it touch upon a national policy which ought to be reviewed in the interests of national security?

2. Does it touch upon an organizational relationship which might need correction, possibly of a legislative nature, in the interests of national security?

3. Could the answer, without breaching the safeguards of classified information, contribute to increased public confidence in the management of our affairs?

The objectives suggested by these three questions are, in my judgment, highly appropriate and much to be desired. The following are illustrative of the questions which have been raised by people interested in these objectives:

1. At what level of Government was this specific U-2 flight authorized?

2. What was the nature of the intelligence (and this should be disclosed only with strict security precautions) which, on balance, justified this specific flight at such a sensitive time?

3. Was there any advance thinking or planning as to what our reaction should be in the event the plane should be brought down in the Soviet Union; if so, were such plans followed?

4. Why did we change our story? It does not seem reasonable to suppose that we planned in advance, under any circumstances, to publicly confess that we were spying. Were we, then, caught in a situation which we had not anticipated and, if so, were there no reasonable alternatives to the public confession?

5. Secretary Herter did not say the flights would continue but that implication was drawn from his statement. Did he intend that the implication should be drawn? If so, why? If not, why did he not correct it?

These and other questions can be asked in an objective and constructive way. They should be asked in no other way.

I know this to be the attitude of Senate committees now making inquiries, with the approval of the President and congressional committees on both sides of the political aisle, and including the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I am a member. The initial, heated flurry of partisan controversy on both sides has subsided; and we can seek to benefit from a very difficult national experience in an atmosphere of relative restraint.

The days and weeks are slipping by rapidly here in Washington. It has been the hope of everyone concerned that we might clean up our work and adjourn the session by July 2. That is a little more than 4 weeks away; and I am afraid that there is a great deal of unfinished work yet to be completed.

My mail indicates the greatest concern with the following: (1) Medical care for the aged; (2) Federal aid for public schools; (3) amendments to the minimum wage law; and, (4) the mutual security program.

I will say further that my mail is basically favorable to action in each of these fields, although there are strong voices in opposition.

In addition, there are several major appropriations bills, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill, the Housing bill and many others of varying importance yet to be considered. The Rivers and Harbors bill, incidentally, will include ten projects of importance to various Maine coastal communities.

If we do adjourn as planned, I expect to attend the Democratic National Convention on July 11 and then return to Maine the latter part of July for the rest of the summer. You cannot imagine how I look forward to the possibility of spending several weeks on China Lake, drinking deep of an incomparable Maine summer. You may recall that I missed it almost completely last year inasmuch as we did not adjourn until mid-September.

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to keep things from becoming too political, after having discussed the matter with the distinguished minority leader and with interested Members on this side of the aisle, I offer for consideration a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, June 15, 1960, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) 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, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

JUNE 14, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement is agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I query the acting majority leader as to whether he has asked for an order to convene the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ADDRESS BY THE SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for being so gracious. I apologize to the Senator for invoking such a long and spirited colloquy on his time.

Mr. President, I listened, insofar as I could, with as much attention as possible, due to some interruptions, to the address by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I thought the Senator displayed a little bad timing and a little bad judgment, because it sounded something like an attack on the President while the President is away from the country, particularly so when he is moving into a rather explosive area.

I thought the judgment was a little questionable also in heaping rather unkind terms on an absent President when he is abroad in behalf of his country.

I think at some subsequent time I shall certainly desire to address myself with some vigor and some care to the whole speech, for, as I envision it, I thought it was all-world inclusive and world embracing, and I could not see that a single thing was omitted from the speech.

I leave it at that point, Mr. President.

THE DOLLY MADISON MIRROR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHURCH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Having heard the debate about furniture purchased for use in Venezuela, it occurs to me it might be appropriate to make available for the RECORD part of the history of the Vice President's office in the U.S. Capitol Building, one paragraph of which reads as follows:

> Dolly Madison mirror: Over the clock in the Vice President's Office is a small gold mirror which is known as the Dolly Madison mirror. As the story goes, Mrs. Madison, the wife of President James Madison, was visiting in Paris while her husband was there on official business. She bought the mirror at a store for $50 in American money. When she arrived back at the port of New York there was a $30 customs fee due on the mirror, and Mrs. Madison, not thinking, charged it to the official account, and the Government paid the fee. At that time, the White House expenses and salaries were paid through the Senate Disbursing Office, and the Senate, through its audit committee, checked the expenses that the President and Mrs. Madison had incurred on their trip and came across the item of the mirror. There was no authorization by the Senate or the committee for such an expenditure, and an investigation was started as to whether or not Mrs. Madison had done anything wrong. This investigation cost $2,800 and was finally canceled.

That was an expenditure of $2,800 for an investigation of a $50 mirror. I hope that the matter of furniture under consideration will not result in a cost of investigation to exceed by that ratio the amount of money involved in the cost of the furniture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. $2,800 to investigate a $50 mirror?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That seems a little like the resolution we approved today, authorizing $35,000 to investigate the dogs which nobody knows exist, so far as political television and radio are concerned. It all becomes a little "doggie," even as it did in other days.

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) 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.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, now that the Senate has entered into a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate upon the pending measure, such agreement to take effect at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, and inasmuch as I have been asked by the Committee on Foreign Relations to present this matter to the Senate, I think it might be useful for a statement to be made at this time in support of Senate Joint Resolution 170, which will be in the RECORD for the Members of the Senate to peruse tomorrow.

Mr. President, the only hopeful aspect of the recent summit conference in Paris was the impressive display of unity among the Western nations emerging from it. It was a forceful reminder that mutual loyalty is one of our most precious diplomatic assets. But steadiness in a moment of crisis should only emphasize our need for more consistent, continuing cooperation among the free nations of the West.

When the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia awakened the West to the danger of Soviet military aggression in Europe, we joined with the threatened nations to form the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO stopped the Soviets in Europe because it confronted them with a solid front of determined nations, united in a common defense.

Eleven years have passed since the birth of NATO. The nature of the Communist threat, and of the problems which beset the Atlantic nations, has changed drastically. No longer is direct military aggression the overriding danger. Changes in Russian strategy, the requirements of closer association, and the rise of the underdeveloped countries have had an impact on all NATO nations.

These developments cry out for closer cooperation in broader fields of policy. In hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, witness after witness testified to this problem. General William H. Draper, Chairman of the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program, testified:

> As a former U.S. permanent representative to the North Atlantic Council, I can testify from personal knowledge both as to the seriousness of the problems within the Atlantic Community and as to the overwhelming need for greater unity: Military, political, economic, scientific, and cultural.

Even in the military realm, which is the heart of NATO, there is need for greater coordination. But these steps cannot be taken within the present structure of NATO, for they involve going behind the defense line to the sources of the military power.

Responsible authorities in many countries have long been aware of these deficiencies. In fact, the likelihood of such developments was anticipated in the North Atlantic Treaty, which directs that further arrangements for cooperation among its members should be considered in the future. Efforts have been made to achieve greater unity of purpose, but they have had very little success.

Senate Joint Resolution 170 is a suggested solution to this situation. It represents an idea which is relatively new in international affairs, but which has been extremely successful on domestic matters in the United States and in other Western nations. When we want an independent survey of a national problem, we appoint a commission of leading citizens to study that problem and recommend solutions to the proper governmental authorities. The two Hoover Commissions are the most notable American uses of this technique; in Canada and England royal commissions have long had a similar function.

Senate Joint Resolution 170 would create a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, consisting of not more than 20 private citizens. This Commission would invite the legislatures of other NATO countries to appoint their own corresponding delegations to a convention to recommend ways of achieving greater political and economic cooperation among these nations. It is expected that the convention would not include more than 100 persons in all, and that it would meet for as long or as often as necessary.

The American Commission would take the lead in arranging for the convention as well as participating in it. It would be composed of eminent private citizens, appointed jointly by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House after consultation with the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees. The resolution specifically states that the Commission is not in any way to speak for, or represent, the U.S. Government. Its members would serve without compensation. It would be authorized to employ a staff of not more than 10 members. The Commission would cease to exist on January 31, 1962. It is not intended that its life will be extended.

The resolution authorizes $300,000 to be appropriated to the Department of State for the expenses of the Commission. No more than $100,000 of this may be used as the Commission's share of any international conference. Members of the Commission will be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. Funds will be paid only on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Commission, subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the obligation and expenditure of public funds. The staff will be employed on a temporary basis, and will not be paid at rates greater than the maximum authorized for employees of congressional committees. The Commission will make semiannual reports to Congress accounting for all expenditures.

This proposal was first introduced as a Senate resolution more than a year ago. It has been entirely rewritten by the Foreign Relations Committee which produced the resolution before the Senate this afternoon. It has received strong support from numerous experts in foreign affairs as well as from authoritative gatherings concerned with strengthening the NATO alliance. It was approved unanimously by two NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences. Last year the Atlantic Congress, a meeting of 650 leading citizens from NATO countries, recommended unanimously that the convention proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 170 be held as soon as possible. The State Department is in favor of this resolution, and has testified that it would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas that might emerge from the proposed convention.

Two years ago, the Foreign Relations Committee reported unanimously a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that at the appropriate time such a citizens' conference should be held. I submit, Mr. President, that there is no more appropriate time than the present. The failure of the summit conference has made a stronger NATO more urgently necessary than ever. The values and interests which the Western nations share give us an opportunity to make the alliance more powerful by making the most efficient use of our resources, and agreeing on joint action to meet the various aspects of Communist penetration.

Mr. President, we have today an opportunity to plant a seed which may grow into great, constructive measures for the strengthening of the free world. To the best of my knowledge no one has denied the need for strengthening NATO. Instead, objections to Senate Joint Resolution 170 have dealt with the suitability of this method of dealing with the problem. I would like to discuss the more important objections which have been raised in committee hearings and elsewhere. Foremost among these is the fear that members of the Commission will in effect be conducting foreign policy in competition with the Government. The delegates to the convention would not represent the Government; they would be exchanging ideas with other delegates. They would have no power to commit this Government. The resolution specifically states that—

> The U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO is not in any way to speak for, or to represent, the U.S. Government.

To make sure that this is understood, we have limited membership on the Commission to private citizens. If there were the slightest danger that this Commission would be taken as an official voice of American foreign policy, the State Department would certainly object to its formation. The State Department has no such fears, however. Indeed, it supports this resolution and, as I have said, has testified that it would welcome any useful suggestions which might result from it.

Some critics of this resolution, while acknowledging the need for action in this field, complain that there is already a multiplicity of organizations which should be able to deal with this problem. This argument can best be discussed by examining the principal groups which might attempt such a task. The most obvious is the NATO Council. But the Council is conceived primarily as the governing arm of NATO, and as such is preoccupied with dealing with a narrowly circumscribed set of problems—which are largely military—in the light of existing policy. Each country's representative on the Council reflects his government's official position, and cannot deviate from it. Moreover, decisions of the Council must be unanimous; questions on which there is serious disagreement are left undecided and often are not even discussed. Many of these factors are matters of necessity for a body which essentially is the board of directors of a military alliance, but they do not encourage the imaginative searching which is required to find new solutions for difficult problems outside the scope of the Council's day-to-day operations.

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference is another useful device which has been designed to serve a special and limited role and therefore is unsuited for the mission of the proposed convention. The annual conferences have operated under severe time limitations which would prevent adequate consideration of the kind of problems entailed or contemplated to be discussed under the resolution.

The Atlantic Congress, which convened last summer, had a somewhat similar handicap, since it met for only a week. In addition, it has more than 650 delegates, which makes it much too large a group for thoughtful discussion of complicated topics.

It has been suggested that we might turn to meetings of strictly private groups financed by private individuals or foundations, to consider the problems of NATO. Experience has shown, however, that citizens of the required eminence and ability have not been willing to devote sufficient time to such a task in the absence of a request from their Governments that they do so.

The convention contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 170 is intended to go beyond the work of these various organizations. Avoidance of the difficulties under which they labor gives us added hope for its success.

It is, in short, to be a small, deliberative convention that has sufficient time to consider seriously and to debate at length, the weaknesses of the present NATO alliance, and thus to formulate thoughtful recommendations, to be returned to the various NATO governments, as to the steps that the delegates think best designed to give added unity and strength to the alliance.

Finally, Mr. President, we should ask what reason there is for expecting such a convention as is contemplated by this resolution to be productive of any real good. What right have we to expect serious and important accomplishments if such a convention is actually undertaken? In the course of our committee hearings one of the witnesses, General Draper, gave testimony bearing upon this point that is worthy of our serious attention. He said:

> As Chairman of the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program, I can testify from personal knowledge as to the value of the studying of our common problems by a commission composed of eminent citizens such as is provided for in this concurrent resolution.
>
> Departments of the government deal constantly with national and international problems but our own Government has from time to time felt the need for a fresh and independent look at these problems by a commission of citizens. The Hoover Commission is a notable and successful example. The Committee of which I had the honor to serve as Chairman is one of the most recent ones.

For my own part, Mr. President, I would emphasize that the problem-solving procedures which this resolution would set in motion seem to me to be in the finest tradition of our own country, and of Western civilization generally. The chief glory of our society is the quality of the individuals it produces. This is what the doctrine of the state being the servant, not the master of the people is really about. This is why we have, and seek to maintain, an open society.

If this kind of society is to survive, it seems to me that we must find more effective ways to exploit its advantages. The central purpose of this resolution is to enable eminent, free citizens, products of this open society, to consider the present situation and recommend possible lines of action that would contribute to the strengthening of the free countries of the world in their common efforts to protect themselves against the Communist threat. It is precisely because they would constitute a citizen's conclave, free to speak and act independently of the official positions which their governments may heretofore have taken, that we could expect from them ideas and recommendations which would breathe new life into the struggle of Western man to retain his freedom. Established governments tend to get bogged down in ruts, and it becomes difficult for them to lift themselves out of these ruts—to break away from habits of vested interest and fixed position.

For this reason, the greatest advances of Western civilization have most often been initiated, not by governments, but by free citizens, thinking and acting in

ways made possible only by freedom; responsible, as free men are in the last analysis, only to their own consciences.

Whatever recommendations may come from the proposed convention will have no official status, no authority except what is given them by their intrinsic merit.

Mr. President, I see no basis for arguing that any harm can come from the kind of meeting which is here proposed. It seems to me, on the contrary, that it has in it the possibility of much good, that it is in the best tradition of free societies, and that it is the kind of initiative that we can properly take, and ought to take. I hope the Senate will approve the joint resolution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. First I should like to congratulate the Senator from Idaho for the fine presentation he has made this evening, and also for the very diligent effort he has made to make certain that the measure before the Senate, or something along this line, should be acted upon by the Senate at this session.

The junior Senator from Louisiana was in the Senate and voted for the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty. That treaty has been regarded as one of the very foundations of the security of this Nation. Much of it resulted from the leadership of the late Arthur Vandenberg, who was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the 80th Congress.

Yet here we see that, notwithstanding the fact that this organization has been a success, by general agreement of most Americans, I believe, many people are fearful of any additional strides toward strengthening and enlarging upon what has been a successful venture.

Most businessmen, when they see that their business is successful and showing a profit, usually like to expand it and make a greater investment in it, and broaden its activities. Yet the Senator from Idaho knows that there has been some fear expressed of what the possible consequences might be of considering new ideas such as those the resolution seeks to achieve. The resolution seeks to bring about some discussion by citizens of this Nation and citizens of our allied nations of ways and means whereby the NATO organization can be strengthened, so that suggestions and recommendations by those persons could be made with respect to what can be done along that line after these persons have had a chance to thoughtfully consider the subject.

I must say that I for one have been discouraged to see that there has been such a reluctance to consider or even to discuss ways in which this very successful undertaking can be enlarged upon. I very much hope that not only will the Senate pass the joint resolution, but that something will come of it as a result of the efforts the Senator is supporting.

I hope that those who will meet in this new organization will not only come forward with constructive suggestions, but will support them and help pursue them and also help muster public support for measures that will make NATO more effective.

There is no doubt that there are a number of things which could be done to strengthen the NATO alliance as far as military measures are concerned. Certainly, there must be some economic ways in which we can cooperate more fully.

I do not want the United States to make any concessions without gaining something by doing so. I would like to see the United States benefit, certainly, as much as the other members of the organization gain in a joint undertaking. I believe that as a result of this new organization, we might possibly achieve a greater matching by our partners of the effort we are making. The time has come when we have every right to demand that other nations make a greater contribution.

The Senator from Idaho has been one of those, in considering mutual security legislation, who have made the point that the North Atlantic Treaty countries have actually reduced their contributions to the overall defense, at a time when the United States has been increasing its contribution to that defense. I hope that a measure of this kind will not mean that America will give more and receive less from others. I hope that these ideas will be stressed as a part of the considerations and recommendations whereby the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can be strengthened.

Mr. CHURCH. I very much appreciate the fine support which is indicated by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He is quite right when he says that the objective of this joint resolution is to seek out recommendations intended to give new strength and health to our NATO alliance. As a matter of fact, the preamble of Senate Joint Resolution 170 succinctly states the objective that is meant to be served. It reads:

> 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 United States delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

That clearly states the objective that is sought by such a convention. I would only make the observation that no alliance can remain static. It either will tend to unravel, to become weaker, and, in the end, fail, as the years go by, or it will tend to become stronger and more closely knit, and thus succeed in the accomplishment of its objectives. It cannot remain static.

There is a sense of uneasiness about the state of health of the NATO Alliance, and a realization that we must find ways to implement what was originally intended by Article II of the Alliance, which directs attention to political and economic ways by which the NATO nations should cooperate.

The truth is that up to now the NATO Alliance has been merely a military alliance. One of the uses of the proposed convention would be to explore ways and means for implementing the clear intent of article II of the NATO Treaty.

I am so pleased to have this endorsement from the Senator from Louisiana. I am hopeful he might find it possible to make a statement tomorrow, in the course of the debate, in support of the resolution.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. First, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Idaho for his very forceful and clear statement with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 170. He has been more than fair in explaining it, and in explaining the objections which have been raised to this idea, as well as in presenting very clearly what, to me, are the overwhelming advantages and desirabilities of this particular procedure.

As the Senator from Idaho knows, I am one of four Senators who joined in submitting Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 earlier in this Congress. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and I joined in submitting it. Shortly thereafter we had a great accession to our ranks in the person of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who carried it forward, and now brings it to the floor with very great persuasiveness.

I should like to say, on behalf of the Senators who cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 originally, that the committee has, I believe, produced a better resolution than the one which we originally submitted. Great credit is due the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and their other colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution is tighter, more specific, and clearer. It avoids the dangers and the possibilities into which the original concurrent resolution, although it was never intended to produce them, might perhaps have led us.

I cannot add anything to the basic argument which the Senator from Idaho has presented in behalf of the joint resolution, except possibly the point made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] at the hearing. He said that we do not very often have a new idea in this whole area, and that the joint resolution, in addition to its substantive appeal, is perhaps that kind of fresh idea which in itself will give a lift to all of us who are deeply involved in the problem of trying to bring about a more stable world, a world in which the ideas of cooperation and brotherhood may have a little better chance to work among those of us to whom has fallen the great responsibilitiy of preserving and extending the values of Western democracy.

One other thing: A number of us have been working on this problem. Among them is the Vice President of the United States, who, when he was in the Senate, had a great interest in this whole area, and still retains it. I am authorized by him to say that he welcomes this initiative on the part of Members of the Sen-

ate; that he strongly believes it is extremely desirable for the countries of the Atlantic Community to engage in cooperative efforts of every sort to draw closer together, for many reasons, including, of course, the reason that if this is not done, the responsibility on those of us who are carrying the major load will become unbearable. But that is only one of the important reasons. The Vice President regards this action as a manifestation of the right kind of initiative in this area. If he were still a Member of this body and had a voice and a vote in its proceedings, he would actively subscribe to the procedure.

I thank the Senator from Idaho and again express to him my appreciation of his excellent and persuasive address.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from New Jersey very much for his statement. I am happy that he emphasized the fact that the joint resolution has the approval and endorsement of the Vice President. Should a tie vote result tomorrow, we can thus be sure of prevailing.

I also am desirous of making the RECORD clear, before the debate closes today, that my part in this proceeding has been a very minor one. I have tried to support the joint resolution and move it through the committee. I am happy to have the chance to present it on the floor.

But the objective of this resolution has been supported for a number of years by such Members of this body as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as well as by the other sponsors of the original Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, out of which the committee put together Senate Joint Resolution 170, which is now the pending business. I think special credit should be given to the original sponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. They deserve to be commended for the long and sustained interest they have given to this cause. I want to make certain that the RECORD bespeaks it.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation on behalf of myself and all cosponsors, each of whom is far more entitled to credit for this venture than I. Indeed, if it proves successful, there will be credit enough for all and great gain for the country.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, my good friend and seatmate.

Mr. CLARK. First, I congratulate the Senator from Idaho on his very able presentation in support of the joint resolution. I note his usual modesty in deprecating the part he has played in bringing the joint resolution to the floor. I am confident that he is entitled at least to equal credit with the original sponsors, with all of whom I am happy to associate myself in this project.

Do I correctly understand that a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, and that no vote will be taken on the joint resolution tonight?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senator from Idaho, if he controls the time, will yield me 4 or 5 minutes tomorrow to speak in support of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be very happy to do so. I am pleased to learn that the Senator from Pennsylvania is willing to speak for the joint resolution.

Mr. CLARK. For the moment, I should simply like to say that I have not only listened to the Senator from Idaho, but I have read the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and have given some consideration to the reasons advanced by the members of the committee who oppose the resolution for the position they take. It is very difficult for me to understand how those reasons can be taken very seriously. To me, they are not only not compelling, but are far from persuasive.

I am a little frightened at what the Senate is doing at this session in connection with our foreign relations. It occurs to me that we are living in a pretty rarefied atmosphere here and are not too well aware of what is taking place in the outside world.

I shall not detain the Senator further tonight other than to suggest to him that if the Senate cannot at this session pass this joint resolution, then indeed this body will have made it abundantly clear, in connection with many another action which we have either taken or failed to take, and I fear will take in the next few weeks, that we are not really very much interested in advancing, through the democratic technique of open discussion, the strength of the free world.

This attitude bothers me very much. I shall have occasion to speak about it on a number of other occasions during the course of the next month.

I hope the Senator from Idaho was speaking in jest when he talked of the possibility of a tie vote on the joint resolution being broken by the Vice President. Although I view with some chagrin the fact that the vote in the committee was 8 to 7, I hope the resolution can be passed with no dissenting votes. I see very little reason for opposing it. I hope I am not being ignorant or arrogant in saying this, but I am totally at a loss and am unable to understand the position of the opposition.

I shall speak tomorrow in behalf of the joint resolution.

I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very much pleased to learn that the Senator from Pennsylvania will speak tomorrow on behalf of the resolution.

Of course, I agree wholeheartedly with him that we should not have any fear of free men gathering together to debate ways and means to strengthen the unity of the Western democracies, if all they can do, as a result of their deliberations, is make recommendations to their respective governments, which, in turn, will evaluate them on the basis of their intrinsic merits.

Mr. CLARK. After all, what are we afraid of?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; what are we afraid of? The deliberations will result in the formulation of ideas which the governments of the Western democracies can appraise, and pass upon as they see fit.

To defeat the resolution, to take the position that there should be no convention, and no deliberation by eminent free world citizens, would be to put on the blinders, as if that were some kind of virtue, when the dire fact of our situation is that the Western World is challenged today as never before, and therefore is called upon to plumb its resources and exert itself to the utmost, to find methods to strengthen the unity of purpose and the vitality of the Western World, to meet the threat that has been thrust upon it.

Therefore, I see nothing but good to come from such a convention. I do not believe any harm could possibly emanate from it.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will concur, and will pass the resolution tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator from Idaho and with the Senator from Pennsylvania that a vote against the joint resolution could certainly be construed by many as fear on the part of this country of communication with other free peoples or fear of a good idea.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Whereas the very basis of our type of democracy and that of our allies is, theoretically, the assumption that we have nothing to fear from exploring the other man's ideas, and discussing them and seeing how they can be improved upon, and that the answer to anyone's idea, if one does not agree with it, is to propose a better one.

Mr. CLARK. And the cliche that is used is "to hammer out the truth on the anvil of discussion."

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. No better method has yet been devised.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I now move, under the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at noon.

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, Wednesday, June 15, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 14, 1960:

U.S. MARSHALS

James H. Somers, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years.

Herbert E. Patrick, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years.

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Alaska for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1960.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

St. John 1: 9: *That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*

Almighty God, who hast created us in Thine own image and made us for Thyself, we pray that Thou wilt now evoke within us those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy and remove from us everything that hinders our minds and hearts from following Thy leading.

Grant that our daily life may be animated and aglow with the spirit of our blessed Lord who walked our human way and revealed unto us the worth and dignity of human life and the supremacy of duty toward Thee and our fellow men.

May the record that we have of His words of grace and His works of mercy kindle our souls with a passion to be faithful in discharging the tasks and responsibilities of our high vocation to which we have given our plight.

Hear us in His name. 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 insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4192) entitled "An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with communications made by or to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the parties to such communications", 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. HARTKE, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4283) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, to provide that certain additional specified officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be exempt from such act," 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. FREAR, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10087) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit," 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. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 715) entitled "An act to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HARTKE, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON S. 1502

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have permission to file a supplemental report on the bill S. 1502.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MISSILE STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I just listened to the statement by our delightful friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for what we have been doing abroad. For months, yes for years, we have been appropriating the taxpayers' money because someone from time to time frightens us and tells us there is a great emergency. So we go ahead and buy more bombers or missiles or something to protect us or authorize the expenditure for war material. In the papers today, we are told that tonight at midnight, the folks working on missiles in Florida and in California are going to tell us whether they will continue to work on production for war. How absurd can we be—appropriate the money because we are frightened half to death—we must get ready for war, a cold war or a hot war, and then permit these folks, sometimes the contractors and sometimes the workers, to hold up production until they get what they want. I am asking again—just how absurd can the Congress get before it does something about that kind of a situation?

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes today on amendments, motions to recommit, or passage of bills may be put over until tomorrow, following the disposition of House Resolution 537 and H.R. 9883, the Federal employee pay increase bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know why the gentleman wants to put these rollcalls over. Is there a primary going on somewhere or is there some specific reason for this request?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. There is a primary today in South Carolina.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my reservation of objection, but I do want to call the attention of the distinguished gentleman to the fact that I was not protected in a similar situation just a short time ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Anfuso	Fisher	Magnuson
Ashmore	Flynt	Mahon
Barden	Fulton	Mitchell
Beckworth	Gallagher	Morris, Okla.
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	Moulder
Bentley	Glenn	Patman
Blatnik	Gray	Poage
Blitch	Hargis	Powell
Brooks, La.	Hemphill	Quigley
Brown, Mo.	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Ikard	Riley
Burdick	Jackson	Rivers, S. C.
Burleson	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Cahill	Jensen	Short
Carnahan	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Casey	Kearns	Stubblefield
Dawson	Kelly	Taylor
Diggs	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Dorn, N.Y.	Kilday	Teller
Dorn, S.C.	Kilgore	Thompson, N.J.
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Thompson, Tex.
Dulski	Lafore	Thornberry
Durham	Loser	Weis
Elliott, Ala.	McGinley	Widnall
Fallon	McGovern	Wright
Farbstein	McMillan	Young
Fino	Macdonald	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GRANTING REPRESENTATION IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 554 and ask for its present 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 resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution, and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary may be offered to any section of the resolution at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE SCURRILOUS OBERDORFER-PINCUS ARTICLES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities took the time necessary to answer the continuous attacks leveled against us by the Communists and Communist sympathizers, we would have no time left to conduct the affairs of the committee which, because of the intensification of Communist activity in the United States, necessitates more and more of our time in investigations, hearings, consultations, preparation of reports, and similar duties.

I have hesitated for quite some time before I decided to discuss the matter of the scurrilous series of articles which appeared under the byline of Don Oberdorfer and Walter Pincus in the Knight newspapers and in the Washington Post, as well as, in excerpts, in Life magazine. Along with many of my colleagues, I regard the Oberdorfer-Pincus series as a concoction of half-truths, untruths, smear, and innuendo adorned with adjectives used in lieu of facts.

I remained silent on that sorry subject until it became clear to me that the Oberdorfer-Pincus series could not be simply dismissed as another example of yellow journalism. I was silent until the cat was out of the bag, or rather—until the cat was out of the mailbag. By that I mean, until the Oberdorfer-Pincus duo devoted their longest article in the series to an investigation of the flood of Communist propaganda reaching the United States, an investigation conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It then became obvious to me that, at least that part of the Oberdorfer-Pincus series which directly played into the Communist hands by smearing the Committee on Un-American Activities, must be answered by that committee's chairman.

One of the Oberdorfer-Pincus articles was devoted to a "road show" which the Committee on Un-American Activities is charged with having conducted from city to city where, according to the articles, the same testimony and the same mail sacks of Communist propaganda are used—all for the purpose of wasting the taxpayers' money.

What is the truth? Several weeks ago, I was advised by the staff that the reporters were examining the vouchers and expense accounts of the committee and its staff. I immediately announced that we had nothing to keep secret with the exception of our security files and that I was not cognizant of a single item in the financial affairs of the committee which could not stand the closest scrutiny.

Mr. Pincus and Mr. Oberdorfer attacked the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of 9 members and a staff of 45 people, because of the hotel bills of 1 or 2 members of the committee, which bills are portrayed as excessive. With reference to my own expenses as chairman of the committee, even the Washington Post in its editorial a few days ago commented as follows:

> The chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, it should be acknowledged, has been pretty Spartan in his habits.

Let it be noted that of the 45 members of the staff, including the investigators who do the most traveling, there was not one item or a single voucher against which anything of a derogatory nature could be found. Regarding the personal expenses of one or two members of the committee the articles referred to "$45-a-day hotel rooms and restaurant bills" as though it is a common practice of all members of the committee and its staff to spend money lavishly and extravagantly while on committee investigations.

The truth is that the Committee on Un-American Activities, like all other committees of Congress, functions largely though subcommittees. The chairman of the subcommittee frequently will use, in addition to his own bedroom, a sitting room which is utilized for conferences with witnesses, the press, and Government officials. In signing for his hotel bill, the subcommittee chairman frequently signs not only for his own personal expenses but will sign the vouchers for those meals which the subcommittee members and the staff have together in the hotel.

It is an invariable policy of the committee that no member of the committee or its staff can charge against the committee accounts any personal expenses such as laundry, cleaning, or any personal entertainment or liquor expenses. If instances have occurred in which these items have been charged against the committee accounts—and I personally know of no such instances—they are obviously either in error or are wrong, and I would not begin to justify them. I cannot believe that any such instances of this kind are more than infrequent breaches which might occur in any operation as extensive as the operations of our committee, which cover the entire Nation. Aside from the personal expense accounts of one or two members used in the articles as a basis for the general indictment of the entire committee and its staff, the articles lay particular emphasis on two other items concerning which I shall now comment.

Mr. Pincus and Mr. Oberdorfer state that the members of the Committee on

Un-American Activities and its staff have taken from the Library of Congress a number of books and periodicals which were lost and paid for at taxpayers' expense. The articles list the books and their cost. The only reasonable interpretation of the article is that these books were taken in the recent past or at least during the existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The truth is that every one of these books was charged out from the Library of Congress in a period beginning in 1938 and extending until 1945 by the old Dies committee which was the predecessor of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I understand that these books were checked out of the Library of Congress by the old Dies committee from 1938 to 1945 as part of a great number of books which were being examined in connection with a project dealing with Communists who were writers.

Back in 1956 the Library of Congress completed an inventory of all of the books which had been checked out over many years but which had not been accounted for. In order to clear the records, I agreed as chairman of the successor committee that the charge for the books which had been unaccounted for by the Dies committee could be charged against the accounts of the present committee.

Mr. Pincus, the coauthor of the articles, was told prior to the time that he wrote his articles that these books had not been withdrawn or used by any member of the Committee on Un-American Activities or its staff and that the committee and its staff had no knowledge of these books, but, nevertheless, the article lists a number of the books by title and cost and conveys the clear impression that this committee and its staff have been promiscuously checking out books from the Library of Congress for personal use and charging the cost to committee accounts.

Another charge which the articles leveled against the Committee on Un-American Activities is to the effect that the committee spent taxpayers' money for limousine service, the clear impression being that it was done in an air of extravagance. The truth is that once or twice in New York City and again once in San Francisco during the course of the last several years the committee did engage limousines because the circumstances required the presence of several staff people as well as four or five members of the committee to conduct the hearings.

The limousines were used exclusively to transport the subcommittee and the staff from the hotels to the hearing rooms and return and were actually cheaper than taxicabs would have been to transport the same people. The use of limousines, moreover, permitted more careful adherence to a close schedule of committee operations. The implication of the articles, however, is that the members of the subcommittee and the staff, at taxpayers' expense, were joyriding around town in these limousines or using them for personal trips. This, of course, is a vicious distortion.

Now, permit me to comment respecting the article in the series which was devoted to the so-called roadshow in which it is charged that the committee goes from city to city with the same testimony by Mr. Irving Fishman of the Customs Service who opens the same mail sacks of Communist propaganda—all for the purpose of wasting the taxpayers' money.

The Washington Post in its editorial entitled "Wandering Minstrels" dated June 10, 1960, adds still another tidbit respecting this series of hearings by suggesting that the real reason for the hearings is to give the committee the names of "thousands of persons to whom mail happened to be addressed from Iron Curtain countries" so that the names of these persons can be added "in those bulging catchall files of the HUAC."

It was the same Washington Post which, in an earlier editorial, advocated the release of all impounded Communist propaganda mail and its immediate delivery to the addressees.

What are the facts? What I am now about to recite, Mr. Speaker, are not only facts known to me, but facts which were painstakingly told and explained to the authors of the Oberdorfer-Pincus series on three occasions prior to the time that their articles were written. Both authors were told that Communist propaganda literature is reaching this country in increasing volume through many ports of entry. They were told that the Communist poison is printed in many languages such as Chinese, Spanish, French, Polish and so forth. They were told that Communist propaganda literature is sent to ports of entry on the east coast, the west coast, the gulf coast, and to some ports on the Canadian border. They were told, also, that Communist newspapers, brochures and tracts are mailed to such ports of entry as serve certain areas of the United States where the local population or parts of it understand the language in which the material is printed.

It was for the purpose of tracing a pattern that hearings were held in New York, in San Francisco, in New Orleans, in Buffalo, and in other places where the foreign language mail is strategically divided and destined to what may be called target areas. It must have been perfectly clear to Mr. Oberdorfer and Mr. Pincus that the Committee on Un-American Activities did not "travel around with the same mailbag" but that our purpose was to show how the same source supplies different areas of our country with propaganda literature in many different languages, entering the United States through different postal conduits.

Mr. Irving Fishman, deputy collector of the U.S. Customs Service, has for several years specialized in developing information respecting this general area of Communist activity. His work has taken him to the four corners of the world. At the present time, he is in Asia in a cooperative enterprise with the Committee on Un-American Activities for which he is developing factual material respecting the sources of some of this Communist propaganda. I shall not attempt now even to give a broad survey of the tremendous scope of this problem or of the startling facts which we are constantly uncovering in its many ramifications. From time to time this subject matter is dealt with in our various publications.

In attempting to get at the facts the committee has on several occasions requested the U.S. Customs Service to assign Mr. Fishman to make a study at a particular port of entry in an area where the committee will be conducting a general investigation. We have found that the factual situation both as to source, destination, and volume of Communist propaganda varies over the Nation but that in content there appears to be a uniform pattern. The process by which we are trying to complete the mosaic is tedious and difficult.

The suggestion contained in the Oberdorfer-Pincus article—that this committee goes from place to place to repeat a presentation of the same testimony or to use the same material—is not only untruthful, but its presentation in this vein, after the authors were three times given a full explanation of the facts, is vile. Of course, the suggestion in the Washington Post editorial that our objective is to get the names of the recipients of Communist propaganda to be included in our files is likewise untrue. The facts are that most of the recipients of this Communist propaganda have not solicited it and many of them protested receipt of it. The only names we have of recipients of this Communist propaganda are the names of people who have addressed letters to the committee commending the committee for its efforts to cope with this poison which is being destined now to schools, colleges, and libraries as well as other groups and organizations across the Nation in increasing volume.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with comments on still other misrepresentations appearing in these articles but I believe I have covered the principal items. I have never yet asserted that the Committee on Un-American Activities is above criticism. I readily assert that as a human institution we do make mistakes. We try to keep those mistakes to a minimum. I honestly feel that the overwhelming majority of the criticism against the committee and its work, however, stems either from those who have an ax to grind or are uninformed. I am convinced, likewise, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing a vital work which has the approval of the House and the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 554, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], makes in order, with 2 hours of general debate, the consideration of House Joint Resolution 757, a resolution which would amend the Constitution of the United States. The resolution provides not only for 2 hours of general debate but also for a closed rule under which no amendments, except those offered by the Committee on the Judiciary, may be considered. That was done because this joint resolution

deals with an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I think perhaps I also should point out that a two-thirds vote of the House and of the other body is required to approve a joint resolution of this type, submitting to the various States of the Union, for ratification, a constitutional amendment.

The House joint resolution, of course, does not require approval or disapproval by the President, but is first the action of the Congress and then later comes the action of ratification by the States. That ratification requires an affirmative vote of three-fourths of all the States, or 38 States.

This amendment to the Constitution, as proposed in the House joint resolution is a very simple one. It would give to the people of the District of Columbia who are legal residents—not residents of some other State, but legal residents of the District itself—the right and privilege to vote for President and Vice President, or perhaps I should say, rather, for not more than three electors to represent them in the electoral college which actually selects the President and Vice President, following the general election which is held in November each 4 years. This constitutional amendment would restrict to three the numbers of electors the District of Columbia would be permitted to have, which is the equal in number to that allowed the smallest State, but actually would be about the number the District would be entitled to on a population basis, if it were a State. But this resolution in no way creates the District of Columbia as a State. It simply confers upon the electors, the legal electors, the right to vote for President and Vice President.

The amendment does not carry any provision for delegates to sit in the House, or in either branch of the Congress. Neither does it have any connection whatsoever with the various home rule questions we have had before us for a long time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Let us suppose that I land here in the District of Columbia and make it my home. I have come from Poland or some other place, and am not a citizen of the United States; would I have the right to vote?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. The gentleman would have to be a citizen of the United States; he would have to meet all citizenship requirements, as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has received perhaps more consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary than almost any piece of legislation which has come before this House in many, many years. There have been a great many constitutional and other legal questions raised in connection with this matter. I feel, as do most of the members of the Committee on Rules, that the Committee on the Judiciary has not only worked long and arduously, but has brought out a very simple and a very effective resolution which will in no way take away from the Congress of the United States the right and authority to control the affairs of the District of Columbia as the seat of the Federal Government, or give to the people of the District any powers except those which I have designated, to vote for electors for President and Vice President.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I should like to refer to the question directed to the gentleman from Ohio by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], namely, whether or not residents of the District of Columbia who were not citizens might participate in the selection of electors. I think section 1 of the proposed amendment is very clear and reads as follows:

> The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct.

In other words, the answer of the gentleman from Ohio to the question of the gentleman from Illinois should have been that that entire matter was left to the Congress of the United States and was not specifically either provided for or prohibited in the terms of the amendment itself.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. But the Congress of the United States has the power to fix those voting rights, just as the legislature of any State may fix them in any particular State.

As I pointed out a moment ago, this does not take away from the Congress the power to control the public activities within the District of Columbia, whatever they may be, whether it deals with transportation or whether with the right of suffrage. As we have it now, the District elects delegates to the party national conventions.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is absolutely correct on that point. I should like to call attention to the language I have just read in section 1. The proposed amendment is the same phraseology as appears in article II, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States. The only difference is that we put in the word "Congress" instead of "legislature." This is the language of the Constitution:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct—

And so forth. We have simply taken the pattern established in the Constitution of the United States and left it completely within the discretion of Congress to set up the qualifications of electors, and how electors for President and Vice President shall be selected.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman making his clarifying statement. I had hoped and thought that I had made the situation clear, but certainly the gentleman's explanation leaves no doubt in the mind of anyone that the Congress retains to itself the powers provided under the Constitution to deal with District of Columbia matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the joint resolution the rule makes in order. I see no earthly reason why we should not grant the same rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia who are American citizens to vote for President and Vice President as all other citizens of the United States have. In fact I would go so far as to say we should grant them the right to have full national representation, full representation in the House and the Senate, the same as all other American citizens enjoy. I have maintained that position for the past three Congresses. I have introduced similar resolutions in each Congress, one to grant the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and the other to grant Congress the authority to give the people of the District of Columbia full voting representation in the House and the Senate.

The joint resolution which we will have before us is practically identical to the resolutions I have introduced in previous Congresses. It is, however, somewhat of a compromise, in that it limits the number of votes in the electoral college to no more than those of the least populous State. Of course it is a compromise. All major legislation gets through as a result of compromise.

It is unfortunate that while we are at it, going through the long, complicated process of a constitutional amendment, we do not do the job right and give them the full vote, the same vote they would have in the electoral college if they were a State of the same population. Yet, as I stated before, sometimes a compromise is necessary and I agree to this compromise.

I should like to address myself for just a moment to the confusion that has existed between this proposal for a constitutional amendment and the proposal for home rule in the District of Columbia. During the hearings the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary admonished the witnesses, and properly so, not to confuse this issue with home rule, but it is confused. Not more than one out of a hundred Americans who are familiar with this problem really understand the difference between this constitutional amendment we are proposing today and the problem of home rule. I venture to say a very small percentage of the advocates of home rule really understand the difference between the two measures. The two measures are similar in only one respect, that is, they give the citizens the right to vote. That is what we want to do, to give the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote. The right to vote for President and Vice President does not infringe on the rights of the other people of this great Nation. If we granted the people of the District of Columbia representation in the House and Senate, it would not infringe on the rights of the other people of this Nation. However, if we attempt to turn over the government of the Nation's Capital to the people who live within its boundaries to rule and control, then we do impinge on the right of the other people of the Nation, because all the people of the States have a

stake and a vested right and interest in the government of the Nation's Capital.

Last week we were talking about a compact for interstate transportation. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] expressed great concern that we were setting up control over the taxicab rates here in the Capital and giving it to some outside agency.

He felt his constituents had a stake involved in the setting of taxicab rates here in the Nation's Capital. Last Monday, the House approved a bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] requiring that no more condemnation for urban renewal will take place until 50 percent of the people who had been evicted, as a result of previous condemnations, had been replaced. That was a proper bill and indicates the concern that the gentleman from Michigan had in the operation and conduct of the affairs of the Nation's Capital. I could give hundreds of other examples of how Members have expressed their interest and concern in the management of the Nation's Capital. Over and beyond the constitutional question involved, I maintain we do not have the right to turn over the control of the District of Columbia to the people living within its boundaries. Over and beyond that fact, we must recognize that 50 percent of all the property in the District of Columbia is owned by the Federal Government or by foreign governments. Of the 750,000 people living in the District of Columbia, they are largely transitory, Members of Congress, members of foreign governments, Federal executives, members of committee staffs. A large portion of the population does not have their grassroots and basic economic interests within the boundaries of the Nation's Capital. In the recent primary election here last month, only 21,000 people out of 750,000 population went to the polls to vote. So that indicates a very small percentage of those 750,000 really have any interest in the affairs of the Nation's Capital. So, if we granted home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia, we would be turning over the Federal interest and the Federal rights to a very small percentage of the population. There is a precedent for not granting home rule or control of the local government here to the people who live within the boundaries of the Nation's Capital. On all military reservations throughout the country, we recognize the Federal interests are dominant. People living on military reservations have rights as other American citizens have. They can vote for President and Vice President, but they do not have any control or say-so as to how the affairs on that military reservation will be conducted. Regardless of what we do regarding home rule, we will still be responsible as to how the affairs of the Nation's Capital are conducted. In view of the fact that the right to vote is the predominant issue that we have here, I trust that the Congress will overwhelmingly approve this proposed constitutional amendment, giving the people the right to vote for President and Vice President and exercise some restraint on demanding that the House act on a measure that will turn over the control of the Nation's Capital to a few people who live within its boundaries. In fact, I hope some other Members will reconsider their previous action, and in the mannerism of Victor Borge, "Whisht," scratch their names off the discharge petition.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 757 and support the gentleman's position on this resolution. As the gentleman has stated in his original remarks, some confusion may exist in the minds of the Members as to this national representation effort that we are supporting, you and I and many others. I rise merely to point out that you and I are supporting this particular measure, House Joint Resolution 757, 100 percent. But you and I differ on home rule. I am a very strong supporter of home rule, but I will not take the time to debate that question at this point, but will merely highlight the fact that you and I differ on the question of home rule, but that we are 100 percent for this resolution providing to the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. BROYHILL. The main thing that the American people are concerned about and in a sympathetic way is to give the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote. That is what this resolution does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, with the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the law of the land now, in full force and effect, every qualified citizen of this country, except those legally domiciled in the District of Columbia, has the right to exercise the elective franchise so far as electors for President and Vice President are concerned.

The rule which is under discussion now will make in order a resolution submitting to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment which will give the people legally domiciled in the District of Columbia the right to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors. This, indeed, is a historic occasion. I trust the rule will be adopted and that the resolution submitting the question to the States will have the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been thoroughly explained by those who have preceded me. It simply provides that the citizens of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States and to elect electors for the purpose of electing the President.

I hope the House will not confuse it with many of the confusing things concerning the District of Columbia, because it deals solely with the one problem of the right of these people who are citizens of the United States to vote for their President. It is an entirely different question, as has been mentioned before, from the present agitation about home rule in the District, because there you run into a constitutional prohibition which has not only constitutional but also historic reasons why the Congress should exercise, as the Constitution requires, exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia. I will not go into that, because it has no relationship whatsoever to the bill before us. I hope this resolution may be adopted and that the constitutional resolution also may be adopted by the House, because I can see no valid reason why any citizen of the United States should be denied the right to vote for President and Vice President.

The joint resolution requires a two-thirds vote. After studious consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, it has been stripped down to the one, as I regard it, noncontroversial question; and in this late day of the session it is my hope that this may be gotten through and go to the States for ratification. It is the one chance, because if it is complicated further with other matters that do not directly relate to the question of the right to vote for President, the whole thing is going to fail in this late day of the session. I hope very much it can be enacted by the Congress.

If it is enacted, then the question of who can vote in these elections in the District of Columbia is a matter to be determined by the Congress; in other words, the qualifications of the voters and all the details with respect to voting will have to be dealt with in an additional act of Congress. I hope the joint resolution may be passed by the House without objection.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, articles appeared in certain Washington dailies strongly implying that certain distinguished Members of Congress had improperly expended public funds while performing special congressional assignments. I refer particularly to the expenditures for meals in the Surf Bar of the Royal Hawaiian Hotel in the State of Hawaii. These articles strongly inferred that the Surf Bar was only a cocktail lounge, or a place where only alcoholic beverages were served, and thereby by inference and implication accused these distinguished Members of falsifying their meal vouchers.

Knowing from my personal experiences that food is served in the Surf Bar regularly, I made certain inquiries in

Honolulu and have received the following information:

The Surf Bar during the year 1957, the specific year the articles referred to, did serve alcoholic beverages to their patrons, but at the same time served meals every day of the week.

My colleagues may be interested to know that in the year 1957, 76,871 meals were served to patrons of the Surf Bar. In the year 1958, 62,200 meals were served to patrons of the Surf Bar. In the year 1959, 77,448 meals were served to patrons of the Surf Bar. This year, as of May 31, 29,947 meals were served to patrons of the Surf Bar.

I have cited these statistics because these newspaper articles strongly inferred that only liquor was being served in the Surf Bar. This inference is understandable because the name, "Surf Bar," would naturally imply that as a place designated as a bar, only liquor would be served. I am hoping that by citing these statistics I am able to indicate to my colleagues that meals are served in the Surf Bar, and by meals I do not mean hors d'oeuvre. I mean full meals. It may also be of some interest to my colleagues to note that across the courtyard from the Surf Bar is the main dining room of the Royal Hawaiian Hotel. This dining room is called the Monarch Room and, naturally, the Monarch Room serves meals, but in a more lavish manner. I feel that I need not tell you that the meals in the Monarch Room are much more expensive than the meals in the Surf Bar.

I purposely cited the existence of the main dining room, the Monarch Room, to point out the strong possibility that our colleagues in having their meals served in the Surf Bar were actually saving taxpayers money. I am certain that my colleagues at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel could have very legitimately had their meals in the Monarch Room at much more expensive rates, but it seems from the printed vouchers that our colleagues decided to have their meals in the Surf Bar at coffee-shop rates.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this short presentation has brought some light to the Surf Bar incident.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we, the representative body of the Congress, pause this day to pay tribute to our flag. What we do and say here today, I pray, will make itself felt not only to our own citizenry, but to the rest of the world as well—for today we express our love for country, our dedication to the principles of human decency, our devotion to the basic concepts of freedom, our national dependence upon Almighty God by pledging, as a nation, our allegiance to the Stars and Stripes.

The story of our flag is the story of our Nation. Shining forth from that field of blue is a star for each of the 50 United States. That field of blue had a proud and courageous beginning, and each addition since then has written a glorious chapter to the story of America.

Wherever this banner is unfurled there is hope in the hearts of men who believe that God created man and destined him to be free. Freed to fashion his life, alongside his neighbor, but not at the expense of his neighbor—to join freely in community with other communities of similar ambition in the creation of the state that will govern judiciously the acts of its citizens—free to choose its leaders and administrators who exercise their mandate to govern. All these basic principles of democratic government are contained in a symbol—a symbol that shall forever be the inspiration of a free people who daily pledge, as did their forefathers—their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor—to the maintenance of their chosen way of life.

Six years ago today, the President signed Public Law 396, which inserted the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag. As author of the bill, I should like to reflect a moment, on this anniversary occasion, upon the significance of this amendment.

In the last 184 years this Nation has gradually increased its role among the free sister nations of the earth to the position of undisputed leadership. This leadership is not only material, but spiritual as well. For today we have been catapulted into the unique position where influence has shifted from the material world to the world of ideas. It has been quoted by many commentators of our contemporary scene that the big battle now is for men's minds.

The means of ultimate material destruction are at hand—the need now is for the deterrent force of Christian ideas to neutralize the preponderance of material know-how.

In many circles not a few informed people are saying that this country is losing this most important battle for free minds. We cannot afford to capitulate to the atheistic philosophies of godless men—we must strive to ever remind the world that this great Nation has been endowed by a creator, and that this concept finds expression in our declared way of life.

The revision inserting the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag goes far toward fulfilling this obligation. As legislators of this Nation's laws, I feel that this task falls primarily upon us—let us be ever alert to the necessity of this duty.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 554, 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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

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 joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 757, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I deem it a great privilege, in fact I look upon it as a most notable milestone in my service as a Congressman, to sponsor this constitutional amendment which will give the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote in Federal elections. It seems incongruous that citizens as far away as Hawaii and Alaska have the right to vote while the residents of the seat of Government do not, especially when it is remembered that the men and women of the District of Columbia have all the obligations of citizenship, including the payment of Federal taxes, local taxes, and service in our Armed Forces.

The District of Columbia with more than 748,000 residents has a greater number of persons than 15 of our States, and a greater number of its sons and daughters served in our Armed Forces in World War II than served from one-third of our States. The District's population, in fact, exceeds the combined population of Alaska, Nevada, and Wyoming. As against 748,000 of the District, Vermont has 372,000, Delaware 454,000, Wyoming 319,000, Nevada 280,000, and Alaska only 191,000 inhabitants.

In 1948, the last time the District's tax contributions were reported separately, the District paid over $363 million in Federal taxes, more than the contributions of 25 States.

One may ask why have the residents of the District of Columbia been denied the right to vote for President and Vice President? A study of the constitutional debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and also the contemporary writings of our leading statesmen of that day discloses that it was not the intention of the Founding Fathers to deny the District such rights. The denial stems, apparently, from an oversight or omission on their part, for nowhere in our fundamental instrument is there an express prohibition against voting by residents of the District. It is just that the Constitution simply does not provide for the right.

At the time the Constitution was being considered in Philadelphia in 1787 James Madison wrote in the Federalist, No. 43, that the inhabitants of the new Federal City should "of course have their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them."

At that time it was not known where the seat of Government would be or what would be the size of the area ceded

to the Federal Government for that purpose. It might have been, for all the Founding Fathers knew, a very small area indeed, just enough to encompass the Federal buildings needed to carry out the business of government, with the residents around it retaining their State citizenship. In any event, no provision for suffrage was included. As the remarks of Madison suggest, the failure to do so was due to an oversight rather than to an intention by the framers to deny residents of the District the right to vote.

Technically, voting rights are denied District residents because the Constitution is said to provide the machinery only through the States for the election of Senators and Representatives to Congress and for the selection of the President and Vice President—see article I, section 2. Since the District is not a State or part of a State, there is no machinery through which its citizens may participate in such matters.

The correction of this omission is the sole purpose of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 757, which calls for a simple amendment to the Constitution which would authorize Congress to pass laws permitting District citizens to vote in national elections.

I wish to emphasize that my resolution does not conflict with or have any bearing on the question of home rule for the District of Columbia. This is not an "either-or" proposition. My amendment only provides for a vote in Federal elections. This resolution is not "home rule" nor is it a substitute for "home rule." It is a matter of public record that the residents of the District of Columbia have been campaigning for the right to vote almost since the time the land which became known as the District of Columbia was ceded by the States of Virginia and Maryland.

Their early campaigns for the franchise were supported by several Presidents. President James Monroe in 1818, Andrew Jackson in 1831, William Henry Harrison in 1841, and Andrew Johnson in 1866 urged national representation for the District in various forms.

In addition, there have been numerous resolutions over the years, some 75 in number. Of these, three were favorably reported by the Judiciary Committees of the Congress, in the Senate in 1922 and 1925 and by the House Committee on the Judiciary in 1940. I may mention that I supported and voted for the bill in 1940, which was favorably reported by this committee.

In this Congress for the first time a resolution has passed one of the Houses of Congress. The Senate on February 2, 1960, favorably acted on Senate Joint Resolution 39. This circumstance and the recent granting of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii lead me to be optimistic about succeeding in getting my amendment adopted by the House during this Congress.

The long struggle to get a vote to the District of Columbia has slowly but surely educated the American public to the point where there is little resistance to giving the vote to the citizens of the District, at least in Federal elections. This legislation will in no way lessen the control of Congress over the seat of government. Further, the number of electors provided for shall in no event exceed the number allotted to the least populous State. That means the District would have three electors, the equivalent number of two Senators and one Representative.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I think the chairman should be commended for making a very concise and clear presentation of what the legislation does. I wanted to ask two or three questions, if I might, to establish in our minds what it does not do.

The bill and constitutional amendment passed by the Senate in February, as I recall, did provide in addition to voting rights for President and Vice President, that the residents of the District could elect two Congressmen. The amendment before us today does not do that. Am I correct?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. The constitutional amendment passed by the Senate last February also had no limitation with regard to the electoral vote in the electoral college of the District. However, there is such limitation in this bill, is there not?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I might say to my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that I find this limitation an invidious one. I think all of the citizens of our country should stand on equal footing. For my own part, I will favor and will vote for this amendment, but I think this limitation does not do justice to the people of the District, nor does it square with my idea of the Constitution as an equalitarian document.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman, he, apparently, is interested in an issue. I am interested in a cause—the cause of the ballot. I am what one would call a practical politician. I could not get through my Committee on the Judiciary nor could I get through this House all that the gentleman wants. Therefore, to use the words that often reflect compromise—half a loaf is better than no loaf at all.

Mr. UDALL. I have no argument with my colleague on this point. May I ask one other question of the chairman, if he will yield further? The citizen of the ordinary American city has a bundle of voting rights consisting of the right to vote for his municipal officials, State officials, the right to elect a Congressman—and also to vote for President and Vice President. It is that bundle of rights that we normally speak of when we talk of voting rights. There is only one of those four rights conferred here today, am I correct in that?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I think the chairman made it quite plain that this amendment does not confer the right of local self-government that the citizens of every capital in the Western World—except I think Washington and Baghdad—have to govern their local affairs—to determine how to dispose of sewage, how to run the police force, and other matters of local concern.

Mr. CELLER. I think Brasilia, the new capital of Brazil, is very much like our present District of Columbia. I think laws have been set up there by President Kubichek of Brazil and his colleagues, along the lines of the laws that appertain to our own District of Columbia.

Mr. UDALL. The only other question I would like to ask of my colleague, and I know he has fought long in his committee for a poll tax amendment, is this question: Is it not true that the other body in the series of constitutional amendments which it sent over contained an amendment sponsored by a Senator from the State of Florida to eliminate the poll tax by constitutional amendment?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. I might add that the resolution which was passed by the Senate was three-pronged. It provided for a vote in the District of Columbia in Federal elections and for the election of a delegate or delegates. Secondly, it provided for the abolition of the poll tax. Thirdly, it provided for the selection by various governors of Representatives in Congress in the event of some holocaust or common catastrophe where a great many Representatives of the Congress might be exterminated. Again, being practical, I knew it would be very, very difficult to get such a three-pronged constitutional amendment through the House, much less through my Committee on the Judiciary, and I reasoned that it would be better not to have such a broad target at which opponents could aim their shafts of opposition, and, therefore, I tried to have this amendment as simple as possible and limit it to the joint resolution which you now have before you. I had a predilection to widen it a little bit, but I had to bow down to the wishes of my committee who are very astute and learned men and practical men. They offered amendments and we fashioned the proposed legislation that you now have before you. I think it is a good bill. On the way to the summit, we may have to visit a number of plateaus. This is one of the plateaus on the way to the summit.

Mr. UDALL. I might say to my colleague, I shall support his amendment. I just want to observe, however, that it seems to me the base of the amendment sent to us by the other body has been almost whittled away. I do not regard it as a generous proposal. I regard it as a minimum proposal, and I shall support it as such. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CELLER. The bill, Senate Joint Resolution 39, which passed the Senate particularly contained the provision for the abolition of the poll tax. The distinguished and dedicated senior Senator from Florida, Senator HOLLAND, was the faithful and courageous sponsor of the poll tax repeal. He has assured me that in the interest of getting at least the vote for the District in national elections he would yield on his amendment. If

he does not make this sacrifice there might not be any bill passing the House. The Senator graciously yielded on his amendment. I hope that he will press for the poll tax repeal in the next session. I pledge every possible help to him in that repeal. I shall do all and sundry to support such repeal on the House side as he will on the Senate side.

The right, the privilege, the duty to vote—whatever characteristization you may ascribe to it—is the foundation upon which rests what is the essence of a democracy, namely, government by discussion. Therefore, unjustifiable segregation from political life is a cruel exercise in isolation.

Under Anglo Saxon concepts, since the year 1215 when the Magna Carta declared that exceptional feudal aids were not to be levied without the common counsel of the realm, the extension of the body of the electorate has been the universal goal. At first, the counsel demanded by the Magna Carta was given by an assembly consisting of great lords, ecclesiastical prelates and tenants in chief, but there were in essence local assemblies or town meetings. They met twice a year to determine questions of law, inflict criminal punishment and to transact other kinds of business. This was the skeleton of the true representative system.

In 1265 the leaders of the barons embattled with the king and called for a parliament of two knights out of each shire, two burgesses from the towns, and from five sports each, four men. Thirty years later, there was summoned what is known as the "model parliament" by King Edward I which consisted of 2 archbishops, all of the bishops, the more important abbots, 7 earls, 41 barons, and in addition to these, each sheriff "shall cause to be elected 2 knights from each shire, 2 burgesses each from 115 cities and boroughs." At first the clergy, the barons, and the commoners met separately. This, of course, could not work and gradually there evolved the House of Lords which was comprised of lords temporal and lords spiritual and a House of Commons representing all of the classes.

I have gone back to English history because our own institutions derived therefrom. In my review I am again struck with the thought that the extension of the franchise was the most civilizing element in the development of national entities.

The French Revolution and the American Revolution gave radical impetus to this extension of the franchise. Basic to our understanding is the historical statement in the Declaration of Independence "all governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It has been said another way, "Either no individual member of the human race has any real rights or else all have the same." Widening the electorate has been no easy victory. At the outbreak of the American Revolution there was not a colony which did not require the ownership of property for the privilege of voting. Eight colonies imposed religious or moral tests upon either officers or electors. New Hampshire excluded Roman Catholics; and South Carolina deemed unsafe all citizens who did not believe in God and a future life. Several required that assemblymen should be Protestants, while others demanded that they should believe in God and the divine inspiration of the Scriptures.

By 1830 it may be said that a broad, though not universal, suffrage had been acquired in practically all the Original Thirteen States. There were exceptions like North Carolina, or Rhode Island, where Dorr and his followers acquired the vote only by rebellion. Where a property qualification occurred in the State west of the Alleghenies, it was of little consequence, so long as an abundant supply of cheap land made it easy for all to obtain property. By the end of the Civil War, practically universal, manhood suffrage had been established for all whites.

It took until the second decade of the 20th century to remove the disqualification of sex. The paramount question therefore before us is—shall the citizens of the District of Columbia be classed with idiots, insane people, and persons convicted of serious crimes which today constitute the major classes of people who are disenfranchised? Great efforts have been made by this Congress to assure the right to vote to all inhabitants under the 15th amendment of the Constitution, although this amendment speaks of abridgements of the vote on racial groups. Our Civil Rights Act of 1957 through 1960 are based upon that amendment. There can be, therefore, no logic, no justification, no indifference to the disenfranchisement of the residents of the District of Columbia. Under this bill, the enfranchisement is a limited one.

The people of the District of Columbia want to participate in national elections, even if it were to be as abortive as such participation was back in 1924 when the Alabama Democratic delegation in Madison Square Garden said "24 for Underwood" through 103 ballots. Without any kind of vote, the people of the District of Columbia are mere wards of Congress. They are declassed. That reflects upon their dignity; it wounds their pride; they are disqualified, though qualified. They are written off like excess baggage.

What useful purpose would be served to deny them the right to vote at least in the presidential election? There is no skin off anyone's back in granting that right. None is hurt but many will be helped. We boast of our conception of fair play. It is not fair to have a whole Nation possessed of the ballot, but not the people of the District of Columbia. Why place a hex on them? Denial of any vote is not like cutting out a useless appendix; it goes to the heart and pride of the citizen, and pride is one of our most precious human emotions.

On an average, 40 percent of our people qualified to vote do not vote either through apathy or ignorance. I assure you the people of the District will not be guilty of either indifference or unwillingness or ignorance. They will vote to a man. Their hunger for the vote is too great—they would literally devour it.

For the reasons stated above, I hope the necessary two-thirds majority will be available to pass this resolution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity today to do our part in conferring a fundamental American right—the right to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors—upon the citizens who reside in and have their legal domicile in the District of Columbia. It is indeed difficult to understand why, more than 180 years after the birth of our Nation, our Constitution has not been amended to provide such fundamental privilege. No one has explained why our fellow American citizens who choose to make their homes in the Capital City of the Nation should be denied the elective franchise in a representative republic. Therefore, we are presented not only with a rare historic opportunity but also with a basic historic challenge.

House Joint Resolution 757 proposes to amend the Constitution in only one particular—to permit the residents of the District of Columbia, who are legally domiciled therein, to vote for President and Vice President, or, more technically speaking, for presidential and vice presidential electors.

House Joint Resolution 757 does not include any of the other measures proposed by the other body in Senate Joint Resolution 39 and it does not contain any provision for the election of Delegates to the House of Representatives. In addition, the rule adopted by the House does not provide for any amendments except amendments offered by the Judiciary Committee.

No amendments will be offered. I am happy to make this statement in order to allay any fear of any Member who desires to support this measure but who could not support it in conjunction with unrelated measures which might be objectionable to any of my colleagues.

I might add that I am of the definite opinion that with anything as fundamental and lasting as a constitutional amendment I much prefer to confine consideration to one topic at a time.

The proposed amendment is necessary because the Constitution makes no provision for the selection of presidential and vice presidential electors by any political subdivision of the Federal Union other than States. Since the District of Columbia is not a State, there is no method short of a constitutional amendment which will permit the residents, legally domiciled in the District, to exercise the elective franchise.

The proposed amendment will simply authorize the District to select presidential and vice presidential electors in a manner similar to the method provided for the States in article II, section 1 of the Constitution. In fact, the language adopted is patterned after the language in article II. In addition, it contains the proviso that in no event shall the District be entitled to more electors than the least populous State. This proviso was adopted because it was thought that under no circumstances should the District, which is not a State, have a greater voice in selecting the President and Vice President than the least populous State.

Upon ratification of the amendment, the Congress will be empowered to enact enabling legislation setting forth the qualifications of the electors; the qualifications for District voters, and the manner in which elections are to be held. With respect to the States, these matters, under article II, section 1, are left to the respective State legislatures.

The proposed amendment next provides that the District electors "meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment." This is the present provision of the Constitution which prescribes the manner in which the electors cast their ballots for President and Vice President. In the event the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, the District would not participate. In that contingency, the delegation from each State is entitled to one vote; and, since the District is not a State there is no method by which it could participate in such event. The committee considered this problem but thought it would be unwise to try to adopt language into this simple resolution which would give the District a vote in the House of Representatives, if such condition ever arose.

It is important to remember that the power of Congress to exercise exclusive legislation over the District under article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution will not be affected. In other words, amending the Constitution to grant the right of franchise in presidential elections will in no way diminish the legislative power of Congress over the District.

There is strong argument that the Founding Fathers did not intend to deprive the citizens of the future District of the right to vote even though they did intend to create a separate seat for the Federal Government under the exclusive domain and control of Congress. To this extent adoption of the proposed amendment will not alter the character of the District as the permanent seat of the Federal Government.

Today the District has a population of about 750,000 people, which is more than the population of each of 13 of our States. The citizens of the District have fought and died in every U.S. war since the District was founded. Yet they cannot now vote in national elections because the Constitution has restricted that privilege to citizens who have a voting residence in one of the States.

The Founding Fathers did contemplate the creation of a Federal district but they neglected to make provision for the residents of the future District to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors. In 1788 and 1789, Maryland and Virginia ceded the original territory to the Federal Government. In 1846, the Virginia portion of the District of Columbia was retroceded to Virginia. To my comprehension, it is inconceivable that the Founding Fathers, if they had contemplated the growth of the District as a permanent home for so many of our citizens, would not have made provision for them to vote. I believe, therefore, by adopting the proposed amendment we will be conforming the Constitution to present day reality, but in keeping with the spirit of our forebears who founded the Nation.

Finally, I should like to stress that this measure was given very careful consideration by the Judiciary Committee. It presents for your consideration a most important proposal. With its adoption by the Congress and its ratification by 38 States the legally domiciled residents of the District of Columbia shall at long last come of age. This is, indeed, a historic occasion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement and his explanation of the resolution and the amendment which is provided in the resolution. In his remarks the gentleman referred to the 12th amendment, and it is also referred to in the body of the resolution itself. I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Ohio the following language which is a part of the first sentence of the 12th amendment:

> The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves.

The amendment with which we are dealing this afternoon is an amendment not pertaining to a State but to the seat of government, or to a district, as it is called, the District of Columbia. May I ask the gentleman if the restricting language contained in this first sentence, which states, "one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves," should be construed to apply to the electors of the District of Columbia, which itself is not a State.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am of the opinion that the resolution before us if adopted would have no bearing on the question propounded by our colleague from Ohio. I am of the opinion, and we studied this question since the resolution was reported, that the President and Vice President would be limited so far as residences are required only and just as they have been limited in the past.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to support this resolution. If I gather the sentiment of the House, I would not be at all surprised that the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, who preceded me, would be followed by the House with a unanimous vote in support of this resolution.

I cannot understand how anyone could be opposed to giving the right to vote, the privilege to vote, to the residents of the District of Columbia.

There is no doubt that this resolution is a step in the right direction, but I must emphasize that it is only one step. I hope that no one who supports this bill will pretend that by so doing he has done all that need be done for the citizens of the District of Columbia. The right to vote is only one element that makes up the right of self-government. Giving the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States is important, but it still does not give them the right to govern themselves within the District. It still does not give them the right to have an elective representative speak and vote for them in the Congress of the United States.

The right to representation in the Congress and the right to make local laws for their local self-government are encompassed within the home-rule bills before the House.

While it is safe to say that the sentiment for this measure now before us has been sparked and encouraged, at least in part, by the persistent action on the part of the sponsors of home rule, none who support this bill should assume that they have done their full duty by the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Having voted for this resolution, each of the sponsors thereof should then resolve to bring before the House for its action the home rule bill which will give to the residents of the District the other two rights which are just as important to them as the right to vote for President and Vice President, to wit, the right to be represented in the U.S. Congress and the right to make their local laws.

It is hard for me to understand how those who stand for States rights oppose home rule for the District. Although the District is not a State, States rights is merely a name for self-government. The State, or the Nation, is merely a fictional sovereign brought into being by the people as an instrumentality by which to govern themselves. To deny to the people of the District the right to govern themselves as to local matters, is to deny them the very rights which the supporters of States rights demand for themselves.

Let me call to your attention this inconsistency. There are seven discharge petitions at the desk. The discharge petition for home rule needs 13 more signatures. On one or more of the other discharge petitions there are at least 30 signatures of Members of the House whose names do not appear on the discharge petition for home rule. I wonder how they can justify withholding their signatures from the home rule petition. To do one's full duty by themselves and their country, those Members should sign discharge petition No. 2 for home rule for the District.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the Congress it is, of course, my privilege to be, you might say, on the city council or the State legislature of the District of Columbia. I own a house in the District of Columbia in which I live during sessions of Congress. I have neighbors who have lived in the District of Columbia for many years, some who have lived in the District for many generations. One of my immediate neighbors is the Marbury family

which has been in this general area for, perhaps, 200 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Addonizio	Fulton	Morris, Okla.
Alexander	Gallagher	Moss
Anfuso	Garmatz	Moulder
Ashmore	Gray	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Ayres	Hargis	Patman
Bailey	Hébert	Poage
Baker	Hemphill	Powell
Barden	Holifield	Quigley
Beckworth	Holtzman	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Ikard	Riley
Bentley	Jackson	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Jennings	Roberts
Boland	Jensen	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Shelley
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Short
Burdick	Kearns	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Keith	Spence
Cahill	Kelly	Springer
Carnahan	Kilburn	Taylor
Casey	Kilday	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	Kilgore	Teller
Diggs	Kirwan	Thomas
Dingell	Kluczynski	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn, N.Y.	Lafore	Thornberry
Dorn, S.C.	Lesinski	Udall
Dowdy	Loser	Wallhauser
Durham	McGovern	Watts
Elliott, Ala.	McMillan	Weis
Fino	Macdonald	Withrow
Fisher	Magnuson	Wright
Flynt	Mahon	Young
Fogarty	May	
Forand	Mitchell	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 757 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 332 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of temporary residence in the District of Columbia during many sessions of Congress, living in a house I own, with my family here with me and my children of school age going to school; so I have a good deal of experience in living in the District of Columbia.

I know what my neighbors feel about this. I have my own feelings on it. I think this is only a matter of sheer justice that this measure be enacted, and at the earliest possible moment.

Since the speaker before me made some reference to home rule, I should like to say that none of my neighbors favor "home rule" as those words are defined by most people who agitate for this. It has been my experience that most people who agitate for home rule are people far removed from the District of Columbia and they have theoretical ideas about what is proper for other people and have ideas as to what is of advantage to themselves for political, or other, reasons for becoming enthusiastic. In my opinion, it is not the desire of the majority of the people of the District of Columbia to have home rule. I find the majority of the people of the District of Columbia are very bitterly, violently, and vigorously opposed to the so-called home-rule provision; but they are in favor of the provision which is before us today. I hope it is enacted as soon as possible.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, we are about to adopt a resolution which if ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, or 38 States, will become the 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I am a member of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, which held hearings on this and related resolutions. I attended all the hearings and participated in the deliberations of the subcommittee and the full committee.

I regard the amendment of the Constitution of the United States as an extremely serious matter. I think we ought to pause and reflect that this remarkable document, the Constitution, has proved workable and flexible enough to permit our Nation to grow in the century and a half of its existence without serious change in the phraseology of our original charter. This consideration is one which should give us all pause when we are contemplating modifying that basic document.

We ought to reflect also that if we regard the bill of rights, the first 10 amendments, as an integral part of the Constitution itself, the Constitution has really been amended permanently only 10 times. The 18th amendment we found necessary to repeal by the 21st amendment. The 22d amendment, the Presidential tenure amendment, after less than 20 years, is now under attack. There is a great deal of sentiment for, and I believe the Senate even commenced hearings on, another constitutional amendment to repeal the 22d amendment.

We should also remember that only five additional resolutions have been presented by the Congress to the States and have failed of ratification. Thus, we realize that when we are proposing to add a 23d amendment to the Constitution we are taking a very serious step.

For that reason, I approached this proposal with resistance, and probably with the least enthusiasm of any member of the subcommittee and of the full Judiciary Committee.

I should like to point out some of the aspects of this proposed constitutional amendment which the Members of the House should have in mind when they vote and which may contribute to the consideration by the several legislatures of this resolution, if it is passed by a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate.

First, I do not believe there is a Member of this body or the other body who wants to deprive any legally qualified citizen of his right to participate in the selection of agents to express his will in their government. But this amendment does not cure that.

This amendment will merely enable the Congress to provide the means whereby electors for the District of Columbia could participate in the selection of President and Vice President. But, it does not do anything for a lot of other citizens of the United States—for the 2,300,000 Puerto Ricans who are citizens of the United States or for the people of other territories such as Panama, the Canal Zone, Samoa, the Virgin Islands and Guam. They will not have their franchise granted to them by this amendment.

The resolution before us is piecemeal legislation and it is also compromised legislation. Even with respect to the residents of the District of Columbia, it does not provide for a full voice in the election of officials who will exercise governmental authority over them. They have no representation in the Congress of the United States and this amendment will not give it to them. They will have no representation in any territorial legislature or in any local unit of government. So this is only a partial franchise that you are granting to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is true, is it not, that there is no constitutional authority needed in our system of government to give the District of Columbia a delegate or several delegates in the House, if we so desire to do?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman, I believe, is correct as far as the constitutional authority of the Congress is concerned. We have provided by statute for delegates or commissioners from the territories, and we have that authority under the Constitution without further amendment.

There is considerable doubt, however, that the Congress could grant voting rights to any such representative of the District of Columbia. He could be here in the same sense that the Commissioner of Puerto Rico is here or the delegates that we used to have from the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

But, voting representation in the Congress either in the House of Representatives or the Senate or both, probably, could be provided for the District of Columbia only by a constitutional amendment. Indeed, the original form of this resolution did contain such a provision which would enable the Congress to provide for the election of delegates to the House of Representatives with the privilege of voting. But, that was stricken in the committee consideration of the measure.

Let me also point out that my attitude was that if this desirable objective; namely, granting the franchise to District residents, could be attained without amending the Constitution of the United States, but by mere statutory enactment, that we ought to explore all such possibilities carefully, thoroughly, and fully

before we take the unusual and important step of tampering with the Constitution of the United States.

Some questions were asked along that line during the hearings, and I just want to call them to the attention of my colleagues. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who spoke earlier in the afternoon on the rule and who has sponsored legislation of this type for a number of years, was a witness before our committee on April 6, 1960. At page 28 of the hearings, I asked Mr. BROYHILL these questions and I received these answers:

Mr. MEADER. Mr. BROYHILL, you represent the area in Virginia which was previously at one time—I guess before 1846 or some such year—a part of the District of Columbia, the 10-mile square.

Mr. BROYHILL. A portion of my district was originally a portion of the District of Columbia—that is, Arlington County and Alexandria.

Mr. MEADER. Have there been any adverse effects that have come to your attention from the fact that the Federal Government did, by statute, relinquish or retrocede that portion of the District of Columbia back to Virginia?

Mr. BROYHILL. Any——

Mr. MEADER. Adverse effects so far as the National Government is concerned?

Mr. BROYHILL. No, indeed. The fact of the matter is that if you tried to get it back, you would meet with some resistance from people over there, I believe.

Some witnesses testified that retrocession was not popular either with the residents of the District or with the State of Maryland. I felt there should have been further exploration of the possibility of retrocession.

If the Maryland portion of the District, except for that portion which is now occupied by the principal Government buildings, the Federal Triangle, were retroceded to Maryland the residents of the District of Columbia would be given what? A partial vote? No, complete voting rights. They would have the right to vote for the Governor of the State of Maryland, for Representatives in Congress, and Senators, and their local city government.

The metropolitan area of Washington would not be artificially restricted by the District lines, but might become a normal metropolitan city. That possibility, in my judgment, although it is commented on in the committee report, was not thoroughly explored; it was superficially referred to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his observations and to ask him a question. As the gentleman may know, I am a member of the much-criticized District of Columbia Committee. When we have hearings about home rule we always bring up the idea: Why do we not retrocede part of the District to Maryland, contracting the Federal City? The gentleman I am sure will be interested to know that we could find no enthusiasm whatseover for that point of view. I do want the gentleman to know, however, that that point of view has been thoroughly explored by the District Committee.

Mr. MEADER. I want to call attention to another important aspect of this resolution. The resolution before you, on page 2, section 1, starting in line 2, reads as follows: "The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct" a number of electors, and so on. That language was adopted by the committee. The original resolution, and I want you to pay close attention to the distinction, read as follows: "The people of the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall elect in such manner and under such regulations as the Congress shall provide by law" a number of delegates and electors.

There is a very important distinction in the phraseology. I might say to the members of the committee that I suggested the language as it appears in the resolution before you because it follows precisely the language of the Constitution, article II, section 1, providing for the electors for President and Vice President.

Article II, section 1, clause 2, states "Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" a number of electors, and so forth.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the phrase I have quoted does not require popular election of electors for President and Vice President; the legislature is given complete authority in article II, section 1, to determine how presidential electors are to be selected. That is the same position Congress will be in if this resolution becomes an amendment to the Constitution.

What does that mean? After 38 States have ratified this resolution and it becomes amendment No. 23 of the Constitution, enabling legislation will be introduced to provide the manner in which residents of the District of Columbia shall select electors for President and Vice President. Do you have any idea where that bill will be referred? It probably will be referred to the District of Columbia Committee. I do not know whether we have accomplished very much or not if, having amended the Constitution, its implementation is referred to the District Committee, which some have accused of being unfriendly to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You will concede that once this amendment is adopted by the 38 States the Congress then has the power to provide a method for the selection of electors, does it not?

Mr. MEADER. That is what this amendment does; it authorizes Congress by legislation to provide for the selection of the presidential electors.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. There is nothing in this amendment that would authorize a so-called election for those electors; is that correct?

Mr. MEADER. It would be completely within the power of the Congress to decide in what manner these electors shall be appointed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman think that Congress could itself elect the electors without referring it to the people?

Mr. MEADER. Let me ask the gentleman whether under article II, section 1, the State legislatures might elect the electors or appoint the electors, if they so decided?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. I understand the gentleman's argument is that the State legislatures may now, if they so desire, provide the method of selection of the electors without referring it to a vote of the people; is that correct?

Mr. MEADER. I am simply reading the exact language of the Constitution. I do not intend to make any interpretation of it other than what the language imparts. I do not know whether the legislature of any State has ever provided for the selection of presidential electors or for the appointment, to use the constitutional phrase, of presidential electors in any other fashion than by a direct vote of the people. I know of no State where that has been done, and I do not know whether there is any litigation involving the interpretation of article II, section 1, or not. I am assuming, however, that this resolution will give Congress the same authority with respect to the appointment of electors that the State legislatures have under article II, section 1.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Once this is adopted and Congress fails to act in setting up machinery for the election of electors or their selection, then are they to be considered as a part of the electoral college and would they constitute one of the 538 that will be in that college?

Mr. MEADER. I believe that the count would be 540, would it not?—437 Representatives, 100 Senators, then 3 additional for the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Except that whenever this census is over, as I understand it, we go back to the 535; that is, after the last census.

Mr. MEADER. That is still to be determined.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But if the Congress fails to take any action whatsoever, the people would not be permitted to vote in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MEADER. I think it would take affirmative action by the Congress before anyone could vote for electors in the District of Columbia. Does not the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I agree it would take affirmative action, and that under the affirmative action the Congress could set the qualifications for electors or the voters.

Mr. MEADER. I believe that Congress could.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For the District of Columbia and set up the method and qualifications of the electors; could it not?

Mr. MEADER. It could, subject to any provisions in the Constitution, governing the time and place of choosing electors.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It could set up all of the election machinery if the selection is to be by an election?

Mr. MEADER. I believe that the Congress could.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. I have one other point. The District of Columbia being the seat of Government, a great proportion of the population is here only temporarily, being connected in one way or another with Government business. Many District residents actually exercise their franchise back home in States from which they come.

On that point I call the attention of the committee to page 34, Mr. McLaughlin's testimony, where he estimated the population of the District as 850,000 or so; but over 100,000 are estimated to have voted by absentee ballots in States from which they come.

In that connection I remind the committee that in the recent primary in the District of Columbia there was something less than 30,000 votes cast in the presidential preference primary.

I call attention also to the fact that the census statistics seem to indicate that the total number of persons 21 and over at the present time is estimated to be 553,000, of which a substantial number maintain voting residence in a State.

In that connection I call attention to the language of the report, and I must defer to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] on this matter; that is, the committee inserted language which indicated in future censuses the committee does not intend to have those persons counted for the purpose of establishing the number of electors who maintain their domicile and their voting residence in other States and vote there. That matter can be taken care of by Congress under its control over the census laws.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose that one of the most important duties that confronts one is when we are considering changing the basic document under which this country is governed. This decision as embodied in House Joint Resolution 757, will not only face the Members of the House and the Members of the other body. If two-thirds of the membership of the two bodies of the Congress approve this resolution, the general assemblies and legislatures of 50 States will within the next 7 years consider this change in the Constitution of the United States.

We have heard a great deal today about the provisions of this resolution. At the risk of boring some of my colleagues who have been so patient today I shall repeat what has been said in outlining the provisions of the resolution. It merely proposes an amendment to our Constitution empowering Congress later to provide for presidential and vice presidential electors for the District of Columbia, not to exceed the number of electors to which the least populous State in the Union may be now or hereafter entitled. This resolution should not be confused with the home rule agitation which has been so prevalent around the Capitol in recent days and for some time prior to the 86th Congress.

I think that as we consider this proposition we may, for the purpose of the record, consider some of the problems which will confront someone in the future in connection with this very simple resolution.

It has been pointed out in the committee hearings that there is some doubt as to what the actual population situation is in the District as compared to a sovereign State, by reason of some factors which are well known to all of us. In testimony before the committee the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Mr. McLaughlin, testified that according to his best information—I believe that is on page 34 of the hearings—some 100,000 residents of the District participated in the last general election through the medium of absentee ballots in their respective States. Of course, Mr. McLaughlin and the other witnesses would not undertake to say how many nonparticipating voters there were in the District who were eligible to participate in elections back home under the laws of their States.

In North Carolina, my home State, there is a specific statutory provision which preserves the voting eligibility of a North Carolinian who is here in Washington, residing here and working for the Government. I would presume that the same is true in other States. So, when we talk about the eligible voting population of the District of Columbia we are dealing with a rather illusory matter.

In our committee report we said on page 4 that—

> It is the committee's intention regarding future enabling legislation to carry out the provisions of this constitutional amendment, that no District inhabitants (including minor dependents) who maintain legal domiciles or voting residences elsewhere, be included in the census computation insofar as determining the number of electors is concerned.

So we are faced with this practical problem, that the District of Columbia must of necessity, if the intent of the committee is carried out, become a favorite child in the census reports of the future and there will be a practical problem which seems to me to be insurmountable.

I think that points out the wisdom of this provision in the resolution—to which some opposition has been expressed—that the District should be limited to the number of electors enjoyed by the least populous State. In doing that we will in effect attempt to bar persons from having the right to vote both here and elsewhere and having them counted in the District as eligible people in determining the number of electors.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. In the regular elections between 50 and 60 percent of the regular voters or the legal voters of a State vote, and that is about all. Judging from that ratio if 100,000 voted from the District, that would mean that at least 180,000 or 190,000 had the right to vote in their own States, if they wanted to.

Mr. WHITENER. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, we are dealing in a rather imponderable realm when we talk of the population and the eligible population here in the District and its fictional characters who, some would say, are being taxed without representation.

The District Commission President in testifying before the committee just a few short weeks ago testified that he estimated the population of the District of Columbia to be between 830,000 and 850,000. As I am informed, just this week the Census Bureau has reported that the population was some 747,000. So when we have this limitation it is a very salutary one, and one which I think makes it possible for those of us who approach this proposal somewhat hesitantly to go along with it. I express the hope that a sufficient number of our colleagues will support it to make it possible to submit it to the several States for ratification.

Without that limitation, the so-called Cramer amendment, I would have serious doubt as to whether it would be the proper thing to let someone go around the city of Washington and count heads and say that therefore the District of Columbia would be entitled to have so many electors, because some of these that are counted are heads of people who are participating in political activity in their own States for both of the major political parties, and who desire to preserve their legal residence in North Carolina, Illinois, or some other State. It would not be proper, I think, to count them twice.

There is a great history about this constitutional provision. Some say it was an oversight on the part of the Founding Fathers that they did not provide for election of electors for President and Vice President within the District of Columbia. From the research I have been able to make, I do not believe that was an oversight because it seems to have been contemplated that this territory known as the seat of the Government, not to exceed, as the Constitution says, an area 10 miles square would be sort of a no-man's land, and that no one could interfere with its administration other than the elected Representatives of the people who serve in the Congress of the United States.

Madison presented the matter with a proposed constitutional provision. Pinckney of South Carolina, my neighboring State, presented another proposition. Out of these came the present provision, clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution. According to the recorded history this provision was very severely criticized in many States, including my own State of North Carolina. The great James Iredell, who later served on the Supreme Court of the United States, in the ratifying body of North Carolina satisfied the people of my State that we should not have the situation of conflicting authority as to the administration of the affairs of what was known as the seat of Government.

I say to you in conclusion that I think too many persons in our country today

under the false contention of liberalism would strike down constitutional principles which were carefully thought out, and which are not outmoded. Today as we deal with this measure we can pass it and amend our Constitution in the orderly manner provided in article V of the Constitution.

But we should not confuse it with home rule. In my judgment we should never engraft on the statute books or the Constitution so-called home rule for this area, which is now and should eternally be the seat of the Government, regulated and controlled solely by those who are elected to serve in the two bodies of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Addonizio	Fisher	Mahon
Alexander	Flynt	Mitchell
Anfuso	Fogarty	Morris, Okla.
Ashmore	Forand	Moss
Auchincloss	Fulton	Moulder
Ayres	Gallagher	Patman
Bailey	Garmatz	Poage
Baker	Gray	Powell
Barden	Green, Pa.	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Hargis	Quigley
Beckworth	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Bennett, Mich.	Hemphill	Roberts
Bentley	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Holifield	Shelley
Boland	Holtzman	Short
Boykin	Ikard	Smith, Miss.
Brown, Mo.	Jackson	Spence
Buckley	Jennings	Springer
Burdick	Jensen	Steed
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Taber
Cahill	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Carnahan	Judd	Teague, Tex.
Casey	Kearns	Teller
Celler	Kelly	Thompson, N.J.
Daddario	Kilburn	Thompson, Tex.
Daniels	Kilday	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	Kilgore	Vinson
Dent	Kluczynski	Watts
Diggs	Lafore	Weis
Dorn, N.Y.	Landrum	Wharton
Dorn, S.C.	Loser	Willis
Dowdy	McGovern	Winstead
Durham	McMillan	Withrow
Elliott, Ala.	Macdonald	Wolf
Feighan	Machrowicz	Wright
Fino	Magnuson	Young

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution House Joint Resolution 757, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 325 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, it will not be my intention to be repetitious, but rather to discuss principally my amendment which was offered in and approved by the committee and which appears on page 2, line 8 of the resolution and reads "but in no event more than the least populous State."

That means that the residents of the District of Columbia would have a right to a number of electors equal to those of the least populous State in the Union. If the bill had been voted out as presented by the subcommittee without this amendment, it would have meant that the District of Columbia, not having the status of a State in this Union, would in effect have a larger number, unquestionably, of electors, meaning three, four, or five. If it were 5 it would have a larger number of electors than 13 States in the Union today. If it were three it would have an equal number of electors to four States in the Union. If it were 4, a number equal to 13 States and more than 4. It was likely under the anticipated population of the District (800,000) that it would at least have four electors as the subcommittee initially voted the bill out without my amendment. The District of Columbia would have a larger representation in determining who the President and Vice President of the United States should be than any one of the following States, and this is the reason it was thought as the bill came out of the subcommittee it was not really fair to those States that have full State status. For instance, Delaware has three, Nevada three, Vermont and Wyoming three. The following States have four. The District of Columbia under the initial bill would have had four and possibly five, so that the District voters would have more to say about presidential and vice-presidential electors than the four States I have named and at least an equal number of electors and an equal voice in saying who should be President and Vice President of the United States as the following States: Arizona, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, South Carolina, and Utah. Obviously, it is understood that the number of electors is determined by two for the U.S. Senators and one for each Representative in the House of Representatives.

Therefore, the feeling of many of us was that the District of Columbia would have a disproportionate voice in determining who the President and Vice President of the United States should be, and thus would possibly have an even greater say-so in those all-important offices than some 13 States, and assuredly equal to some 13 States in the Nation, depending on whether, under the subcommittee proposal the District would get four or five electors.

On the bill itself, let me say that this bill deals only with the question of the President and Vice President as chosen by the electoral college. This is not a home rule bill. I have not seen a home rule bill which I personally feel I could support. This is not a bill dealing with the question of Representatives in Congress. It has been agreed that the Congress has power to determine that issue by legislation without constitutional amendment any time in the future it sees fit to do so.

It also requires 7 years for ratification by three-fourths of the States. This is necessary legislation because the Constitution itself in article II, section 1, deals with this question of choosing the electors and only refers to the "States." Therefore the District of Columbia not being a State is in a no-man's land in a sense. Therefore a constitutional amendment is needed in order to permit the District of Columbia, in effect for this purpose alone under the Constitution, to choose electors.

At present the electoral college is set up with 537. It is anticipated it will be set up due to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii with 2 new Members in the House and 4 in the Senate for the 1960 election, adding 6 new electors over the previous 531 figure. It is expected the number this year for President and Vice President will be 537. If this proposal were effective, once it is ratified by the needed number of States, the District of Columbia would have 3 in addition to those 537. After 1960, it is probable that the number will go back to 535, depending on what Congress does in the future with regard to 2 Representatives from Hawaii and Alaska and the number of Members in the House of Representatives, which of course is a decision only Congress can make after the census is determined. But assuming the number remained at 537, then this bill would add 3 new electors. It would not diminish the number of electors the States presently have, which is the case in the event the Congress fixed the number of Representatives in the House, that is, that the District of Columbia would have three additional electors and there would not be three taken away from the States themselves.

That is the effect of the bill. With regard to the amendment itself again, the reason why this amendment was proposed, I having the privilege of offering it in committee, was that we were concerned about the District of Columbia having a greater status than the States in determining the number of electors and who should be the President and Vice President of the United States.

An additional reason is, it is to some extent a flexible formula. In other words, if the smallest State at any time should have in excess of three, which I might add is highly improbable, then, of course, the District of Columbia likewise would be entitled to that larger number. If the smallest State had a larger number, it does, and I think necessarily so, relate the question of new electors to relative electoral strength of the States themselves and the population of those States, and relates to the say-so that those States have at the present time and in the future as to who should be President. I do not think we can separate the question of the District of Columbia's right to make that determination from the rights the States have, and cannot afford to give it greater say-so than the States themselves have.

Also, I think it is a minimal number, but again it is no more than any of the smallest individual States would have.

For instance, as an example of the problem the committee had in reaching a decision, the State of Florida has 10 and has an anticipated expected population at the end of the census of 4,870,000 people, or an increase of 90 percent in population. This would, without this amendment, give the District of Colum-

bia half as many electors as the State of Florida. This would result in disproportionate voice of the 800,000 estimated people in the District, many of whom are not "residents," as compared to Florida as well as all other States. My amendment guards against this disproportionate District vote.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 757, providing for legislation which is long overdue.

This resolution provides that an amendment be added to our Federal Constitution which will permit the residents of the District of Columbia to vote in presidential elections for their choice for President and Vice President.

One of the fundamental concepts of our Founding Fathers was that the new Government was to be a government by representation. Such representation, of course, should not be and was not intended to be restricted to certain electors, and that others should not participate just because they happen to reside in a certain locality. The recent civil rights bill was passed to insure the free right of suffrage to certain of our citizens who, it had been claimed, were being denied that privilege.

There is a group of our citizens, however, who are still being denied this fundamental right. I refer, of course, to those of our citizens who have their permanent home here in the District of Columbia, the Capital City of this great Nation, and, as such, the place where our Federal laws are made, which, among other responsibilities, are to guarantee and protect the rights of all of our citizens.

There seems to be no logical reason why these citizens should not have this Federal franchise. Certainly they are as interested in who is to be their President and Vice President as any other citizen. The denial of their right to vote for these offices seems to be more a matter of neglect than of intent. There is certainly no justification for this disenfranchisement of these good people.

Let us now pass this resolution, to start on its way an amendment that, when passed by the necessary three-fourths of the several States, will correct this oversight and give to the citizens of the District of Columbia this fundamental American right.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 757. In my opinion, this constitutional amendment is very much needed and is long overdue. I feel very strongly that the citizens in the District of Columbia should have the right to vote for President and Vice President. These citizens are taxpayers and are subject to our Federal laws. They should have the right to participate in the selection of a President and Vice President to govern them.

This is only one of several needed steps. I hope that Congress will also soon recognize the need for granting home rule to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I support House Joint Resolution 757. This resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution, will grant representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia. Simply stated, the resolution, if adopted by us and subsequently ratified by three-fourths of the States, would permit the residents of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President. The bill is not perfect, because it contains one glaring shortcoming, which I shall discuss further in a moment. Nevertheless, I support it.

At times it is difficult to realize that the citizens of this great city are unable to express their preference at the ballot box for the office of President or Vice President. The people of the District are no different than those in the cities you and I represent. The Treasury consumes their tax dollar in the same fashion as they do any other revenue. No boy was disqualified from serving in the Armed Forces because he was a resident of the District of Columbia. The District has a population equal to or larger than several States and the tax revenues from it exceed that of 25 States.

The vitality of this city stems from its residents regardless of the fact that the principal industry of this city is government. Our concern is with these residents who are American citizens. As such they deserve the rights and privileges of Americans, and among them certainly the opportunity to vote in presidential elections.

Now, what is the shortcoming in this bill? The bill gives the District of Columbia "a number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State." It is this "but" clause—this limitation upon the number of electors—that is bad. It serves no useful purpose, it violates logic, and it smacks of spite. If there is merit and worth in the general proposal, why must it be done in such a manner as to impose, by constitutional language, a permanent inferior status upon the District's participation in the electoral college? It is no argument that there is a shifting population in the District, or that a census is not a true count of the voting population because there are residents of the District who vote by absentee ballot in the States. This same argument is applicable to a great many areas. In my own congressional district in Manhattan, for example, there are many residents who vote elsewhere—in Connecticut, in New Jersey, in upstate New York, and in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

The bill comes to us under a closed rule which permits no amendments. Therefore, an amendment to strike out the limitation would be out of order. This is indeed unfortunate, and I fear we have written in language that we will one day regret. Perhaps a closed rule is necessary, as a practical matter, to get this bill enacted, bearing in mind that a two-thirds vote is required. But I fear we have overcompromised on this one point.

This bill of course does not grant home rule to the District of Columbia. That is another subject, but no less important. It is unfortunate that the home rule bill is not also before us for action.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the resolution which will set in motion machinery which will permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President. This resolution is brought to the consideration of the House today after many weeks of detailed study by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and by the full Committee on the Judiciary. The resolution presents one issue, namely, should American citizens who are residents of the District of Columbia be permitted to vote for President and Vice President as are other American citizens? Other issues such as statehood with the accompanying right to representation in the Congress and the principle of local self-government are not being considered in this legislation. I know of no reason why this legislation should not receive the wholehearted approval of all of my colleagues. The language is clear. It is brief and unambiguous. I would like to point to the language of the resolution, and to the fact that in drafting it the committee has been very careful to follow the parallel language of other portions of the Constitution.

So that there cannot be any question about the meaning of the language, so that there cannot be any new issues raised that have not already been considered by the courts of the land, brevity in the drafting of legislation, brevity in drafting constitutional provisions is of paramount importance; because, as you increase the number of words you also proportionately increase the number of opportunities for misunderstanding and consequent lawsuits.

Congress as the legislative authority over the District of Columbia will determine the exact details of exercising the vote.

I want to emphasize that this is a constitutional amendment, not mere legislation upon which we are voting. It must be approved by the House by a two-thirds vote, by the Senate in similar fashion, and finally ratified by three-fourths of the States before it is a part of the law of the land.

I do not feel that this action is premature; rather, it is long overdue. If arguments should be advanced that it is unwise or premature the fact that it will be subjected to the scrutiny of many people for many months will afford ample opportunity for consideration and weighing of all factors. I want to request that my colleagues in the House

give their earnest consideration and approval to this very worthwhile and long-needed amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the Judiciary Committee for bringing this very important piece of legislation to the floor. I think it will be recalled that during debate on the civil rights bill I offered an amendment to accomplish this same purpose. At that time the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], said a bill would be brought in providing this constitutional amendment, and I am delighted it is here. I shall support it.

I am disappointed that the District of Columbia will not have representation in the House of Representatives. The more I sit on committees having to consider the affairs of the District the more I am convinced that the people of the District should have some representation here to present their arguments and their position to the committees of Congress.

When we say we are giving the right to vote to the people of the District of Columbia we are, in fact, giving back to the people the right to vote, for the Federal city in my opinion is different than Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Canal Zone that have been spoken of. The area now occupied by the District of Columbia was at one time part of the States, and the people resident therein had the right to vote, had all the rights of citizenship, the right to elect Members of Congress. When we took from those States the original area of the District of Columbia we took away from the residents thereof their constitutional rights to vote for President, Vice President, Senators and Members of the House. We are now in fact giving back part of those things we took from them, and I hope that later we will give back to them more in the way of representation. I believe under the Constitution the House cannot grant home rule, but I do believe that this is a step forward. I hope the bill now pending will pass and I hope the 38 States will soon ratify this action of the great Judiciary Committee.

I shall urge the State of Ohio to ratify as soon as possible.

May I say further that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] has done outstanding work on this bill as he has on the civil rights bill and all other legislation before his committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 757 and urge unanimous passage by the Members of the Committee.

This is truly historic legislation. And today is a great day for the citizens of the District of Columbia. It is, also, a great day for the Members of the House of Representatives. For on this day, June 14, 1960, the House sets in motion the enfranchisement of the last primitive pioneer colonial, political dependents in the United States.

Closing this last voting gap in our citizenry has taken 160 years. Since 1800, the democratic ideals from our fountain of justice for the rights of individual persons, of responsibility by individual citizens for the nature and conduct of their own government, and of responsiveness by elected Government officials to the problems of the citizens served, have all flowed inexorably through the corridor of time to the peoples in the farthest reaches on earth. They have flowed to most everyone save those persons occupying the doorstep of the citadel of democracy. These are the citizens who more than any of our citizens have gazed daily and longingly upon the U.S. Capitol, holding forth as it does the Statue of Freedom.

This symbol has meant to the District of Columbia citizens freedom in every respect but freedom to participate in the elective representative government process. Lacking this essential freedom has meant that the District of Columbia citizens until now have been the most free political serfs in the world. They have not, for the past 160 years, been full-fledged American citizens.

Since the end of World War II, over 755 million persons have established their own independent governments. These are new nations flying for the first time the flag of freedom. True, they are underdeveloped economically, politically youthful, socially emergent, taking firm first steps on their own to combat illiteracy, disease, and poverty. But they are free people. They can determine and participate in the conduct of their governments. They are now outside the Communist bloc. We must continue to help them remain free and independent.

Thus there is, in addition to all others, an immediate and timely reason to pass House Joint Resolution 757. By enfranchising the citizens of the District of Columbia, we will, on this Flag Day in 1960, be completing our firm fabric of freedom. The Statue of Freedom fully embellished will glisten and gleam with a luster, new and fresh, having lost its last tarnish, the unsightly spot before its eyes of District of Columbia citizens prohibited from voting.

This freedom light inspires and will continue to inspire all free persons, confirming them in their entitlement. This light will keep alive the noble aspirations of all those hoping to be free.

I urge passage of House Joint Resolution 757, and having extended these rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia, Congress should provide home rule to them to make them full-bodied American citizens.

The definitive work on the subject of home rule is "Government of the District of Columbia," by W. J. Dodd. The following historical facts are related there.

On the first Monday in December 1800 the seat of the U.S. Government was transferred from Philadelphia to the Federal District on the banks of the Potomac. In a letter to Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant on September 9, 1791, the three Commissioners were appointed by President George Washington to lay out and survey, purchase or accept such lands as the President deemed proper for the use of the U.S. Government and to provide suitable buildings for the Congress, the President, and the public officers of the Government. In discharging their responsibilities the Commissioners stated to Major L'Enfant that "We have agreed that the Federal District shall be called the Territory of Columbia and the Federal city the city of Washington."

Between 1790 and 1801 the laws of the States of Maryland and Virginia remained in force in the parts of the territory ceded by these States as a seat of the Federal Capital. On February 27, 1801, the Congress provided that the laws of Virginia should remain in force in that part of the District of Columbia ceded by that State, and the laws of Maryland should remain in force in that part ceded by Maryland. The District of Columbia was erected into two counties; one lying east of the Potomac called the county of Washington, the other lying west of the Potomac called the county of Alexandria. The incorporation of the city of Washington by Congress on May 3, 1802, increased the number of governing bodies in the District of Columbia to five: First, the county of Alexandria; second, the town of Alexandria; third, the county of Washington; fourth, the town of Georgetown; fifth, the city of Washington.

As time passed the Federal Government did not find occasion to use the territories ceded by Virginia as a site for public buildings. The people of the town and county of Alexandria were from the first dissatisfied because of their failure to reap any advantages from their inclusion within the Federal District. No benefits accrued to them from the connection, but on the other hand they were subject to the hardship of disfranchisement except with reference to their local affairs, and because Congress had not had time to give to a systematic revision of their laws, they were still subject to the somewhat antiquated laws which were enforced in Virginia in 1800. In the early part of 1846 petitions were presented to Congress asking that the town and county of Alexandria be retroceded to Virginia. On July 9, 1846, Congress retroceded to Virginia all that part of the District lying west of the Potomac River, the question of retrocession being first submitted to a vote of the citizens of that territory. By Presidential proclamation of September 7, 1846, the town and county of Alexandria ceased to form a part of the District of Columbia.

The county of Washington was governed as a county under the laws of Maryland until 1812. In that year Congress, by law, provided that the governing body, a levy court, should be composed of seven members designated by the President from among the justices of the peace of the county. This form of government continued substantially the same until 1871.

The town of Georgetown was governed under the laws of Maryland until 1805. That year Congress provided that a board of common councilmen of 11 members was to be annually elected by the

free white male citizens of full age who had resided within the town for 12 months and had paid a tax to the corporation and 5 persons were elected by the same voters to serve as aldermen for a term of 2 years. These officials annually by joint ballot chose a mayor and a recorder. In 1830 Congress provided that the mayor should be biennially elected by the citizens qualified to vote for aldermen and common councilmen. In 1856, Congress authorized the town of Georgetown to levy an annual poll tax of $1 for school purposes and granted the right to vote to every free white male citizen who had attained the age of 21 years and resided within the limits of the town for 1 year and had paid the school tax for the year preceding the one in which he desired to vote.

On May 3, 1802, the city of Washington was divided into three wards. A council of 12 members was created, elected annually by ballot on a general ticket by the free white male inhabitants of full age who had resided in that city for 12 months and who had paid taxes therein within the year preceding the election. The councilors chose from among themselves five members to form a second chamber. The mayor of the city was annually appointed by the President of the United States. Ordinances passed by the council were submitted to the mayor for his approval, but if he should veto them they might be reconsidered and passed by votes of three-fourths of the two branches of the city council. In 1804 Congress provided that each chamber of the city council should consist of nine members, to be chosen annually on separate ballots. In 1812 Congress provided that the board of aldermen should consist of eight members, elected for a term of 2 years, two from each of the four wards into which the city was now divided. The board of common council was composed of 12 members, 3 being from each ward, for a term of 1 year. The mayor was annually elected by joint ballot of the common council and board of aldermen. The elective franchise continued to be restricted to white males who paid taxes. The mayor was required to be 30 years of age and a resident of the city for the 2 years immediately preceding his election. In 1820 the mayor became elective biannually by the people qualified to vote for members of the common council and board of aldermen. In 1848 the officers of assessor, register, collector, and surveyor of the city were made elective and the suffrage was extended to all free white males of 21 years of age who were subject to the school tax of $1 per annum and who had paid such tax and all other taxes.

On January 8, 1867, a change was made in the charters of both Georgetown and Washington. This provided that male persons above the age of 21 years should have the right to vote at elections in the District of Columbia, without any distinction on account of color or race, and thus, established universal male suffrage. A law made on March 18, 1869, repealed the provisions of the charters of Georgetown and Washington which restricted to white persons the right to hold office.

In the early part of 1870 a movement began in favor of establishing a centralized government for the District of Columbia. This movement was successful, and by an act of February 21, 1871, the separate governments of the cities of Washington and Georgetown were abolished, and a government for the District established, similar in organization to that provided for the territories of the United States. The executive power was vested in a Governor, appointed by the President of the United States with approval of the Senate for a term of 4 years. The Governor was given a veto upon all legislation, such veto to be overcome by the votes of two-thirds of all members of the Council and House of Delegates. Legislative power was vested in an assembly composed of a Council and a House of Delegates. There were 11 members in the council, all appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate. The House of Delegates was composed of 22 members elected for a term of 1 year. Twenty-two districts were formed for the election of the members of the House of Delegates. Members of the two legislative bodies were to reside in the districts from which they were appointed or elected. The suffrage was exercised by all male citizens of the United States of the age of 21 years who had resided in the District for 1 year and the legislative assembly was forbidden to limit the right to vote in any way.

The voters qualified to elect members of the House of Delegates were authorized to choose a Delegate to the House of Representatives to serve 2 years with the same rights and privileges as Delegates from the territories.

The most important organ of the new government was the board of public works which consisted of the Governor as president and four persons appointed by the President of the United States with the approval of the Senate. The board had entire control of and power to make all regulations for keeping in repair the streets and sewers of the city, and such other works as entrusted to it by the legislative assembly or by the Congress. The board was limited and had no power to make contracts to bind the District to the payment of any sums of money except in pursuance of appropriations made by law. And not until after such appropriations had been made. Early in 1872, certain citizens of the District of Columbia charged the board of public works with extravagance, violation of law, and corruption. A congressional committee majority report found no evidence of corruption or illegality. However, on August 19, 1871, the Congress limited the debt of the District of Columbia to $10 million. The new government of the District had inherited a debt of nearly $4 mililon and by May 1872, had added nearly $5 million to the original amount. The board of public works in 1872 made improvements upon and around Government property and on January 8, 1873, Congress appropriated $1,241,920.92 to pay for such improvements. At the same time Congress forbade the board to incur further liabilities on behalf of the United States. Notwithstanding this prohibition, the board of public works on November 1, 1873, claimed an indebtedness of the U.S. Government to the District of over $4 million.

The arbitrary conduct of the board toward individuals, the rapidly increasing debt of the District, and the undeniable jobbery prevalent in the letting of contracts aroused the people to petition Congress for another investigation into the affairs of the District. A joint congressional committee found that the treasurer of the board was the sole disbursing officer of the funds under its control and there was no check whatever upon his actions. He kept no cash account and the checks issued by him did not correspond with the amounts which he reported to have been paid. He had the power to draw his checks upon public moneys without the knowledge of any other member of the board. No record was made of audits by the board. The board itself had never verified the accounts of the offices of treasurer and auditor. The original plan of improvement by the board was for $16 million. However, without further basis for making contracts they expended over $12 million in excess of this sum. These extensive obligations were contracted without legislative authority and in the face of legal prohibition. The joint committee found that an attempt had been made to accomplish an extensive and much needed system of improvements in too short a time. Because of this haste, contracts were often let before the details of engineering, work, plans, and estimates had been properly made, and defective plans added to the extension of the original estimates. Contracts were let without open competition at a fixed scale of prices and were sometimes awarded to persons who did not expect to fulfill them but who sold them to others at a profit.

The committee further found that the board of public works had done a tremendous amount of work within a short time. It had changed the whole appearance of the city of Washington. It had created a beautiful city out of a straggling, dirty, and mean looking town. However, by 1874, the District of Columbia was bankrupt. The joint committee recommended what was practically the appointment of receivers to conduct its affairs and to settle its financial obligations. On June 20, 1874, the existing government was abolished. Three Commissioners appointed by the President were vested with all powers formerly exercised by the Governor and board of public works. An officer of the Engineer Corps of the U.S. Army was detailed to have control of all public improvements.

When the government by Commissioners was created, it was considered merely a temporary expedient. A joint select committee was appointed by the Congress to prepare a suitable form of government for the District. On December 7, 1874, the committee reported an elaborate bill of over 200 pages. The bill was tabled by the Congress. The debate revealed that the appointed

board of public works was the strongest organ of the territorial government and its abuse of power was the cause of the dissolution of that government. The defects of the territorial government did not arise from its elective portion. Finally, on June 11, 1878, the organic law of the District of Columbia establishing the present Commission form of government was passed by the Congress.

Under the Federal Constitution the Congress may grant and has granted to the Commissioners power to adopt local police, health, building, and other regulations. Congress can delegate only its powers which relate to purely local matters and must exercise directly its legislative powers with reference to subjects of general interest such as contracts, titles of real property, corporations, commerce, and marriage. Congress is and under the Constitution must remain the supreme legislative power of the District of Columbia. The Commissioners and other bodies exercising subordinate legislative power have only such powers as Congress may see fit to confer upon them. Under the Constitution, Congress cannot confer general powers of legislation upon the District. But it has not seen fit even to confer the full powers of a municipal legislature upon the present District Government. It now occupies toward the District of Columbia a twofold relation of a general legislature and municipal council. The legislative power of the Commissioners is largely negative in character. They may usually prevent legislation by the expression of their disapproval. The bills submitted by the Commissioners to the Congress are frequently not reported at all by the District committees, and if reported, are so amended as to defeat the objects which the Commissioners have in view.

Even when Congress does act, it often acts in an unsatisfactory manner. As an indication of the careless methods of legislation with reference to the District of Columbia, the compulsory education law of June 8, 1906, provided that inspectors under the child labor law should assist in the enforcements of its terms. No child labor law was enacted until May 28, 1908. The child labor law when enacted provided for two inspectors who should enforce its terms, but Congress made no appropriation for the payment of such inspectors.

Since 1949, home rule legislation has been considered by the Congress on several occasions. Four previous times in the intervening years the Senate has passed home rule bills. This year for the fifth time, the Senate has acted favorably. A number of companion bills before the subcommittee provide for establishing the territorial form of government for the District of Columbia. H.R. 4633 is my bill. No doubt many Members will file statements rather than to appear personally. I hope the subcommittee's deliberations will be conducted with dispatch and that this public-interest legislation can be considered on the House floor before this session of the Congress adjourns. To this end, I introduced House Resolution 320 on July 16, 1959, to facilitate consideration by the House of the territorial government proposals in this 1st session of the 86th Congress.

I do not presume today to discuss with the subcommittee the fundamentals of American democratic theory. But I do think that this is an appropriate time to reconsider and reiterate what we, as citizens of the United States, ought all to agree on as basic principles of political life in a free society.

We have a dual concept in our political theory which recognizes the reciprocal relationship between civic rights and civic responsibility. The American citizen is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights in the conduct, policymaking, and management of his government. In exercising those rights he assumes a relatively large measure of civic responsibility to take an interest in the affairs of government and to participate actively in those affairs.

What civic rights do American citizens throughout the country have? They have the right to vote assuming they meet reasonable qualifications, for public officers of their own choosing, and to run for elective offices themselves if they wish to do so. Citizens of the United States are entitled, within the framework of wide discretion, to select for themselves the form and manner in which the government of their local affairs shall be conducted. They are entitled to participate in the election of local officials. They are protected by constitutional guarantees against arbitrary or unreasonable infringements of their political and civic rights.

Citizens of the United States, in exercising their civic rights, assume great responsibilities, far exceeding those assumed by citizens in an authoritarian dictatorship who are spoon-fed from a cafeteria of state directives over which they have absolutely no control. Our citizens are expected to inform themselves about governmental and political affairs, and to go to the polls to vote for candidates of their own choice. Our young people, through our schools and other educational activities, are taught and encouraged to learn how to be good citizens by taking an active part in politics. Our society endows our citizens with free civic and political rights, and it extracts from them a large measure of civic responsibility.

What of the citizen of the District of Columbia? In contrast to other Americans, he is not a citizen of any State, and thus does not, as all others do, hold dual citizenship. He is only a citizen of the United States. He lives in the United States, pays taxes to his Government, serves in the Armed Forces of his country. Yet, he is not entitled, through an act of Congress, to vote or to manage purely local affairs through local self-government. His only rights are solely those of the Constitution. From a legislative standpoint he can petition the Government for redress of grievances; he can join voluntary associations for the advancement of goals through collective action; he has freedom of expression by speech or by writing. He has no effective civic rights. The Congress has imposed upon him telling civic obligations. He is, in effect, a serf who periodically does fealty to his masters in the Federal Government. What different status does he have from all the colonials of history? Very little, except the guarantees of the Constitution.

Citizens living in the District of Columbia pay their annual tribute to the Federal Government in taxes, though they are not represented in the levying of those tributes. And they pay more than most Americans. From 1929 until 1941, per capita personal income in the District of Columbia was higher than in any other State in the entire Nation. Since then the District has been in the top four or five among States in per capita personal income. In 1957, per capita personal income in the District of Columbia was fifth in the Nation, exceeded only by the States of Connecticut, New York, Delaware, and California.

Per capita personal income among 5 highest States and the District of Columbia, 1957

State:	
Connecticut	$2,821
Delaware	2,740
New York	2,578
California	2,523
District of Columbia	2,514

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "U.S. Income and Output," 1958, pp. 158–159.

Such a high per capita income means that the resident of the District of Columbia pays, on a per capita, a higher proportion of Federal taxes than most Americans in other parts of the country. Yet the District citizen has no voice in the determination of how Federal funds appropriated for local purposes shall be allocated, and no voice in the management of government. Furthermore, in addition to personal income taxes, the District resident pays substantial personal property taxes, though he has no control over or voice in the allocation of or use of such funds. He is taxed, and pays far more than the average share, without being represented in any way. Our Founding Fathers believed that taxation without representation was the cruelest form of tyranny. The Congress has, since 1874, allowed this state of affairs to continue. It is respectfully submitted that in 1959, after 85 years of congealed citizenship, there should be a thaw. The rights of free people again should flow in the lives of the people of the District of Columbia. For these citizens of the United States deserve privileges as well as responsibilities.

In addition to dutifully paying his taxes on income and property to the Government, without representation, the citizen of the District of Columbia is liable to service in the Armed Forces. In this respect District residents have made an extraordinary contribution. In World War II, the District of Columbia contributed 105,000 young men and women to the Armed Forces, a greater number than that contributed by 14 of the States. An even higher proportion of District residents marched off to defend the freedom to which they were not themselves fully entitled during the Korean war, when 28,200 citizens of the District of Columbia entered the Armed Forces of

the United States. This is a greater number than that contributed by 22 States of the Union. The record proves that the citizens of the District of Columbia are outstanding citizens of the United States.

The Congress in imposing burdensome obligations upon citizens of the District of Columbia has refused them a share in the determination of their own local affairs. This denial of fundamental civic rights which would create widespread public abhorrence if they were refused to Americans living elsewhere in the country. Those who support local self-government—local integrity in the determination of purely local affairs—should, to be consistent with our traditional high principles, restore home rule for the District of Columbia. Restoring home rule would destroy the blighted area at the doorstep of the Capitol of freedom.

These residents of the District of Columbia are, I think, the last remaining citizens of the United States who are wards of the Congress. We have made our political peace with the Indian tribes. Citizens living on Indian reservations have the right to participate in politics and, in large measure, manage their local affairs.

Eighty-five years of disuse normally would result in complete atrophy of civic interests by any citizens. Apathy, indifference result from lack of exercise. But any indifference of the residents of the District of Columbia toward their governmental affairs, and their political life, is far exceeded by basic disinterest by most of past Congresses toward their political fate. And congressional indifference toward District affairs and District problems is not a recent development. Walter F. Dodd 50 years ago wrote in 1909 that—

> The system of congressional legislation works badly in great measure because of the want of interest in District affairs upon the part of the great body of Senators and Representatives. Important legislation to which there is no particular objection often fails simply because the pressures of other business which affects more closely the interests of the Members of Congress. (From "the Government of the District of Columbia: A Study in Federal and Municipal Administration," 1909, p. 66.)

The absence of civic rights for citizens of the District of Columbia has, in my opinion, the further consequence of stultifying the development of responsible municipal leadership and the active interest of citizens in their own fate—a kind of political nihilism has been forced upon these citizens of the United States.

The present three commissioner form of government was created by act of Congress, approved June 11, 1878. From 1879 through 1920, the Federal Government made what is called the Federal payment to the District of Columbia on the basis of 50 percent of the general fund appropriation. Thus, the local District of Columbia taxpayer paid 50 cents of each dollar appropriated to operate and maintain the District with the remaining 50 cents being paid by the Federal Government. The primary purpose of this Federal payment is to compensate for the fact that the Federal Government, as the principal employer and land user in the District, is tax exempt, thus depriving the city of major sources of tax revenue common to other cities.

The practice of paying 50 percent of the cost of operating the District government was discontinued by the Congress in 1921. Since that time, the percentage of costs borne by the United States has fluctuated from a high of 39.5 percent in 1924 to a low of 8.5 percent in 1954. Since 1956, the Federal payment has been slightly over 12 percent. It is significant that during all this time, that is from 1879 to date, the Federal Government has maintained 100-percent control over the lawmaking power for the District of Columbia.

The most recently authorized annual payment by the Federal Government to the District is $32 million. However, the Congress has never appropriated the full authorized amount. In 1958, the Federal Government appropriated only $20 million of the authorized $32 million. In this regard, the most important legislative proposal submitted by the Commissioners in their 1959 state of the Nation's Capital report to the Congress was a request for the creation of a territorial form of government. The drive for home rule for the District of Columbia has developed strong impetus in recent years with a broad base of support regardless of political party affiliation. In the present Congress, three separate proposals have been submitted. These are S. 659, the Bible bill, providing for a territorial form of government; H.R. 1379, the Wier bill, providing for a mayor and a council form of government; and H.R. 2321, the Auchincloss bill, providing for a commission form of government. A comparision of the significant differences in these bills is set forth below. It is important to keep in mind that the territorial and the mayor-council bills are identical except for the differences noted below:

EXECUTIVE

S. 659: Bible bill, Territorial	H.R. 1379: Wier bill, Mayor and Council	H.R. 2321: Auchincloss, Commission
Governor, $21,000 and $2,500: A. Appointed by President. B. 4 years.	Mayor, $15,000 and $2,500 expenses: A. Elected by people. B. 4-year term.	Mayor, $19,000 and $2,500: A. Elected by Commission. B. 1-year term.

LEGISLATIVE

I. Legislative Assembly: A. 15 members. B. $10,000. C. $12,000 (for Chairman). D. 2-year term. E. Elected.	I. Council: A. 9 members. B. $3,000. C. $5,000 (for Chairman). D. 2-year term. E. Elected.	I. Commission: A. 5 members. B. $19,000. C. President elected among Commission. D. Secretary appointed. E. 1 commission elected by people annually. F. 5-year term.
II. District delegate: A. 2-year term. B. Elected by people.	II. Board of Education: A. 9 members. B. $29 a meeting. C. 2-year term. D. Elected by people.	Title IV: A. Each act deposited with Congress. B. After 30 days, sent to President and if no congressional joint resolution approving, President can approve act.
	III. District delegate: A. Elected 2 years.	

It is hoped and expected that the 86th Congress will adopt a home rule measure. The territorial bill has the broadest base of political support and appears to have the best chance of adoption.

Within the past year the most significant governmental development concerning Washington and the surrounding areas was the establishment by Congress of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Affairs. This committee is made up of three Senators—Senator BIBLE, of Nevada; Senator MORSE, of Oregon; Senator BEALL, of Maryland—and three Congressmen—Mr. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina; Mr. SMITH, of Virginia; and Mr. BROYHILL, of Virginia. During 1958, the staff of the joint committee developed significant reports on water supply, sewage disposal, and economic forecasts for the Washington metropolitan area. The area encompassed by the studies includes the District of Columbia; Arlington County and Fairfax County, Va.; Montgomery County and Prince Georges County, Md.

The most significant decision made by the joint committee was the unanimous proposal submitted to Congress on January 31, 1959. The joint committee favors the establishment of two governmental bodies, one Federal in nature—the other locally constituted. The Federal agency is the Regional Planning Council. This would be a nine member body; three representatives from the District of Columbia, one from each of the four counties, and two "at large" representatives, one from Maryland and one from Virginia. These members would be appointed by the President of the United States. The council would assume the functions of the National Capital Planning Commission with no authority over zoning. It would be financed with Federal funds. The establishment of this council would manifest a strong Federal interest in the entire metropolitan area. This Federal interest to date has been limited solely to the District of Columbia territorial boundaries. The manifestation of this Federal interest is justified by the great growth in population in the area since World War II. A strong community of social, economic, and political interest exists among the citizens of the four counties and the District of Columbia. By way of example, many, if not most,

of the persons who live in Montgomery County are employed either in the District of Columbia or Virginia. Though the increased Federal interest in the entire area is justified and should be made manifest, it is important to emphasize that this governmental structure would not impinge upon the local autonomy of the four counties in the two States.

The second governmental agency recommended by the joint committee is the Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference. Membership on this conference would be by election conducted by the counties. The conference would establish general policy on regional projects involving transportation, water supply, and sewage disposal. It would take steps to establish such projects. Financing for the conference would be by way of taxes collected by each county and transmitted to the conference. At the outset there would be a small Federal appropriation to establish the conference.

The joint committee thus has recommended the establishment of a combined Federal and local bicameral regional organization to coordinate development projects in the Washington metropolitan area. It should be emphasized, however, that the establishment of these two agencies would not break down the present balance of political power between the Federal and local governments.

A further important recommendation of the committee is the establishment of the office of Coordinator of National Capital Affairs. The Coordinator would be the Presidential aide in the White House advising the President on matters pertaining to the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area.

There is a very strong likelihood that the recommendation of the joint committee will be accepted by the Congress and these two agencies will be established within the next 2 years.

Finally, some mention should be made of the existing District of Columbia Committee for the House of Representatives. This committee, which now is an important factor in the enactment of all laws pertaining to the District of Columbia, consists of 25 Members of the House of Representatives. There are 16 Democrats and 9 Republicans. The committee is subdivided into four subcommittees: No. 1 deals with fiscal affairs; No. 2 with judiciary, insurance, and public utility matters; No. 3 with police, fire, traffic, streets, crime, and court matters; and No. 4 with health, education, recreation, and banking matters. Any citizen of the District of Columbia today can feel free, under the existing system, to contact any one of the members of the committees on any matters pertaining to roads, streets, sidewalks, retirement pay, taxes, and everything that any citizen would take up with a city council. To free Congressmen and Senators for national problems, home rule legislation is feasible and necessary.

Section 8, clause 17 of article I of the U.S. Constitution provides as follows:

Congress shall have power—

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings.

And while the Founding Fathers of our Republic may not have foreseen all the needs of our District citizens, they certainly had no intention of disenfranchising them and relegating them to the unfortunate status of wards of the State. James Madison wrote in No. 43 of the Federalist Papers of the Federal District that "as the inhabitants will find sufficient inducements of interest to become willing parties to the cession; as they will have had their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them" then they will agree willingly to reside in the special Federal District acquired for the purpose of establishing a National Capitol. The Founding Fathers assumed that no Congress would, under the Constitution, deny citizens living in the Federal District the ordinary and widely respected rights of self-government.

I respectfully urge the Congress to restore local representative government to the District of Columbia. It is perhaps the most significant domestic political anomaly of all time that our Nation which properly proclaims to the world its belief in the democratic process of self-government through congressional action abrogated representative institutions at the seat of our Government.

I have cosponsored the so-called territorial home rule bill because I believe it is the legislation which is most compatible with the unique place the Capitol of freedom occupies in the world while providing constitutional representative local government. It has the support of the administration, the District Commissioners, and of citizens' groups in the District of Columbia who are fighting for their civic life. Home rule for the citizens of the District of Columbia should be provided as well as the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, this is really a great occasion, because for the fourth time this Congress, this great 86th Congress, is recognizing the universal right of suffrage.

First, in 1959, we recognized and extended through the leadership of the Congress the introduction of Alaska as a State, then it was extended to the introduction of Hawaii as a State, then in extending the right of franchise to all possible disfranchised people in the Civil Rights Act of 1957, it was extended so that all the people of the country would be given the right to vote.

Now, for the great glory of the 86th Congress, we are going to extend that same privilege to the people who live in the District of Columbia.

This is the greatest Congress in the history of America, and I congratulate its Members on having this opportunity to vote for the extension of this privilege to the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a mild resolution which should win the overwhelming support of all Members of this Congress. However, I wish that it went even further than it does. I concur in what the gentleman from New York, Mr. LINDSAY, said, that there is an unfortunate limitation on page 2 with reference to the number of electors. I do believe we should go much further and grant home rule and self-government and representation to the people of the District of Columbia. Here in the Nation's Capital we really ought to be the showcase of democracy for the free world.

Someone during this debate referred to those supporting home rule for the District of Columbia as agitators, with theoretical ideas. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be called an agitator and am proud to wear that label. We would not be sitting here today were it not for some agitators at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge and those who wrote the Declaration of Independence. I love the theoretical ideas so boldly set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Self-government is a revolutionary principle for which I will keep right on being an agitator.

Nevertheless, I concur with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that we must take one step at a time; therefore, I hope that this resolution will win the overwhelming support of the Members of this House.

In passing this resolution, it is most appropriate and fitting that we take this action—the first step in amending the Constitution—to allow citizens of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President on this particular day, Flag Day. I am honored to join in this minor piece of agitation to extend democracy in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, like others, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing this measure before us. I certainly intend to vote for it. But I do want to take this time, Mr. Chairman, to point out some observations that perhaps have not been brought before the committee in some time.

We have talked considerably this afternoon and at various times about home rule for the District of Columbia. I certainly do not want my vote for this very worthwhile resolution to be considered as a vote for so-called home rule, and I say "so-called home rule" because the better term is "Capitol rule." I hold to the position just as sincerely as I can that a Federal city, reserved especially for the Capitol of the United States, is a responsibility of all the representatives of the United States and we cannot abrogate that responsibility. Some this af-

ternoon have talked about the political serfs in the District of Columbia, because they have been denied the right to vote for what we might call city government. May I remind you that if we abrogate our responsibility there will be literally thousands of political slaves behind an iron curtain who will not have any voice in government because there are literally tens of thousands of people all over America who have their legal residence in your State and mine who, because of their position, live in the District, who can never become bona fide citizens of the District. And yet we are suggesting that we take away from them the right of representation.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] mentioned a few minutes ago, if I recall correctly, the fact that there were 100,000 people, approximately, who voted in a presidential election here in the District several years ago. I take it then that these people voted by absentee ballot and I pause to yield to the gentleman to ask if the figure I gave is approximately correct.

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman that that was the testimony of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia as will appear on page 34 of the hearings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I shall assume that for every adult there probably is at least one other person who is not an adult, in the same situation, living in the District but with legal residence elsewhere. And I should assume, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] pointed out, that there are many thousands of people who are legal residents of States back home who live in the District who could have voted in this presidential election, to which I have referred, and who did not. So I suggest to you that the total number of people in the District of Columbia who have legal residence in the various States probably amounts to hundreds of thousands. You talk about political serfdom. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that you will have political slavery behind an iron curtain for many thousands of citizens if you give so-called home rule, such as has been envisioned by many of my colleagues—and I respect them and I love them and I admire them. But I cannot abrogate my responsibility for the Capital City because this city is different. Its problems are different. It is the seat of the National Government. Its many beautiful and ornate public buildings were built by taxpayers' funds from all over the United States. Just the other day in one of our appropriation bills as I recall, between one-third and one-half of all the money appropriated for public buildings—tax money of your constituents and mine, was spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we ever stop to think of how many thousands of people live in the District of Columbia who are employed by the Federal Government. There are the great problems of mass transit which will cost literally hundreds of millions of dollars, which problems cannot be solved by the District of Columbia alone. They must be solved also by you and me. And I intend to do my part in trying to solve these problems.

The pollution of the Potomac River: whose responsibility is it? It must be the responsibility of the whole Nation, I say to you. And so I could go on and on and on. So there are two points of view; one, the District of Columbia, a great city, belongs to all the people of America. And there is the other point of view; the District of Columbia would have its responsibilities divided between a sort of a Capital-rule type of government on the one hand and an acceptance of some responsibility on the part of the Federal Congress on the other.

I know not what course you may take, but as for me, I say sincerely and humbly, I shall always continue to look upon this beautiful Federal city as our Capital City. I am a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia now. I do not expect to be a member of it too much longer. I think that is a responsibility all of my colleagues ought to enjoy. But so long as I am on that committee, I shall take the responsibility of making decisions on the basis of what I think is best for all of this great beloved Nation of ours.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], as I recall, referred to the committee report on page 4 with respect to future enabling legislation if this resolution is adopted by the House and ratified by three-fourths of the States. He did not have time to read the language to which he referred but, by reason of its importance, I take that time now and I quote from page 4 of the report:

> It is the committee's intention, regarding future enabling legislation to carry out the provisions of this constitutional amendment, that no District inhabitants (including minor dependents) who maintain legal domiciles or voting residence elsewhere, be included in the census computation insofar as determining the number of electors is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to repeat that which I said at the beginning of the debate on this important proposal. It is a step forward, a historic step forward. It would serve a useful purpose if this resolution were unanimously adopted by the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. All Congresses are very important and, as we know, very important legislation comes up in each Congress. It has in the last Congress, in the present Congress, and it will in future Congresses. But there are some Congresses that go down in history because of certain happenings that are historic in nature. The 86th Congress will be a historic Congress not for one historic event but for two: First, the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, and the other resolution now under consideration amending the Constitution. I join thoroughly with the remarks of my friend from Ohio in urging the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the gentleman who said this was the greatest Congress the country has ever had, and shortly thereafter the majority leader said substantially the same thing, I will have to buy a new hat in the morning. It may be that because it has been and is my privilege to be a Member of this Congress. We are a great Congress. No doubt about that. Certainly we have had more inefficiency and waste; if we believe what we see in the RECORD and the press this Congress is the greatest in some respects within the memory of anybody here. We have established a record of spending, of the use of counterpart funds, and, if the press has the record correct, other public money for our own personal advantage over any previous Congress. Sure, we are a great Congress. Our tax levies, our spending, our public debt has never been exceeded. We are leaving a legacy to coming generations that has never been approached. Future generations will certainly remember us—but with what thoughts?

It is easy to give away the money exacted from others—or use it as our own. What does the Good Book say about pride?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution should not be changed except by the amendment procedure specified in the Constitution itself. The zeal we display today for preserving the Constitution is commendable. At the moment we are all constitutionalists. We praise the flexibility of the Constitution which has lived through the years, almost unchanged. The truth is, that we have already stretched the Constitution out of all recognizable shape and that today we are displaying our constitutional concern only on a noncontroversial matter, the granting to residents of the District of Columbia of the right to vote for President and Vice President. Yet, over the years we have adopted laws of dubious constitutionality without raising the constitutional question; and with few qualms about the oath taken every 2 years by Members of Congress. Using the general welfare clause and the interstate commerce provision we have justified many such measures if and when we felt justification was necessary.

As to specific laws which are unconstitutional as I see it, let me name a few: The present income tax, under which up to 91 percent of an individual's earnings may be seized—effective confiscation—and employers are compelled to act as tax collectors and bookkeepers for the Government without compensation; the social security program, which has been sold to the public and within the Congress as an insurance program, but justified before the courts as another out-and-out tax program; the farm programs, under which free Americans may be told how much of what crops they may raise on how many acres of their own land; the minimum wage law and the Davis-Bacon Act, which empower the Federal Government to establish wage rates in areas of commerce quite remote

from any subject to proper Federal jurisdiction; foreign economic aid programs, under which money seized from Americans is redistributed abroad in social welfare schemes whose relation to our national defense is a little hard to grasp; and Government dabbling in business enterprises either directly or through subsidies with the taxpayers' money as in the fields of public housing and power development.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, "As the District of Columbia goes, so goes the Nation" could very easily become the new political slogan.

The only reservation I had with respect to House Joint Resolution 757 was that if the District of Columbia is granted the privilege of voting for President and Vice President and the election returns were broadcast while the polls were still open in the States to the west, the outcome of the election could very easily be affected. With the difference in time from here to Hawaii and the fact that the majority of people go to the polls in the late afternoon and evening, the returns of a presidential election in the Capital of the Nation—the Federal city—could have a tremendous psychological effect upon the results elsewhere in the Nation.

To those people who have never been in Washington and know nothing about its citizens or the compact nature of its population, together with their attitude of hostility toward the occupant of the White House regardless of his political affiliation, the vote in the District could be controlling. This unprecedented situation should be desired by no one.

A study of the resolution, together with the committee report and the explanation by the able chairman, plus the colloquy between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], both members of the Judiciary Committee and able lawyers, have resolved this question to my complete satisfaction. The debate this afternoon has made it clear that Congress would have the power to prohibit the counting of the ballots or the totaling of them on voting machines until after the polls had closed in our most western State. It is also clear that Congress would have such power and authority to determine when the results of a presidential election in the District of Columbia would be made public.

No doubt House Joint Resolution 757 will receive early approval by the Congress and will be signed by the President. The critical hurdle will be to secure the approval of three-fourths of the State legislatures on the proposed amendment within the 7-year period.

Many State legislators might very well oppose the adoption of the amendment were they not cognizant of the fact that the Congress could postpone the release of the District of Columbia returns until the last American had cast his ballot. The debate this afternoon should resolve all doubt as to the congressional power in this regard.

The Committee on the Judiciary and its great and sincere chairman deserve much credit for the measure now about to be approved by the House, and the rapidity with which House Joint Resolution 757 was brought to the floor for consideration. The distinguished chairman and the members of the Rules Committee are to be commended for their expeditious consideration.

The prompt action by these two outstanding committees, composed of members from different sections of the country and of different psychological viewpoints, demonstrates the desire and purpose of this body that no American should be denied the right to vote for the two highest offices in the land.

I am sure the vote in both bodies, Mr. Chairman, will be practically unanimous, and I join with my fellow Members in hoping that the requisite number of States act within the prescribed time.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 757 which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia by granting representation in the electoral college.

Mr. Chairman, the framers of the Constitution did a magnificent job in providing guidelines and protecting individual rights of the citizens of this great Republic. It is a true charter for free men living with one another in peace and harmony. No other constitution has stood such rigid tests or served as well so many men. This Constitution has served this Nation throughout its history with few major amendments. It has been used as a model by our many States and many independent countries. Therefore, I have no criticism to offer about the work of our Founding Fathers in the drafting of this important document. It is possible that the failure to provide a vote for the residents of the District of Columbia was an oversight but it is also possible that the Founding Fathers assumed that anyone working in the Federal city would have permanent residence in some other State. Regardless of the reason for this omission it is time that we take affirmative action in granting the right to vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the proposed constitutional amendment and hope that favorable action will be taken before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the adoption by the Senate and now the House of Senate Joint Resolution 39, proposing a constitutional amendment that would permit residents of the District of Columbia to vote in national elections is a most commendable step forward. I believe that the entire Nation welcomes this measure that would provide for three votes in the electoral college for the District of Columbia.

Those who have long been observers of the national political process will at last become participants when the amendment is ratified by the required 38 States.

Pleased as we all are with the adoption of the amendment by both Houses of Congress, it is somewhat disappointing that the second so-called District provision in the original Senate version of the resolution was not included in the final measure. This would have provided the District with two House Delegates in Congress to represent the views of the more than 750,000 residents of the Nation's Capital. I surely hope that the Congress will consider this feature next year.

Another vital measure that should be brought before Congress for consideration is the so-called home-rule bill. We have broken through the barrier and opened a way for democracy to flow into the District. But, it is only a beginning, since the privilege of the vote has still to be extended to include the election of local government officials and representatives in Congress.

The fact that the District is a "Federal city" in which all the citizens of the country have an interest is not, in my opinion, a sufficient reason for denying to its inhabitants control over their local problems, matters in which the people neither of New York nor California could possibly have any concern.

Those of us who have supported the constitutional amendment cannot assume that our task is finished. Self-government has always been the bulwark of our Federal system and any supporter of States rights should ardently favor the same prerogatives of local rule for the citizens of the District.

The home-rule bill discharge petition before the House requires just a few more signatures to bring the measure to the floor for debate. Action this session by the House can send a bill to the President for enactment into law. I urge that the bill be cleared and that we maintain our momentum to bring to the residents of the District the privileges of democracy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the joint resolution is considered as read and open to amendment. Also, under the rule, no amendments are in order except those offered by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Are there any amendments?

Mr. CELLER. There are no amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia, pursuant to House Resolution 554, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, and to enfranchise the people of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following articles are hereby proposed as amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and any one of which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of sixty days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"ARTICLE —

"The people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States shall elect, in such manner and under such regulations as the Congress shall provide by law—

"a number of Delegates to the House of Representatives equal to the number of Representatives to which they would be entitled if the District were a State with such powers as the Congress, by law, shall determine; and

"a number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in the Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State; such electors shall possess the qualifications required by article II of this Constitution; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and cast their ballots as provided by the twelfth article of amendment."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 39 and insert the provisions of House Joint Resolution 757 as passed, as follows: "That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislature of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

" 'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Joint Resolution 757 was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 552) providing for the consideration of H.R. 6597, a bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, 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. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and 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.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] and pending that yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is clear from its reading. I know of no controversy on the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, but I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I understand from the reading of the resolution that it waives points of order. Can the gentleman tell me why points of order are waived in this instance?

Mr. BOLLING. If I may respond to the gentleman, the reason that points of order are waived is because of the language on page 28 of the bill, lines 3 and 4, which reads "and funds appropriated for the National Park Service shall be available for these purposes."

We understand this is not an evasion of the appropriation process, but merely makes it possible after this bill is passed for them to use moneys already appropriated for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. 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. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

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. 6597, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, although this is important legislation, it might have been brought up either under unanimous consent or on the suspension calendar, except for the reason that, as the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considering the legislation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the ranking member of the committee, and the chairman of the full committee took opposite sides on an amendment which was adopted by the committee. So that we might present to this committee the two sides of the question involved, it was requested that a rule be granted. The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are very appreciative of the fact that the Committee on Rules has permitted us to come before the House for this purpose. May I say as I start the discussion on this legislation that we shall be discussing one of those areas which is an integral part of the playgrounds of the United States of America, a part of the national parks system consisting of national parks, national monuments, historic sites, and other areas which the people themselves have the advantage of using. If it were not for this sort of program, which is comparatively new as far as our Government is concerned, we might have vast areas set aside for the recreation of individuals who are privileged because of circumstances to enjoy these places, while the traveling public, the ordinary citizen and family, the American people themselves, would not have the opportunities of such pleasure and enjoyment.

In this particular facility the United States is possessed of a fine playground and scientific research area which has been carved mostly out of the public domain. The reason the legislation is brought to the floor at this time is because the National Park Service and those sponsoring the bill wish to change the boundaries, provide for an approach road and administrative site, and establish a permanent status of national monument by statutory enactment. May I advise my colleagues that the boundaries will be so changed that there will be 960 acres fewer in the monument than there are at present. The access road will provide for an entrance road into that part of the park which is the playground, not that part from which the area gets its name, but that part which will afford recreational opportunities. The legislation also will provide that certain rights which are now permitted in the park for grazing will be continued in accordance with the plan established by the last Presidential order issued for this area.

This is not anything new, as the National Park Act itself provides for grazing within like areas. Where members of the committee differ, which will be brought out during the debate, is how we place a value, if any, on these grazing rights when they are terminated by action of Government.

And, now, may I say that this national monument was established by Executive order signed by former President Woodrow Wilson in 1915. It was established for the purpose of preserving this area which I now indicate on the map, a small tract where the dinosaur remains exist and where they are being set out in place by hewing away the rock in which the remains are buried, Then in 1935 former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt issued another order enlarging the boundaries of the park to include the area which is within the dark lines which I now indicate on this map, an area of approximately 209,000 acres. You may ask: Why such a large monument? In reply may I say that this is one of those unusual areas where the history of the world is very well written in rock and soil. One finds many fine phenomena of Nature's work as he visits this monument.

The fact is that this area has been so important in the minds of the American people, that in 1955 and 1956, when we were working on the Colorado River storage and development program, the sponsors of the bill, including the gentleman now speaking, endeavoring to have an irrigation project with a large dam and reservoir in this area known as the Echo Park project, were defeated in their efforts.

I now indicate the Colorado-Utah line. The part to the west of this line is in Utah. The larger area to the east is in Colorado. There is a fine headquarters in Utah where the dinosaur remains are found, and it is comparatively easy to visit the area. The visitor enters the park from the town of Jensen, Utah.

But to go from that area around to the playground area is practically impossible. There are no well-improved roads presently in the monument area. One can visit the interior of the monument area, of course, by pack train, wagon, horseback, boat or sturdy truck. It is easy to hire some boat operators and go down the two beautiful canyons that are in the area. The Canyon of the Green is to the north with beautiful Ladoe Canyon as a part of it. Much has been written about the area. Here to the east is the Canyon of the Yampa River.

You may well ask: How great in extent is the area? I would say that it is approximately 40 miles from east to west and 18 to 20 miles from north to south at the present time. Federal and State Highway 40 is located some 16 miles to the south of the southern boundary of the monument. This legislation will permit the building of a road outside the park from Highway 40 to the park area. As soon as it reaches the park area, then, of course, the construction of roads and trails would come under the jurisdiction which the National Park Service has at the present time.

The bill also provides for the acquiring of lands to the east, an area that is known as Lily Park, so that in time there may be a road from the east providing for travel both ways from east to west and west to east. There is a State road in that area at the present time. A visitor then could follow the rim of the Canyon of the Yampa down into the Steamboat Rock or the Echo Park area.

There is also a program which will be considered in years to come of building a road from the Steamboat Rock or the Echo Park area to the west along the canyon, which would then connect with the dinosaur area. But that must wait for further study and survey.

Mr. Chairman, for the remainder of my time I wish to explain the differences that exist between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself as to the reimbursement for the grazing rights which are present in the monument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the cost is modest in view of the benefits to be achieved. The estimated cost of land acquisition is $50,000, and the entrance road from U.S. Highway 40 will cost about $1,500,000.

In the boundary adjustments, there are 20,455 acres of Federal lands to be included within the boundaries for the first time. Another 22,475 acres of Federal lands will be removed from the monument, but it is the 20,455 acres to be added to which I wish to call particular attention at this time.

Most, if not all, of these added lands are being grazed by livestock under grazing privileges evidenced by grazing leases, licenses, or permits. These grazing privileges date back to pioneer times in the history of the States.

This area was established over 100 years ago. The men who went there saw that the farming values were to be found in livestock operations. Until the Taylor Grazing Act was authorized and became law, these people used these lands for which they did not have title as they saw fit in livestock operations, both cattle and sheep. But with the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934, permits and licenses became necessary. In the determination of who should use these areas, of course the people who had ranch operations or livestock outfits were given grazing areas in close proximity to their fee lands and they have been using them by term lease continually since that time. They pay lease rentals to the Federal Government.

Investments have been made by the ranchers on the Federal ranges. Fences and water facilities have been constructed. Many areas have been reseeded. The grazing privileges and the investment inprovements in the range have been capitalized into the value of the base properties. This is why range users traditionally resist any sharp increase in grazing fees. This is why any sudden withdrawal of privileges for monument purposes without compensation would cause severe hardship to the range users. The policy of the Government recognizing vested interests in public grazing lands has been reaffirmed in departmental regulations just published in the Federal Register.

On June 8, at page 5085, there appears the revised section 160.12 of title 43, Code

of Federal Regulations. This section deals with compensation to grazing lessees for loss of range improvements. Before any application for the sale of public land is allowed, evidence must be furnished that the applicant has agreed to compensate the grazing lessee and the United States for any authorized grazing improvement placed on the land. Payment must be in an amount and manner to be mutually agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this to your attention because it is recognized that there are values that go with these leased properties; although I think it only fair to advise you that in reality, as far as statutory authority is concerned, a person's right in this property can be said to end with the termination of his lease.

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that this obviously reasonable requirement depends merely on regulatory authority and is not a part of the statutes. It is unfortunate also that there is no statutory provision requiring the Government itself to make an equivalent payment to the owner of authorized range improvements when a Government department, rather than a private citizen, is the land applicant. The Government ought to be willing and able to pay in the same manner and to the same extent as it requires its citizens to pay under like circumstances.

May I add here that, at my suggestion, a study to examine inconsistencies in grazing fees on various classes of Federal lands has just been undertaken. The study will be made jointly by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior. This will be a long-range study, and I mention it here even though it does not directly bear upon the present bill.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's report contains the separate views on the grazing question of my friend and colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. With all respect to my friend, I must state that the information on which he has based his views, in my opinion, is not in keeping with the legislation, although on the general principle involved I am in agreement with him.

The last proviso of section 3 of the bill, as introduced—appearing on page 29, lines 2–8—has the format of an authorization to the Secretary of the Interior so that, when he appraises the value of privately owned land within the limits of the monument to be acquired under the act, he may take into account the influence on such value of the appurtenance of Federal range.

I say, advisedly, that the proviso has the "format of an authorization," because in all probability the Secretary already has the same authority, or would necessarily have to exercise it, whether this proviso is included or not.

Mr. Chairman, I shall reserve the balance of my argument on the range proposition until the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] presents his views.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in 1915 Woodrow Wilson, then President of the United States, on the 4th day of October, following a study and discovery which had been made by certain American scientists who were exploring the canyons in western Colorado and in eastern Utah, issued a proclamation and set aside 80 acres wherein the fossil remains of dinosaurs had been discovered. From that time until the present that area and the area surrounding those 80 acres have been known as Dinosaur National Monument.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION—1915

Whereas in section 26, township 4 south, range 23 east of the Salt Lake meridian, Utah, there is located an extraordinary deposit of Dinosaurian and other gigantic reptilian remains of the Jura-Trias period, which are of great scientific interest and value, and it appears that the public interest would be promoted by reserving these deposits as a national monument, together with as much land as may be needed for the protection thereof.

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power in me vested by section 2 of the act of Congress entitled "An act for the Preservation of American Antiquities," approved June 8, 1906, do hereby set aside as the Dinosaur National Monument, the unsurveyed northwest quarter of the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 26, township 4 south, range 23 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, as shown upon the diagram hereto attached and made a part of this proclamation.

While it appears that the lands embraced within this proposed reserve have heretofore been withdrawn as coal and phosphate lands, the creation of this monument will prevent the use of the lands for the purposes for which said withdrawals were made. Warning is hereby expressly given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, excavate, injure or destroy any of the fossil remains contained within the deposits hereby reserved and declared to be a national monument or to locate or settle upon any of the lands reserved and made a part of this monument by this proclamation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifteen and the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fortieth.

WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:

ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State.

The area continued to have 80 acres until July 20, 1938, when Franklin D. Roosevelt, then President of the United States, on the 14th day of July 1938, issued a proclamation, published in the Federal Register on July 20, 1938, in which the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument were expanded and included 209,000 acres of land.

[From the Federal Register, vol. 3, No. 140, July 20, 1938]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

ENLARGING THE DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT, COLORADO AND UTAH

Whereas certain public lands contiguous to the Dinosaur National Monument, established by proclamation of October 4, 1915, have situated thereon various objects of historic and scientific interest; and

Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as an addition to the said Dinosaur National Monument:

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906 (ch. 3060, 34 Stat. 225 (U.S.C. title 16, sec. 431)), do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following-described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION NOT COPIED

Warning is here expressly given to any unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this monument and not to locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof.

The reservation made by this proclamation supersedes as to any of the above-described lands affected thereby, the temporary withdrawal for classification, and for other purposes, made by Executive Order No. 5684 of August 12, 1931, and the Executive order of April 17, 1926, and the Executive order of September 8, 1933, creating water reserves No. 107 and No. 152.

The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535 (U.S.C., title 16, secs. 1 and 2)), and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof, except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 14th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1938, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-third.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

CORDELL HULL,
The Secretary of State.

(No. 2290)

The Brown's Park Reservoir damsite is located within the confines of the Dinosaur National Monument.

President Roosevelt's proclamation stated that the land that was to be included in the monument would be subject to all valid existing rights. I point that out because in 1934 the Congress of the United States passed the Taylor Grazing Act. The Taylor Grazing Act had as one of its provisions the creation of grazing districts, and provided that the Secretary of the Interior should grant licenses to persons to graze cattle within these districts. It also had this provision:

But in the issuance of permits pursuant to provisions of this chapter shall not create any right, title, or interest in the land.

That is the condition that exists today.

The chairman of our great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, introduced the bill which is presently being considered by the House, H.R. 6597, which

revises the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. With that part of the bill which contains the revision of the boundaries I am very much in accord. Our chairman has called attention to the changes wherein certain land was taken out of the boundaries of the monument and other land included. The new boundaries as near as possible conform to the topography of the land. These new boundaries will conform to the area which drains into the Green and the Yampa Rivers as they flow through the Dinosaur Monument. I certainly hope the committee will accept and approve that portion of this bill.

My only objections to this bill are contained in section 3. The first part of section 3 is necessary, but the last two provisos, in my opinion go too far. Members of the committee who were in Congress about 8 years ago will recall that the committee debated a bill which became known in the minds of the public as the D'Ewart bill or the stockmen's bill. At that time there was a deliberate attempt by the stockmen of the country to see that the provision of the Taylor Grazing Act, which specifically states that as a result of the license given to graze cattle on the public domain there was no property right given, was changed—an attempt to have the Congress change its view and say that if you obtained a license from either the Secretary of the Interior to graze on the public domain or on the Taylor grazing land, or from the Secretary of Agriculture to graze in the national forest, you had not a privilege or a license but you had a right—a right that could be transferred from father to son or could be bought and sold and become something which the Congress would recognize. Congress at that time defeated that proposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is probably for that reason, is it not, that we placed in our report on page 10 the last sentence, to show that this was not to be considered as a precedent or establish that sort of an idea for the general program?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. On page 10 of the report we so stated. But I opposed in the committee the provision which appears on page 29 of the bill in line 2 with regard to private land that is within the boundary of the monument.

In the second proviso which was added in the committee bill, our committee states that these same rights must be considered for anyone who owns private land outside the Dinosaur National Monument but who has been given a license by the Secretary of the Interior to graze cattle within the monument.

I have not always been right in every one of my predictions of how our past actions will in the future haunt us, but I have said from time to time that even though a committee states in its report that this is not to be a precedent the departments downtown will invariably seize upon it, and sometime in the future you will find that the department, including the Interior Department or the Agriculture Department, will come up and point to this bill, saying that Congress on the 14th day of June 1960 passed a bill which established such a precedent. Therefore, I would ask the members of this committee to disapprove the committee amendment which appears on page 29 of the bill on line 8, which would extend to the property owners of private land outside of the monument, and who have grazing privileges in the monument, the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make a reasonable or equitable allowance to them for the value of such grazing privileges.

Then I would ask that the committee support an amendment which I will offer on page 29, line 2. After the word "default", strike the balance of the sentence. With this deletion from the bill, there would be no doubt in anyone's mind that there was an attempt to create for any property owner, who has a license for grazing privileges within the Dinosaur National Monument, a right for which he would be entitled to compensation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the committee report states definitely the position of our State with regard to whether these grazing privileges are rights or privileges. Definitely, it has been determined they are privileges offered by the Government. That is the way they are considered legally. But there is something behind this privilege. We had to testify before the committee on this bill, Mr. Colton, a man who came here with Millard Marriott. They were partners in starting the Hot Shoppes. Mr. Colton told about his father settling in this area near Vernal in 1879. In those days when a settler stayed and improved property, he could homestead the property and it became his. When he used water from the creeks for irrigation, he obtained title by right of usage. I am not arguing that these are legal rights, but I am explaining to you the background of this situation because of the history of how we acquired water rights and how we acquired homestead rights and so on.

There are other cases similar to this where the Government has had to acquire property. I know of one instance where we had to have quite attractive land for a military base, and the Government did offer the cattle and sheep people some compensation for their grazing privileges and improvements in order not to bankrupt these people. There are people who own private property within this monument who range their cattle and livestock outside their own property, but on the monument. I think they should have some consideration for improvements at least because they would lose the value of that grazing right. It might seem farfetched that a person in Colorado who does not live on the monument, but who has a ranch outside would be injured, but if his grazing privileges are taken away from him and his summer range is taken from him, then his ranch is not of much use.

It was testified in committee that there are not more than 1,000 cattle being grazed. These are privileges and they are worth about $50 per head. They are sold back and forth. Then there are some sheep. I do not think it would cost the Government $70,000 in this whole situation to compensate these people and save them from ruin. There are not more than 10 or 12 livestock people affected.

Furthermore, we must have their good will around the monument. They have to be boosters for this park. They have to be hospitable and they have to do everything to make this park succeed. I have in the testimony quotations from Conrad Wirth, head of the Park Service, who says that this is one of the most important points.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, when this area was made a monument, the people were given to understand fully that their grazing privileges and their right to put in irrigation dams and reclamation projects on that monument would not be interfered with. They have definite testimony to that effect, and they were willing to go into this proposition because they had the faith that the Government would keep its word that their grazing privileges would not be interfered with. There is no question in the world about the moral rights of these fine people who have gone in with the Government and cooperated and who Mr. Wirth says we need so much to continue to cooperate in order to build up these wonderful parks.

I, of course, am very much in favor of this bill. I hope the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not be passed, but that this Committee of the Whole will sustain the amendments offered by the great Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for H.R. 6597 with the committee amendments.

Let me say first of all that people of Utah are very suspicious of any legislation expanding the amount of Federal land ownership in our State, because 75 percent of the land of Utah is already owned by the Federal Government.

However, the people and the agencies of Utah have tried to be reasonable and cooperative although they disagreed with the committee about the inclusion of a site of land identified by No. 12 on some maps, in the boundaries of the monument, they are still willing to accept this bill. The reason they are willing to accept the bill is that they recognize the need for further development of the Dinosaur Monument which will be provided as a result of this bill.

Few areas in America can lay claim to so many wonders worth preserving as those located in the Dinosaur National Monument area.

Apart from the purely scenic beauty of the colorful and "rugged wilderness of deep canyons, dissected erosional benches, and bold promontories of exceptional grandeur," the area is im-

portant from a geological, scientific, and historic point of view.

First. Imbedded in the rock formations is the geological story of what took place on earth for a period estimated to cover 500 million years.

Second. It contains the most unusual collection of fossil forms ever found, including the world-famous dinosaur quarry.

Third. Many of the caves and canyon bottoms contain refuse heaps left by people who are estimated to have lived in the area nearly 2,000 years before the birth of Christ.

Fourth. I am told that nowhere in the country is there such an outstanding example of stream piracy, whereby one stream intercepts another and its course changes completely, as is included in the Dinosaur National Monument area with the Green River.

As the Congressman in whose district this scenic wonder lies, I extend an invitation to all of you to visit this monument. It will be one of the most breathtaking experiences you will ever have

Let me point out to the House that as the bill and the committee amendments have been developed they represent a delicate compromise of all parties concerned with the new monument.

I hope the House will accept the committee amendments, particularly section 3 pertaining to compensation of any people who may lose grazing privileges within the boundaries of the monument.

With the committee amendment the bill will permit the Secretary of Interior to take into account the reasonable value of grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned land which is acquired within the monument. This is standard practice, and I do not believe there can be any objection to it.

The bill takes into account another type of loss for which compensation might also be given. This is the loss of grazing rights within the monument which are appurtenant to privately owned land outside of the monument.

I believe this provision is equitable and should by all means be adopted by the House for the following reasons:

First. Grazing of this land has become a longstanding tradition with the cattlemen of the area. The nearest town to the monument, Vernal, was settled in 1879 and cattle grazing became a major industry in the development of the western area. This grazing began long before there was ever any monument and before the Bureau of Land Management or Department of Agriculture started to grant grazing permits.

It should be pointed out that use of Federal lands in many other fields becomes the basis for acquisition of title. It is use of the land which permits it to be homesteaded without charge. It is the initial discovery and development of mining claims which permits them to be patented and the use of these lands for grazing is a longstanding tradition.

Second. These grazing privileges have come to develop a marketable value. Every week people buy and sell these grazing privileges. A typical cost of sale is $50 per head of cattle and $10 per head of sheep. Many of the people who are grazing now in the Dinosaur Monument paid this kind of money in order to buy that privilege from the person who previously held the privilege.

Third. It had been reported to the people who graze their land in the monument area that their grazing privileges would not be disturbed. Consequently to deny these privileges without equitable compensation would, as far as the permittees are concerned, constitute a breach of faith.

Fourth. The amount of money involved is extremely small. It may be many years before these grazing privileges are ever canceled, but in any case the total value of an extended period of time probably will not exceed $50,000.

Fifth. It is extremely important with the further development of the monument to have a cooperative attitude on the part of the citizens in the neighboring areas. Conrad Wirth, the Director of the Park Service, stated this philosophy at Vernal in hearings on May 24 when as part of his statement he said:

> We realize that in running this great national monument it is important that we have friendly relations with our neighbors and that they should be our best friends and business helpers in the job we have to do.

You all know that there has been a festering controversy about water development in the monument. And this controversy has not yet been finally resolved considering all of the contention and controversy that has gone on about Dinosaur Monument. I believe it is extremely important to accept this provision compensating the users of grazing privileges within the monument for the marketable value of their privilege.

This will be a major factor in creating very good relations between the community and the Government and administrators of the monument.

Sixth. Finally, it is very important to state that the compensation of these grazers because of the special unique reasons which have been listed does not establish an important precedent on the basic question of whether these grazing privileges should be regarded as rights or not. These grazers are suddenly being told that they will ultimately lose privileges that they have long held.

This is a basic change of their status of the type which Congress has previously recognized. Although Congress was not willing to pass the D'Ewart bill which would have recognized a universal legal right and equity in these grazing privileges Congress has recognized special cases. For example, the act of July 9, 1942 (43 U.S.C. 315(g)) authorized the military services to compensate stockmen with grazing privileges on lands that had to be taken over for defense purposes.

Similarly in Public Law 85-868 section I(g) recognized the special rights of cattle grazers who lost their privileges because of land being transferred to the Navajo Indian tribe. Consequently this act can be passed based on the special situation involved by the people who have been traditionally grazing in the monument without any way affecting or changing the fundamental law involving grazing privileges.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to see that this bill authorizes the construction of proper access roads into the major portion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

Six years ago it was my privilege to float on a rubber raft down through the entire length of the Yampa River through the entire national monument from Lily Park at one end on the east, out the monument on the other side, about a 6- or 7-day trip, an extremely unusual trip, a trip in which we studied the Indian petroglyphs on the walls and in which we found the tent poles, some lying in caves, used by Indians thousands of years ago, and saw many other extremely unusual characteristics of this national monument.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned the wonders of this area. It is remarkable, it is unusual, it is irreplaceable. I am glad the gentleman went down the Green by boat.

Dinosaurs are peculiar beasts. He had a brain in his cranium and one at the base of his spinal column so when an idea missed the first brain he had a saving afterthought, I have often wished we had the same equipment. But even with all that equipment he became extinct because he could not adapt himself to his changed surroundings.

I thank the gentleman for praising this area.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me it is quite appropriate that in this bill adequate provision is made for access roads, because the facts are true as stated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], that there is practically no access to it from Highway 40. I drove by there last year. If you look you will find no invitations along the road or signs to actually direct you into the main part of the monument. The only actual sign you will find is the one that leads to the dinosaur remains, but it will be completely unrelated to the main portion of the monument which, in my opinion, has some extremely unusual and significant features. I think it is appropriate that the committee has taken this step to make available authorization for the construction of proper access roads to the main monument so the monument can be visited so people can enjoy Steamboat Landing and the other features of the monument that are so unusual.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as we sit here day after day and month after month there seems to be a continuous effort all the time to spend the taxpayers' money on reclamation projects, parks—first one thing, then another. I have noticed that all these reclamation projects are fine and wonderful, but someone with a commercial

idea gets in and takes over the park, or the lake, or a part of its shore, and commercializes the project. That has been the case in park after park. Just the other day we had a bill up here for a project with $171,000, that amount carried in the bill for—shall I say entertainment? Well, you might call it entertainment; yes, that is what it was, it was so designated. Now, you may make these improvements the gentleman has spoken of and soon you will not have a park any more, or a monument, fine though those improvements may be, the original purpose of taking the land has been abandoned. You will have a paved parking lot, a restaurant, a movie show; and when you get those things you defeat the original purpose of having a park, the main purpose of which, as I have always thought and understood, was to show this generation and future generations what nature actually was. That was really the main purpose, to have some place where they could learn what had been. But that is what you are doing, as I read it—a place of entertainment instead of nature's product. I have two amendments at the desk to be offered at page 29 to strike out those provisions giving authority to make unlimited payments. I think they are similar to amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] who, being a member of the committee, I assume, will be recognized to offer similar amendments.

What we are doing is just what he said, we are attempting for the benefit of some of these people who live there, some of them within the park and some outside the park, to turn a license and privilege into a property right, then asking the Government to pay for it. Is that not what we are doing, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ASPINALL. There are only three people who live within the confines of this area and they have lived there I suppose for 60 years, or longer. This is the area where the old trading rendezvous was had with the Indians.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are not answering the question. You are converting a license into a property right; are you not?

Mr. ASPINALL. We are not changing anything in this particular area. All we are asking is to have this road built to the park boundary, so that people can use it. There will be no new park concessions, if that is what my friend wishes me to say. There will be no new park concessions whatever.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Referring to the people in the park the gentleman spoke about as having grazing rights, when you take that you want to authorize the Secretary to pay them for the grazing rights, which was a privilege, not on their land but on park land. Then those who live outside, having grazing rights inside, you want to pay them, for the grazing land; is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I might go along with the gentleman from Utah, Mr. DIXON, who made a real, sympathetic plea to help these poor folks out and keep them good natured and happy. That is all right, but it is a strange thing that we want to give our own people something instead of sending it abroad. I can accept that argument too. But why should the Government pay for grazing rights on land it owns?

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the gentleman be willing, or does he think it is right that if the Government, the National Park Service, sooner or later takes over the grazing rights, as it has a right to do, the Government should pay?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They belonged to the Government in the beginning. All you did was to give some license to let their cattle eat grass there for a term—no permanent right.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would like to finish my question. Would the gentleman be in favor of permitting the Government to pay the user for the permanent improvements that the user paid for on those grazing lands while he was using them?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He took his chances when he made the improvements but the Government should—and under the bill will—pay for improvements, but a grazing permit is not an improvement.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. But the gentleman does not answer the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Government is paying him for what the land is worth as improved. What you are trying to do with this bill is to pay for that grazing right which originally belonged to and still is the property of the Government and which you let him exercise for awhile. You let him graze his cattle for so many years and now you want to say that is an absolute right and the Government has to pay for it. I cannot agree.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I need to make this observation to the members of the committee in regard to Mr. Colton's testimony which the gentleman from Utah mentioned in his argument. In describing his property he said it is open range:

> There are a few drift fences here and there that either the permittees themselves have constructed or in cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Land Management they have cooperatively built fences. Outside of that it is open range.

That is the reason I oppose these amendments in which you say that for this open range people would be paid.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit confused here, as was the previous speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], because I remember well when the D'Ewart bill several years ago came to the House floor it had already been marked as a giveaway bill. The giveaway part of the bill was a perpetuation of the real ownership of these leased lands. In other words, you could go into the business of leasing to relatives or to other people; that is, the right that you felt you had to this property by transfer or lease of it to other people. Would you say there is any of the D'Ewart language in this amendment that you are contesting?

Mr. SAYLOR. This amendment has, in my opinion, the same result as the language of the D'Ewart bill.

Mr. WIER. I can hardly believe the gentleman from Colorado is mixed up in a giveaway. That would be hard to believe. But is there anything in this bill that bestows certain rights upon a rancher, no matter whether he has been there 1 year or 20 years, as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] said, who has put some dams in the creeks to hold water, or he has built a few fences, or he built a little irrigation ditch? That, in my opinion, would not necessarily mean he had acquired ownership or the right to re-lease, sell, or transfer that lease he had acquired; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the language is purely permissive. It permits the Secretary when these rights are terminated, if he sees fit, to place any value which he believes has accrued to the grazer because of improvements or for any other reason, that he has in that permit that he has been using.

Mr. WIER. Then is the crux of the difference between the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Colorado's language is permissive, while the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to make it very explicit?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado is not about to give away anything that belongs to the people of the United States. There are involved in this particular matter some 6,885 acres of rangeland in Colorado and 2,370 acres of private lands, as such, in Utah. With that go these grazing areas which, I might say, take 5 acres to take care of one cow for 1 month during the grazing season. These are the values that are involved. What the gentleman from Colorado thinks is that if these people who used this area and have built it up, have some values there that the Secretary of the Interior recognizes, then when these rights are terminated those users should be paid for those rights. Other than that the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] are in accord. I am sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would admit that.

Mr. WIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument, established in pursuance of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 431), and administered in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 1, et seq.), and Acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof, are hereby revised so that the monument shall include, subject to valid existing rights, those lands in the States of Colorado and Utah, encompassed within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at a point on the Utah-Colorado State boundary line at the northeast corner

of section 36, township 2 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah—

thence westerly along the north lines of said section 36 and section 35, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 35;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 35, said township 2 south, range 25 east, and sections 2, 11, and 14, township 3 south, range 25 east, to the north quarter-section corner of section 23, said township and range;

thence westerly along the north lines of said section 23 and sections 22, 21, and 20, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 20;

thence southerly along the west line of said section 20 to the northeast corner of section 30, said township and range;

thence westerly along the north lines of said section 30, said township 3 south, range 25 east, and section 25, township 3 south, range 24 east, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 25;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 25 and section 36 of said township and range to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said section 36;

thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 36 and section 35 of said township and range to the west quarter-section corner of said section 35;

thence southerly along the west line of said section 35, said township 3 south, range 24 east, to the southwest corner of said section 35, at a point on the north line of section 3, township 4 south, range 24 east;

thence westerly along the north line of said section 3 to the northwest corner of said section 3;

thence southerly along the west line of said section 3 to the northeast corner of southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 4, said township and range;

thence westerly along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 4 and sections 5 and 6, said township 4 south, range 24 east, and unsurveyed section 1, township 4 south, range 23 east, to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said unsurveyed section 1;

thence southerly along the west line of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said unsurveyed section 1 to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said unsurveyed section 1;

thence westerly along the east west quarter section line of said unsurveyed section 1 and unsurveyed section 2, said township and range, to the west quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 2;

thence southerly along the west line of said unsurveyed section 2 to the southwest corner of said unsurveyed section 2;

thence westerly along the south lines of unsurveyed sections 3 and 4 of said township and range to the north quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 9, said township and range;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said unsurveyed section 9 and unsurveyed sections 16 and 21 and sections 28 and 33, said township and range, to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 33;

thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 33, said township 4 south, range 23 east, to the thread of the Green River;

thence upstream along the thread of the Green River within said township and range and township 5 south, range 23 east, township 5 south, range 24 east, and township 4 south, range 24 east, to a point at its intersection with the south line of section 30, said township 4 south, range 24 east;

thence easterly along the south lines of said section 30 and sections 29, 28, and 27, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of section 34 of said township and range;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 34, said township 4 south, range 24 east, and section 3, township 5 south, range 24 east, to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 3;

thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 3 and sections 2 and 1 of said township and range to the east quarter-section corner of said section 1;

thence northerly along the east lines of said section 1, said township 5 south, range 24 east, and sections 36 and 25, township 4 south, range 24 east, to the southwest corner of section 19, township 4 south, range 25 east;

thence easterly along the south line of said section 19 to the southeast corner of said section 19;

thence northerly along the east line of said section 19 to the southwest corner of section 17 of said township and range;

thence easterly along the south lines of said section 17 and sections 16 and 15 to the northwest corner of section 23 of said township and range;

thence southerly along the west line of said section 23 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section 23;

thence easterly along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 23 and fractional section 24, said township 4 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, to a point on the Utah-Colorado State boundary line.

thence southerly along the Utah-Colorado State boundary line being the west line of fractional section 23, fractional township 6 north, range 104 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado, to the southwest corner of lot 12, said fractional section 23;

thence easterly along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said fractional section 23 and section 24, said fractional township and range, to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 24;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 24 to the south quarter-section corner of said section 24;

thence easterly along the south lines of said section 24, said fractional township 6 north, range 404 west, and section 19, township 6 north, range 103 west, to the northwest corner of section 29, said township and range;

thence southerly along the west line of said section 29 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 29;

thence easterly along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 29 and section 28 of said township and range to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 28;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 28 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 28;

thence easterly along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 28 and section 27, said township and range, to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 26, said township and range;

thence southerly along the west lines of said section 26 and section 35, said township and range, to the west quarter-section corner of said section 35;

thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 35 and section 36, said township and range, and sections 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 6 north, range 102 west, sections 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 6 north, range 101 west, and sections 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 6 north, range 100 west, sections 31 and 32, township 6 north, range 99 west, to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of said section 32;

thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 32 and section 29, said township and range, to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 29;

thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 29 and sections 28 and 27, said township and range, to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of said section 27;

thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 27 and section 22, said township and range, to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said section 22;

thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 22 to the east quarter-section corner of section 21, said township and range;

thence northerly along the east line of said section 21 to the northeast corner of said section 21;

thence westerly along the north line of said section 21 to the southeast corner of unsurveyed section 17, said township and range;

thence northerly along the east line of said unsurveyed section 17 of the east quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 17;

thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section line of said unsurveyed section 17 to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of said unsurveyed section 17;

thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said unsurveyed section 17 and unsurveyed section 8, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 8;

thence westerly along the north line of said unsurveyed section 8 and unsurveyed section 7, said township 6 north, range 99 west, sections 12, 11, 10, 9, and 8, township 6 north, range 100 west, to the southeast corner of section 6, said township and range;

thence northerly along the east line of said section 6 to the east quarter-section corner of said section 6;

thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 6, said township 6 north, range 100 west, and unsurveyed sections 1 and 2, township 6 north, range 101 west, to the east quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 3, said township and range;

thence northerly along the east section lines of said unsurveyed section 3, said township 6 north, range 101 west, and section 34, township 7 north, range 101 west, to the east quarter-section corner of said section 34;

thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 34 to the east quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 33, said township and range;

thence northerly along the east section lines of said unsurveyed section 33 and unsurveyed section 28, said township and range, to the east quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 28;

thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said unsurveyed section 28 and unsurveyed sections 29 and 30, said township 7 north, range 101 west, and unsurveyed sections 25, 26, 27, and 28, township 7 north, range 102 west, to the east quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 29, said township and range;

thence northerly along the east section line of said unsurveyed section 29 to the northeast corner of said unsurveyed section 29;

thence westerly along the north lines of said unsurveyed section 29 and unsurveyed

section 30, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 30;

thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of unsurveyed sections 19 and 18 and sections 7 and 6 of said township 7 north, range 102 west, to the south quarter-section corner of section 31, township 8 north, range 102 west;

thence easterly along the south lines of said section 31 and section 32, said township and range, to the south quarter-section corner of said section 32;

thence northerly on the north-south quarter-section line of said section 32 to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 32;

thence easterly on the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 32 and section 33, said township and range, to the east quarter-section corner of said section 33;

thence northerly on the east line of said section 33 and sections 28, 21, and 16, said township and range; to the east quarter-section corner of said section 16;

thence westerly on the east-west quarter-section line of said section 16 to the east quarter-section corner of section 17, said township and range;

thence northerly on the east section lines of said section 17 and section 8 and unsurveyed elongated section 5, said township 8 north, range 102 west, to a point in the south line of section 33, township 9 north, range 102 west;

thence easterly along the south line of said section 33 to the south quarter-section corner of said section 33;

thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 33 and sections 28, 21, and 16, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 16;

thence westerly along the north line of said section 16 and sections 17 and 18, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 18;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 18 and section 19, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of section 30, said township and range;

thence westerly along the north line of said section 30 to the northwest corner of said section 30;

thence southerly along the westerly line of said section 30, said township 9 north, range 102 west, to the northeast corner of section 36, township 9 north, range 103 west;

thence westerly along the north line of said section 36 to the northwest corner of said section 36, said township and range;

thence southerly along the west line of said section 36, said township 9 north, range 103 west, to a point in the north line of elongated section 2, township 8 north, range 103 west;

thence westerly along the north line of said elongated section 2 to the northwest corner of lot 6, being a mid-point of the north line of said elongated section 2;

thence southerly along the north-south line dividing said elongated section 2 to the north quarter-section corner of section 11, said township and range;

thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 11 to the south quarter-section corner of said section 11;

thence westerly along the south line of said section 11 and the north line of section 15, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 15;

thence southerly along the west lines of said section 15 and sections 22 and 27, said township and range, to the northeast corner of section 33, said township and range;

thence westerly along the north line of said section 33 and section 32, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 32;

thence southerly along the west lines of said section 32, said township 8 north, range 103 west, and section 5, township 7 north, range 103 west, to the northeast corner of section 7, said township and range;

thence westerly along the north lines of said section 7, said township 7 north, range 103 west, and section 12 and fractional section 11, fractional township 7 north, range 104 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado, to a point on the Utah-Colorado State boundary line, being a point on the east line of township 3 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah;

thence northerly along the Colorado State boundary line, being the said east line of township 3 south, range 25 east, and the east line of township 2 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, to the northeast corner of section 36 of the said township 2 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, the point of beginning.

The tract as described contains approximately 214,500 acres subject to adjustment to lines of public land surveys.

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 1 of the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out from line 3 down to and including line 17 on page 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Beginning at a point on the Utah-Colorado State boundary line at the northeast corner of section 12, township 3 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah—

"thence westerly along the north lines of said section 12, and section 11, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 11;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 11, and section 14, township 3 south, range 25 east, to the north quarter-section corner of section 23, said township and range;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said section 23 and sections 22, 21, and 20, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 20;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 20 to the northeast corner of section 30, said township and range;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said section 30, said township 3 south, range 25 east, and section 25, township 3 south, range 24 east, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 25;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 25 and section 36 of said township and range to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said section 36;

"thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 36 and section 35 of said township and range to the west quarter-section corner of said section 35;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 35, said township 3 south, range 24 east, to the southwest corner of said section 35, at a point on the north line of section 3, township 4 south, range 24 east;

"thence westerly along the north line of said section 3 to the northwest corner of said section 3;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 3 to the southwest corner of said section 3;

"thence westerly along the south lines of sections 4, 5, and 6, said township 4 south, range 24 east, and unsurveyed sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, township 4 south, range 23 east, to the north quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 9, said township and range;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said unsurveyed section 9 and unsurveyed sections 16 and 21 and sections 28 and 33, said township and range, to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 33;

"thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 33, said township 4 south, range 23 east, to the mean high water mark on the north or right bank of the Green River;

"thence upstream along the mean high water mark on the north or right bank of the Green River within said township and range and township 5 south, range 23 east, township 5 south, range 24 east, and township 4 south, range 24 east, to a point at its intersection with the south line of section 30, said township 4 south, range 24 east;

"thence easterly along the south lines of said section 30 and sections 29, 28, and 27, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of section 34 of said township and range;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 34, said township 4 south, range 24 east, and section 3, township 5 south, range 24 east, to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 3;

"thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 3 and sections 2 and 1 of said township and range to the east quarter-section corner of said section 1;

"thence northerly along the east lines of said section 1, said township 5 south, range 24 east, and sections 36 and 25, township 4 south, range 24 east, to the southwest corner of section 19, township 4 south, range 25 east;

"thence easterly along the south line of said section 19 to the southeast corner of the said section 19;

"thence northerly along the east lines of said section 19 and section 18 of the northeast corner of said section 18 of said township and range;

"thence easterly along the south lines of sections 8 and 9 to the northwest corner of section 15 of said township and range;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 15 to the west quarter-section corner of said section 15;

"thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 15 to the center of said section 15;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 15 to the south quarter-section corner of said section 15;

"thence easterly along the south line of said section 15 to the northwest corner of section 23, said township and range;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 23 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 23;

"thence easterly along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 23 and fractional section 24, said township 4 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, to a point on the Utah-Colorado State boundary line;

"thence southerly along the Utah-Colorado State boundary line, being the west line of fractional section 23, fractional township 6 north, range 104 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado, to the southwest corner of lot 12, said fractional section 23;

"thence easterly along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said fractional section 23 and section 24, said fractional township and range, to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 24;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 24 to

the south quarter-section corner of said section 24;

"thence easterly along the south lines of said section 24, said fractional township 6 north, range 104 west, and section 19, township 6 north, range 103 west, to the northwest corner of section 29, said township and range;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 29 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 29;

"thence easterly along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 29 and section 28 of said township and range to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 28;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 28 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 28;

"thence easterly along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 28 and section 27, said township and range, to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 26, said township and range;

"thence southerly along the west lines of said section 26 and section 35, said township and range, to the west quarter-section corner of said section 35;

"thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 35 and section 36, said township and range, and sections 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 6 north, range 102 west, sections 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 6 north, range 101 west, and sections 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 6 north, range 100 west, sections 31, and 32, township 6 north, range 99 west, to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of said section 32;

"thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 32 and section 29, said township and range, to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 29;

"thence easterly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 29 and sections 28 and 27, said township and range, to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of said section 27;

"thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 27 and section 22, said township and range, to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said section 22;

"thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 22 to the east quarter-section corner of section 21, said township and range;

"thence northerly along the east line of said section 21 to the northeast corner of said section 21;

"thence westerly along the north line of said section 21 to the southeast corner of unsurveyed section 17, said township and range;

"thence northerly along the east line of said unsurveyed section 17 to the east quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 17;

"thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section line of said unsurveyed section 17 to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of said unsurveyed section 17;

"thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said unsurveyed section 17 and unsurveyed section 8, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 8;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said unsurveyed section 8 and unsurveyed section 7, said township 6 north, range 99 west, sections 12, 11, 10, 9, and 8, township 6 north, range 100 west, to the southeast corner of section 6, said township and range:

"thence northerly along the east line of said section 6 to the east quarter-section corner of said section 6;

"thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 6, said township 6 north, range 100 west, and unsurveyed sections 1 and 2, township 6 north, range 101 west, to the east quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 3, said township and range;

"thence northerly along the east section lines of said unsurveyed section 3, said township 6 north, range 101 west, and section 34, township 7 north, range 101 west, to the east quarter-section corner of said section 34;

"thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section line of said section 34 to the east quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 33, said township and range;

"thence northerly along the east section lines of said unsurveyed section 33 and unsurveyed section 28, said township and range, to the east quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 28;

"thence westerly along the east-west quarter-section lines of said unsurveyed section 28 and unsurveyed sections 29 and 30, said township 7 north, range 101 west, and unsurveyed sections 25, 26, 27, and 28, township 7 north, range 102 west, to the east quarter-section corner of unsurveyed section 29, said township and range;

"thence northerly along the east section line of said unsurveyed section 29 to the northeast corner of said unsurveyed section 29;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said unsurveyed section 29 and unsurveyed section 30, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said unsurveyed section 30;

"thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of unsurveyed sections 19 and 18 and sections 7 and 6 of said township 7 north, range 102 west, to the south quarter-section corner of section 31, township 8 north, range 102 west;

"thence easterly along the south lines of said section 31 and section 32, said township and range, to the south quarter-section corner of said section 32;

"thence northerly on the north-south quarter-section line of said section 32 to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 32;

"thence easterly on the east-west quarter-section lines of said section 32 and section 33, said township and range, to the east quarter-section corner of said section 33;

"thence northerly on the east lines of said section 33 and sections 28, 21, and 16, said township and range, to the east quarter-section corner of said section 16;

"thence westerly on the east-west quarter-section line of said section 16 to the east quarter-section corner of section 17, said township and range;

"thence northerly on the east section lines of said section 17 and section 8 and unsurveyed elongated section 5, said township 8 north, range 102 west, to a point in the south line of section 33, township 9 north, range 102 west;

"thence easterly along the south line of said section 33 to the south quarter-section corner of said section 33;

"thence northerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 33 and sections 28, 21, and 16, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 16;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said section 16 and sections 17 and 18, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of said section 18;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section lines of said section 18 and section 19, said township and range, to the north quarter-section corner of section 30, said township and range;

"thence westerly along the north line of said section 30 to the northwest corner of said section 30;

"thence southerly along the westerly line of said section 30, said township 9 north, range 102 west, to the northeast corner of section 36, township 9 north, range 103 west;

"thence westerly along the north line of said section 36 to the northwest corner of said section 36, said township and range;

"thence southerly along the west line of said section 36, said township 9 north, range 103 west, to a point in the north line of elongated section 2, township 8 north, range 103 west;

"thence westerly along the north line of said elongated section 2 to the northwest corner of lot 6, being a midpoint of the north line of said elongated section 2;

"thence southerly along the north-south line dividing said elongated section 2 to the north quarter-section corner of section 11, said township and range;

"thence southerly along the north-south quarter-section line of said section 11 to the south quarter-section corner of said section 11;

"thence westerly along the south line of said section 11 and the north line of section 15, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 15;

"thence southerly along the west lines of said section 15 and sections 22 and 27, said township and range, to the northeast corner of section 33, said township and range;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said section 33 and section 32, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 32;

"thence southerly along the west lines of said section 32, said township 8 north, range 103 west, and section 5, township 7 north, range 103 west, to the northeast corner of section 7, said township and range;

"thence westerly along the north lines of said section 7, said township 7 north, range 103 west, and section 12 and fractional section 11, fractional township 7 north, range 104 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado, to a point on the Utah-Colorado State boundary line, being the northeast corner of section 12, township 3 south, range 25 east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, the point of beginning.

"The tract as described contains approximately 208,760 acres, subject to adjustment to lines of public land surveys."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide suitable access to Dinosaur National Monument and facilities and services required in the operation and administration of the monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to select the location of an entrance road or roads to the monument and to points of interest therein, from U.S. Route 40, including an entrance and related administrative headquarters site of not more than four hundred acres, and he may provide, upon lands donated outside of the monument, connections between Dinosaur National Monument park roads. To carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of the Interior may acquire non-Federal lands or

interests in lands by donation, purchase, or exchange: *Provided*, Lands and interests acquired for said entrance roads and connections shall consist of the fee title to a right-of-way of not more than an average of twenty-five acres per mile and of scenic easements on lands adjoining the right-of-way, said easements not to exceed an average of one hundred acres per mile. Said roads and administrative site shall constitute a part of Dinosaur National Monument and be administered pursuant to such special regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the land so acquired or otherwise in Government ownership an entrance road or roads and connections of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary, and funds appropriated for the National Park Service shall be available for these purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 7, after "acres," insert "and he may provide, upon lands donated outside of the monument, connections between Dinosaur National Monument park roads."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment, page 27, line 13, after "roads" insert "and connections".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 1, after "roads" insert "and connections".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 2, after "bridges" insert "and other structures and utilities as necessary".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Where any Federal lands included within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument as revised pursuant to this Act were legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States the person so occupying or utilizing such lands, and the heirs, successors, or assigns of such person, shall upon termination of such lease, permit, or license be entitled to have the privilege so possessed or enjoyed by him renewed from time to time, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, for a period of twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act, and thereafter during the lifetime of such person and the lifetime of his heirs, successors, or assigns, but only if they were members of his immediate family on such date, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within Dinosaur National Monument shall not be withdrawn until title to the lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto after reasonable notice of default: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition by purchase or exchange of any privately owned land within Dinosaur National Monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make equitable and reasonable allowances, as determined by him, for the value of any grazing privileges appurtenant to such privately owned land.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 29, line 8, strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That in the event grazing privileges within the Dinosaur National Monument appurtenant to lands outside the monument are retired, then the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make equitable and reasonable allowances, as determined by him, for the value of such grazing privileges."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the proviso which states that if you own land outside the monument, and have a license to graze cattle within the monument, the Secretary is authorized to make an equitable or reasonable allowance as determined by him for the value of the grazing privileges. This to me is a direct attempt by the stockmen to make sure that the principles of the D'Ewart bill are inserted for the first time in legislation. As I called to the attention of the members of the committee, this is in direct contravention of the Taylor Grazing Act, which specifically states that the Secretary of Agriculture is not allowed to give any value to these grazing privileges. I sincerely hope that this committee amendment is defeated.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Is the gentleman referring to the defeat of the whole amendment or just this part?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is just an amendment which is added by the committee, on page 29, line 8. It concerns merely lines 8 through 13 on page 29. It does not apply to all of section 3.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I ask the gentleman if this issue has not been up before the Congress?

Mr. SAYLOR. This isue was up before the Congress several years ago under the bill which has been referred to as the D'Ewart bill. At that time the Congress stated that this grazing privilege was not to become a property right, and it was overwhelmingly defeated. I sincerely hope that this amendment is overwhelmingly defeated by the Committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It comes to us from the committee. I take issue with my friend from Pennsylvania. He states this is an outgrowth of the Congressman D'Ewart legislation a few years ago. It is true that if this were a matter of general policy that would apply to all the public lands of the West, I would have to admit that the gentleman's argument would be sound. But in the committee report there is a statement that this is not to be considered a statement of principle; in fact, it is not to be considered as establishing a precedent. All that this provision would do, and I might add also, all that the preceding proviso would accomplish would be to permit the Secretary, if he saw fit, to make payment for any values that he found present in the grain at the time of the taking. Those values might be the establishment of water resource development facilities, they might be some fencing, some corrals, or reseeding. Whatever the values were, this would permit the Secretary to acknowledge them. If he saw fit to acknowledge any value in the grazing permits he could do so. It is a permissive provision in the legislation as it is now before us.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Let us assume that the Saylor amendment to strike out these few lines in this particular amendment prevails, what damage is done to the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. No damage is done to the bill particularly. It might deny to some of the livestock people—they are not all cattle people, there are some sheep people involved—settlement for some of the improvements they have made and values which they feel they possess.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But leaving these few lines in the bill, you have a nibbling process, do you not?

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not like to accept my colleague's definitive term. Nevertheless, I can see that in his reasoning that it might amount to that.

Mr. DIXON. There is a great possibility and likelihood that these people who have grazing privileges could be given other privileges in nearby areas without any cash payment so that they would not be ruined.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think the gentleman is correct. Perhaps, that will be the result, anyhow. But here we are establishing what we thought was some language to set forth certain equities to be found in the grazing privileges.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in fairness it should be pointed out that there are probably no more than a dozen instances in the United States similar to this. Yet, I have some reservation, which has been indicated by others as well, about the matter of establishing a precedent. The legislative history which is set forth in the committee report indicates that this is not to be a precedent. Yet, in the hearings we have these words by a member of the committee, which I think

might be considered as in some respects the legislative history of this proposal. May I quote this language:

In other words, they have a value which they feel has accrued to them over the years and it is something that rightfully belongs to them. I personally do not believe this committee should take the position they would close out something which these people feel belongs to them and make no provision that they be compensated for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a special pleader, the gentleman from Colorado has no equal in this House. Note what he says—he lays down the general doctrine with which he agrees but which he does not wish applied in the present instance—he says this bill will not establish a precedent because of that statement in the hearings which he quoted. The doctrine is all right he agrees. He does not want this amendment to establish a precedent. What he is doing is creating an exception for his people; do you not see? That is just exactly what he is doing. The principle involved is correct, but do not adhere to it in the bill. There is no disposition and there is no language in the bill that would deprive anyone who owns land either within or without, the park if it is taken by the Government, of the value of the improvements that have been made on it. But what it amounts to, as was stated earlier, is that it just simply is creating a temporary privilege or turning a privilege into a permanent property right for which someone in the Government is given authority to pay. How much? There is no limit. We have heard in the last few days, and we have read in the RECORD how in the other body the gentleman who is one of the representatives of Illinois has just been giving us fits about the way the military people have been spending and wasting money. Here is an authorization which will permit another Secretary to go ahead and use his own judgment. Spend high, wide, and handsome. How long will it be before that charge of waste comes up again? If there is anything of value to the individual, it is his good name and good reputation. The same is true with the Congress. Yet, we read day after day first in one paper and then in another, and for weeks we have heard over the radio about all these charges against Members of Congress and about the misuse of tax money. It seems to me we should close every door and every crack where there is any possibility of anyone making a deal with someone to pay them more than they are entitled to receive. I have nothing against the stockmen. They are all right so far as I know. They as a group are as honest as anybody else. But, they have tried this thing before and here is the nose in the door, the beginning of something that will never end. It is about time the Congress began to protect its own good name and to see to it that there is no opportunity afforded not only for waste and inefficiency but opportunity to do something that is downright, as a Member of the other body in just the last few days has charged, absolutely dishonest.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 29, line 2, after the word "default" strike out the colon, insert a period and strike the balance of the section.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely strikes from the bill the same provision with regard to private lands that are within the boundaries of the monument, stating that if those people have a grazing privilege it cannot become a right and be compensated for by the Secretary of the Interior. I would like to call to the attention of the members of this committee the statement of Mr. Colton, whose testimony has been referred to. Mr. Colton represented the stockmen and I asked him whether or not this grazing license was a right or a privilege. I stated, in my opinion, that this was a privilege—these permits which they received from the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture were privileges.

I asked him whether or not that was correct, and this was his answer:

Congressman, that is today. But it is a long story, these rights or privileges. I think they are rights.

In other words, unless the second amendment is adopted the stockmen believe that they have, as a result of the grazing license or permit, a right which they actually sell to one another in the area. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Just to clarify this, I understand this is the committee amendment applied to those who are outside of the monument, allowing those who are outside the monument to graze inside.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Your amendment will apply to those who are inside the monument and allow them to graze inside the monument.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, the principle is the same in your opinion in both cases.

Mr. SAYLOR. In both cases, that is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the logic made by the gentleman from Illinois is correct as far as that is concerned.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], primarily is that the amendment, by striking out certain language, will remove from the bill a perfectly proper and workable provision which merely declares that the Secretary of the Interior must carry out well known constitutional requirements in the acquisition of privately owned lands.

I refer to that portion of article V of the Constitution which provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

The language that would be stricken by the pending amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That in the acquisition by purchase or exchange of any privately owned land within Dinosaur National Monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make equitable and reasonable allowances, as determined by him, for the value of any grazing privileges appurtenant to such privately owned land.

The committee's report—Report No. 1651—describes the meaning of this language as follows:

The second proviso authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in fixing the price to be paid on acquisition by the Government of privately owned lands newly included within the boundaries, to include an allowance for added value arising from Federal land grazing privileges appurtenant thereto. This latter provision, the committee has been advised, is in accord with the standard appraisal practice in public land grazing areas which recognizes that buyers and sellers, in bargaining for the sale of base ranch properties, take due account of the added productivity and value arising from relationship to appurtenant Federal range.

In opposition to this language, in his separate views in the committee's report, the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated:

The last proviso of section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in the case of purchase or exchange of privately owned lands within the monument, to make equitable and reasonable allowances for the value of any grazing privileges appurtenant to such privately owned land. This discretion vested in the Secretary, in my opinion, goes too far.

I must differ with my colleague from Pennsylvania on this point. The practice set forth in the language merely conforms to the standard real estate appraisal practice in public land grazing areas. This practice is accepted by the Lands Division of the Department of Justice. It is recognized in decisions of the Federal courts, and I cite as directly in point the case of *United States* v. *Jaramillo* (C.C.A. 10, 1951, 190 F. 2d 300). This case dealt with the valuation of certain condemned privately owned base ranch lands in New Mexico to which were appurtenant certain national forest grazing lands administered by the Forest Service. The court held in part as follows:

In the judicial determination of fair value as just compensation for the land taken, the highest and most profitable use for which it is reasonably adaptable may be considered, "not necessarily as the measure of value, but to the full extent that the prospect of demand for such use affects the market value while the property is privately held." *Olson* v. *United States* (292 U.S. 246, 255, 54 S. Ct. 704, 109, 78 L. Ed. 1236). See also *Boom Co.* v. *Patterson* (8 Otto 403, 98 U.S. 403, 408, 25 L. Ed. 206); *Mitchell* v. *United States* (267 U.S. 341, 344, 45 S. Ct. 293, 69 L. Ed. 644); *McCandless* v. *United States* (298 U.S 342, 56 S. Ct. 764, 80 L. Ed. 1205); *United States ex rel. T.V.A.* v. *Powelson* (319 U.S. 266, 275, 63

S. Ct. 1047, 87 L. Ed. 1390); (2 Lewis Eminent Domain, 3d ed., sec. 707, p. 1233). All rights, easements and privileges appurtenant thereto should be considered in estimating its fair value or compensation to be paid, taking into account also the possibility of their being discontinued without resulting obligation (2 Lewis Eminent Domain, 3d ed., sec. 721, p. 1262). In determining the adaptability of the lands as a ranch, it was therefore proper to take into consideration the availability and accessibility of the permit land as an appurtenant element of value for ranching purposes, provided that consideration is also given to the possibility that the permits could be withdrawn or canceled by the Government at any time without constitutional obligation to pay compensation therefor.

This case has not been overruled or superseded, and is reported by the Lands Division, Department of Justice, as being the rule in effect today.

I trust, even though the pending amendment should be adopted, and the language is not later restored, that the Secretary nevertheless will have authority to observe constitutional principles in the valuation of properties, since in the condemnation of the land, should it be necessary, those principles certainly will be applied by the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, 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. 6957) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 552, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to file additional views to the report of the Appropriations Committee on the bill making appropriations for mutual security which was considered by the committee yesterday, but I learned too late that this would have required special permission from the House. I am therefore using this means of making my viewpoint known.

I find myself in disagreement with the committee particularly in respect to sections 107 and 109. Section 107 prohibits the use of funds to carry out the provisions of section 404 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 which makes funds available to carry out the agreement of the United States to contribute toward settlement of the Indus River Basin controversy between India and Pakistan.

Section 109 prohibits the use of funds for the construction of any building, structure, or other similar facility in connection with the Special Program for Tropical Africa.

The possibility of establishing peace between the heretofore irreconcilable nations of India and Pakistan through an agreement for sharing the waters of the Indus River has been hailed throughout the free world as a monumental achievement. The controversy has raged since 1947 when India was partitioned. The Indus Basin has been one of the principal food sources of the area and its use was understandably of concern to both nations. The prospective agreement reached marks the completion of long years of negotiation by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Finance and by our Foreign Service. The United States is being given justifiable credit for her role as a peacemaker in this dispute.

Section 107 of the bill disrupts the proposed settlement. In my opinion, this action was shortsighted for two reasons. First, it was harmful to our own national interest in shattering a constructive program for bringing a peaceful solution to a bitterly hostile relationship between two great Asiatic nations. Doubt will now be created throughout Asia of the sincerity of our proposals and our desire to promote peace through rational negotiation.

Second, it will terminate the first major cooperative effort between the great nations of the free world to initiate a program of joint contributions for helping solve the economic difficulties of underdeveloped nations. The objection has frequently been made that the United States has long carried too much of the burden of assisting new nations to help themselves. It has been rightly suggested that this responsibility should be borne as well as by other nations which have recovered from the devastation of the last war and are now enjoying a prosperous economy. The Indus Basin proposal is such a multilateral undertaking. While it is true that the United States would still carry a major portion of the financing arrangements, the fact remains significant contributions would also be made by other nations. The committee's action requires the postponement of the joint undertaking.

The Special Program for Tropical Africa is essentially an educational program for training the personnel to carry on affairs of government in the new nations. In my opinion this is the best kind of technical assistance that a nation can give if we want to cement closer relationships with a newly born nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think both sections 107 and 109 should be stricken and I shall offer proposed amendments to do so.

A BILL TO EXTEND AND AMEND THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which extends and amends the Sugar Act of 1948. I intend to offer the language of this bill as a substitute to H.R. 12311, the sugar bill as amended and reported by the Committee on Agriculture on June 6.

The committee bill contains two provisions. The first is a 1-year extension of the act, and the second is an authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the quota of a country or area which is unable to fill its quota. The Secretary may reduce the quota by the amount of the deficit for 1 year only.

My substitute contains both of the provisions included in the committee bill, and it contains three additional and important items.

The first is the grant of authority to the President to act only when the 86th Congress is not in session. Under this provision, the President must first find action necessary either in the national interest or to insure an adequate supply of sugar. If Congress is not in session, he would send his recommendations to Congress. If Congress has adjourned, the President could reduce the quotas of foreign nations—except the Republic of the Philippines which is covered by treaty. The Secretary of Agriculture would be charged with the responsibility of obtaining such amounts of sugar elsewhere and insofar as practical would follow the pattern of quotas set forth in the act.

The second additional provision in my substitute will prevent a windfall to Cuba which will occur unless the act is changed. This year Puerto Rico and Hawaii have been unable to fill their quotas. It now appears that there will be a total deficit of 500,000 tons from these areas. Under present law about 156,000 tons of this deficit will be assigned to Cuba. This would be worth between $15 million and $16 million to that country. My substitute will prevent this windfall. I for one do not think Castro should be rewarded for his previous conduct.

The final additional provision in my substitute is to bring our new State of Hawaii into full statehood as far as the sugar act is concerned. It strikes out of the act all references to Hawaii as a "Territory."

PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has taken no action on House Concurrent Resolution 610, which is merely a resolution to be passed by the House and Senate that the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and several other Members of this body have introduced similar resolutions. Frankly, American labor and business are being severely injured by the importation of foreign-made goods—goods that are manufactured by labor that receives only a fraction of what American labor receives.

I fear that our zeal to assist manufacturing and production in foreign countries has caused us to forget that the principal duty of any country is to first look after the interests, welfare, and security of its own citizens. I have voted against every reciprocal trade bill since I have been in Congress, because in each instance I felt that the welfare of the American workingman and American industry was secondary. I spoke against the reciprocal trade bill on June 10, 1958, and at that time pointed out the growing problems of unemployment caused by unfair foreign competition. The developments in the last 2 years have shown that I was accurate in my estimate of future developments, as imports have cut deeper and deeper into our economy.

At that time I mentioned that the importation of rubber clothing and raincoats from abroad was going to destroy a thriving American business in Washington, Ind. Within the last month or so I have received over 300 communications from workmen in the United States Rubber Co. plant at Washington, Ind., protesting that if something was not done they were going to be out of work. I also received letters from the management of that firm. A few days ago I met here in Washington with representatives of workers from the rubber industry throughout the country to discuss these same problems. I recently had conferences with workers in the glass industry and also with workers in the shoe industry from Vincennes, Ind. Conditions in those industries are also becoming critical and unless we take action in the near future these industries will be damaged beyond our assistance. This year there will be 1 million boxes of sheet glass imported into the United States from the cheap labor areas of Europe. This is one-third of the U.S. production. The glass industry must get the tariff on glass increased, yet, I am informed that there will be attempts made to again cut the tariff on glass.

I learned from my meeting with the shoeworkers that there must be some quota imposed on the importation of shoes or this industry will be destroyed. The veneer, tile, battery, and all types of electronic equipment industries are facing a serious future unless our Government recognizes the problem before it is too late. The same applies to the ladies garment industry. The textile and watch industries are rapidly becoming nonexistent in this country. The importation of residual oil is greatly damaging the coal industry.

The bill which I have introduced is the very minimum of what we should do. In fact, we should go far beyond what this bill suggests. Such bills to go much further have been introduced—including my bill H.R. 5776 introduced in March 1959—but no committee action has been taken on them. I do not claim that my resolution will cure this problem. It should keep conditions from getting much worse in the immediate future. We must in the next session take constructive legislation to give American labor some real protection.

In my opinion Congress made a great mistake when it gave up all control over tariffs. I am proud that in each instance I fought to restore this control to the Congress to such a degree that we could save such industries from irreparable harm. No one political party is responsible for this situation, for leadership of both parties has been favoring the granting to foreign countries unusual concessions to encourage the importation of their goods into this country. This philosophy violates the ancient principles of trade. The normal course of international trade is for a country to import those items which are scarce and export those which it produces in surplus. The products which I have mentioned are those which we certainly have in surplus. No one would object to our importing coffee, silk, sugar, tropical wood and the like into America; however, I do not believe that anyone expects Japan to import silk, Italy to import spaghetti, or Brazil to import coffee, but we in the United States have been following a course equally as absurd.

I am well aware that we who are fighting this battle to protect American industry seem to be in the minority, but I trust that we will soon be in the majority.

FURTHER COMMENTS ON ALLEGATIONS IN MR. VANIK'S SPEECH OF JUNE 2, 1960

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, first let me briefly recap the history of the controversy to which I shall address myself. On June 2 the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] addressed the House, claiming that a procurement contract for M–113 armored personnel carriers was "rigged."

On Friday, June 10, Assistant Secretary Douglas as well as Assistant Secretary Perkins McGuire repudiated these charges in a factual memorandum.

On yesterday I utilized some of the material compiled by Assistant Secretaries Douglas and McGuire along with certain factual information known to me which further repudiated the charge made by the gentleman from Ohio.

May I summarize briefly the points I made yesterday?

First, no one knows or should know the outcome of the bid competition for the contract under discussion. Therefore, any charge of rigging is pure speculation until the contract is actually awarded.

Second, the competition has been conducted in strict accordance with Army Service Procurement regulations, Budget Bureau 60–2, section 4532–A, title X of the United States Code.

Any impression given in any bidders' conference that these previously established rules would be ignored is unjustified. The simple fact remains that no new ground rules were made for this competition. They were in existence prior to the bidders' conference and have been rigidly followed. To say this contract was rigged is about as ridiculous as it would be for the Washington Senators to show up at Griffith Stadium expecting the right to field 12 men instead of 9 because somebody on the street corner had said it would be all right.

Third, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], has repeatedly stated that the Ford Motor Co., employed at a fee of $338,000 to survey Government-owned facilities, determined that the M–113 production should take place at the Cleveland Arsenal. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] has quoted the Army as approving this finding. As I have repeatedly stated to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], he has misinterpreted the facts.

First, I quote Secretary Douglas in the letter which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] inserted in the RECORD yesterday:

> The Ford Motor Co. was employed to serve selected Government-owned plants that had been predetermined by the Department of the Army as part of a concept for the establishment of a production base for combat vehicles. It was not intended and did not take into consideration the capability of private industry to produce equipment.

In another paragraph of the same letter Mr. Douglas states:

> The Department of the Army is familiar with the contents of this letter, and agrees with the statements made.

Now, this is repudiation enough of Mr. VANIK's contention, but I have more authority. Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics, Courtney Johnson, said this morning:

> I will say emphatically that we do know of both statements in Secretary Douglas' letter and agree with both of them.

Mr. Johnson informed me that this was his understanding, even at the time the contract was awarded Ford Motor Co., and he said further:

> I did not request them to go into private plants except insofar as necesary to determine what was needed for production in these Government-owned facilities.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. VANIK's charges of rigging in this contract are nothing more than sheer fantasy.

Personally, I would be ready and willing to end this controversy and let the facts speak for themselves, as they do so conclusively. However, it is regrettable that on yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] had more to say. Confronted with factual repudiation of

his charge of rigging, he resorted to a technique which unfortunately is often seen on Capitol Hill. In order to becloud the issue and throw up a smokescreen to obscure the true facts, he has countered with reckless statements, erroneous figures, and even implied vilification of an individual's character. Some of these are so ridiculous that I shall not dignify them with an answer, but I shall reply with factual evidence to statements of specific facts which are clearly in error.

Yesterday, during my colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], he stated clearly that the original research and development contract with Food Machinery for development of the M–113 vehicle was for $1½ million, and he stated further that the U.S. Government was forced to bail out Food Machinery with an augmentation of $10,600,000, bringing the total cost of the research and development contract to $12,100,000.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] must get his figures from a foggy crystal ball, because they are not correct.

The original contract number was DA 04–200–ORD 536. The original bid was not for $1½ million but for a figure in excess of $2,331,000. After the successful bid, changes were ordered during the negotiation process, some of which added to the cost and some of which subtracted. The final contract amount was not $1½ million but $2,459,000. The actual amount expended under the contract was less than the contract price, namely, $2,331,000.

Under this contract several handmade prototype vehicles were produced and tested but, as is normal during the process of a research and development contract, the experts of the Army, as well as the Food Machinery engineers, fulfilled their true mandate under a research and development contract to develop the best possible vehicle. These combined brains—and may I include the Army for a just share of those brains—found that thickening the armor was desirable and also found that it was entirely possible that using a water-cooled engine instead of an air-cooled engine could reduce costs. It was also felt that using off-the-shelf commercial components might further reduce the costs. Accordingly, the Army very wisely decided that even though their first prototype vehicles were satisfactory, they could be made better. This is not unusual in any research and development activity. In fact, improvement of existing weapons is the general basis of research and development.

Convinced that further cost reductions were possible, the Army amended the original contract for an additional $2,465,000 and here is the result of that amendment. The armor was thickened. A water-cooled engine, available from inventories, was installed. The need for special engine manufacture, special parts and special tools, was eliminated. The standard Allison TX–200 truck transmission was used instead of the expensive special development originally contemplated. And what was the gain to the taxpayer of this amendment? A total saving of $5,681 per vehicle, a saving of 20 percent. This saving amounted to $5,112,900 on the first 900 vehicles and the same saving when projected through the 1,380 vehicles now out for bid will represent a total saving to the taxpayers of $12,962,900.

I would say that this research and development contract as amended paid handsome dividends to the taxpayer, and the Army as well as Food Machinery can well be proud of its decision.

Mr. Speaker, the total expenditure in research and development for the M–113 vehicle was $4,996,000. I ask you and I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], how in the world did he dream up the figure of $12.1 million? This, Mr. Speaker, is a classic example of the most slippery of slippery arithmetic. It is used as a side issue to becloud the fact that the bidding of which he speaks was not rigged. But as a side issue it is just as ridiculous as the first charge because his facts and his figures will not stand the light of day.

As another smokescreen to hide the ridiculous statements of yesterday, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] has stated that a champagne party was scheduled to celebrate the award to Food Machinery of this bid. Once again the charge is without basis in fact.

In the first place, there will not be any champagne or liquor. It was never intended that there should be. I have learned that the ceremony now in progress or almost concluded at this time to celebrate the initiation of production on the last contract awarded Food Machinery for 900 vehicles was suggested last October; and by whom? By the Army Chief of Information. The program was planned to secure beneficial public relations for the Army in pursuing its program of modernization. This was suggested in October, and the original bidders conference was not until December 17. It was originally scheduled to be held in March, but because the chairman of the board of Food Machinery was in India it could not be held, and the only available date was today, June 14. The ceremony today is to commemorate the delivery of the first production of the M–113 to field troops.

May I remind the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] that such parties to inaugurate production facilities are common practice. I understand that a similar occasion was held at the Willys plant in Toledo, Ohio, and they have been held in many other places.

Mr. Speaker, some of the other charges made yesterday were just as ridiculous as the ones I have referred to. I shall not dignify them with a response. Insofar as I am concerned, I will refuse to engage in future debate on unfounded shotgun charges which have no bearing on the basic issue. This basic issue, I repeat, is whether the established, written procedures have been followed in the competition for construction of the M–113 vehicles. The facts clearly show that they have, and I will rest my case on fact instead of fancy.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I am sure the gentleman did not expect me to be sitting here in the Chamber and not have a reply ready at this time, because otherwise we could not get to the very heart of the issues that are involved here. I think the gentleman has completely overlooked, perhaps conveniently so, the issues which are clearly on the record upon which I contend that through this so-called process of evaluation and setting up of ground rules the bidding can only occur in a way which can direct the contract ultimately to only one prospective bidder, the Food Machinery Corp.

Mr. GUBSER. I must interrupt the gentleman. He, in anticipation, has reserved a special order following mine, so I can presume to interrupt him when I have yielded to him. I think it would be very useful for the gentleman and I here and now to get at what the issue is. This whole controversy arose when the gentleman said this competition was "rigged."

Mr. VANIK. Exactly.

Mr. GUBSER. Now, I ask the gentleman this question: Is there any ground rule, to use the gentleman's term, by which this competition has been conducted which was not in writing before the invitation to bid was issued?

Mr. VANIK. That is correct. At the bidders conference in December 1959, the bidders were told they could build on the Government plant and there would be no penalty for using the Government plant and facilities, and thereafter——

Mr. GUBSER. I must ask the gentleman this question in order to finish this issue.

Mr. VANIK. If I may finish the statement, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Thereafter, in order to deliver this contract to only one possible bidder, these impossible obstacles were written into the specifications. The Army was told to put them in.

Mr. GUBSER. May I ask the gentleman, these impossible obstacles are the terms of Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 60–2; is that not correct?

Mr. VANIK. They are arbitrary obstructions which constitute an abuse of discretion.

Mr. GUBSER. They are the requirements of 60–2; is that correct?

Mr. VANIK. No; they are not.

Mr. GUBSER. Then what are they?

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman refers constantly to 60–2, which is the Budget Director's regulation. Now, the change in specifications in which these roadblocks or obstacles to fair and equal competitive bidding—these obstacles were written in, theoretically, all relating to 60–2, but they constitute a misapplication of 60–2 and are arbitrary. I might say it is an abuse of discretion on the part of those people in the Pentagon who ordered the Army to make specification changes. The Army has not really spoken to this point. Nowhere does the gentleman refer to a statement made by the Army. The Defense Department says the Army approves of this position, or that the Army is aware of this position. But the Army, the Secretary of the Army, Wilber Brucker, is the one who must

sign this contract and comply with the law. Nowhere do we find that anyone responsible for the Army has taken the position or concurred in or ratified the procedure which is now imposed upon the Army.

Mr. GUBSER. I am not going to yield to the gentleman for a speech, but I shall only quote, as I quoted in my earlier remarks, Mr. Courtney Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics, who told me this morning that this statement in this letter from Secretary Douglas which you have inserted in the RECORD was his understanding even at the time the contract was awarded to the Ford Motor Co.

Mr. VANIK. You are talking about one facet of this, the Ford survey; but you do not deal with the change in evaluations, the change in specifications which was imposed upon the Army by higher authority in the Pentagon after the bidders' conference in December of 1959.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is referring to 60–2 and its interpretation; is that correct?

Mr. VANIK. I am referring to the ground rules which provide this, and I will just enumerate, if the gentleman will please be patient.

First. The ground rules provide that if the Government plant were to be used, a rental charge would have to be added to the bid. The bidding would have to be increased by a rental figure based upon the acquisition cost of the plant, ignoring the factor of depreciation, and upon some recommendation by the local real estate board. That rental figure comes to 5½ cents per square foot for the total plant regardless of what part the producer or manufacturer who had used that plant would use.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is in error on that point. The bid specifications do not call for payments for the entire plant but only for that part used.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman quote his authority?

Mr. GUBSER. One of the bidders.

Mr. VANIK. I do not know who he is, but I do have other information on that score. The gentleman has, I might say, more access to this Pentagon information, because Mr. Johnson's conversation or writing to you is something exclusively in your possession, and I do not have any information of that type.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman has a telephone in his office exactly the same as I have, and all he needs to do is to pick it up and call, and I am sure he would get the same answers that I get.

Mr. VANIK. I might say to the gentleman from California that in my office I try not to do business by telephone. I like to make it a matter of record. I like to do it by an official communication so that I have something I can document and have something that I can include in the RECORD rather than something that I can allude to.

But, the second item in which the impossible barrier was set up for the use of the Cleveland plant provided that if the equipment and the tools and machinery in this plant were used, they would be evaluated on the basis of a 19-month period, a full calendar term rather than the productive period. Now when any corporation evaluates the cost of its productive equipment, they take into consideration the time that the machine is in production on that job, and they certainly cannot charge any other bidder fairly for a 19-month use of a piece of equipment which is only used in the plant, perhaps, a total of 18 hours on the whole production contract. This makes it impossible for the taxpayers of America to get any reasonable use or benefit from their investment in the public facilities.

The third consideration was a matter of special tools which the gentleman and I discussed yesterday, which were paid for by the taxpayers of America in the Food Machinery plant and which are withheld from any other producer who seeks to use a Government-owned facility. If the gentleman can condone this kind of waste in the interest of bringing something to his district, it seems to me I cannot reconcile it with the gentleman's past positions on this floor and in this Congress when he has always been advocating economy.

Mr. GUBSER. I can assure the gentleman that this is his last filibuster that I shall permit on my time. But I would like to say in response to the gentleman that 60–2 which is rather clear cut and specific was in existence as of September of last year, prior to the time that invitations were sent out. I would like to point out this bidding has been strictly in adherence to regulations or 60–2 and I would like to point out that the mistaken impression that the provisions of 60–2 would be ignored for this competition was apparently given out erroneously by someone who did not have the authority to do so.

This made the meeting, in February, of the bidders necessary in order to correct this impression and in order to inform them that the established rules and regulations were to be followed.

60–2 calls for a fair rental payment for the use of Government facilities. I believe the gentleman is in error when he says the entire plant would have to be paid for; I do not believe that is true, but that is something we will have to prove or disprove at a later date.

May I remind you that this regulation is imposed against all bidders, including Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., and that they have to pay an adequate rental for any Government facilities which they are now using on exactly the same terms and at exactly the rate as would the potential user of the Cleveland Arsenal.

Insofar as tools are concerned which you say are not made available and are presently Government-owned and in the plant of Food Machinery, and are not made available for use at the Cleveland Arsenal, I hope the gentleman does not think that the M–113 is the only defense equipment that is constructed by Food Machinery. There are five or six different versions of this vehicle which are being constructed there. There are missile launchers, there are other tanks, there are all sorts of defense items which are being manufactured there and in which these tools would have to be used. So if you were to equip this old worn-out bomber plant that the Government built for bombers in the first place with the tools which are currently producing elsewhere in the United States you would be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

I repeat, the same requirements were imposed upon any bidder as were imposed upon a potential user of the Cleveland Arsenal. These were the ground rules which were established in advance, and one cannot say that the contract was rigged.

If you want to argue the philosophy of 60–2 that is another subject, but the issue here is: Was there anything which had been previous practice, and which was included in the M–60 and M–80 programs? My answer to the gentleman and the evidence from authorities who support me is that there was not.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GUBSER. I will be glad to yield, but the gentleman has a special order of 30 minutes to follow mine. I had not intended to us all my time. Would the gentleman like to take his special order now, or will this suffice for it?

Mr. VANIK. This will suffice. I do not want to hold the matter up. Let us wisely use whatever we have to get the issue threshed out.

In the colloquy the gentleman from California referred to the extra payment that was made to the Food Machinery Corp. which he said was in the sum of approximately $2,600,000. I have not had an opportunity to check on it. Obviously this is double the amount, more than double the amount of the original bid.

Personally, I am concerned about these extra charges that are fastened onto a contract on the basis of alleged changes. It seems to me that if changes are going to be made in a contract for research and development, and the creation of several prototypes of a weapon, that changes that would involve doubling the cost of the original contract, or exceeding it by 110 percent, certainly indicate that something was paid to help this corporation out on its original contract.

It is inconceivable to me how the changes which the gentleman discussed and the change which he said would save the taxpayers so many millions of dollars in the long production run, it is difficult for me to understand how these changes compare so drastically in cost in comparison to the entire development contract, more than 110 percent of the original contract.

Does the gentleman contend that this is ordinary, justifiable, proper practice by the Department of Defense or by the Army in its relationship to Food Machinery Corp.?

Mr. GUBSER. I say this, and I regret to say to the gentleman, but in all frankness I must say it: The gentleman has betrayed a complete ignorance of the concept of research and development.

Development is a thing which progresses; as you learn one thing the next step down the road may be entirely different based upon what you have learned.

Any industrial corporation of this country which develops machinery finds this to be true, and it is true in practically every defense contract.

I do not think the gentleman should imply that this first development contract as it was originally signed was not carried out. It was carried out, and it was successful; but jointly, the Army and the Food Machinery Corp. engineers saw on the basis of their experience something better down the road.

Now, Food Machinery could have gone ahead and produced a prototype which had been tested and found to be successful. What would have happened?

Here is the kick in the teeth the taxpayers would have gotten. They would have paid for each one of those vehicles the sum of—I cannot find the exact figure now, but as I recall it—$5,681 more per vehicle, or a 20-percent increase. Based upon this saving, because the Army and Food Machinery saw a new road ahead, based upon what they have learned, and that is development; it is learning, because of that when the next 1,380 vehicles are produced along with the 900 currently being produced, we will see a saving to the taxpayers of this country of $12,962,900.

I ask the gentleman, Do you think it would have been good business for the Army and Food Machinery jointly, when the first research and development contract was completed, to have shut off their minds and said: We have reached the ultimate in learning, we cannot progress further, and if we can save $12 million we do not want to because we do not want to admit there is anything better than we have now? That is what the gentleman is arguing.

Mr. VANIK. I think the gentleman reaches out into space on the $12 million saving. Did not the Army in entering into this contract pay 110 percent more than its original contract? Did it not fail to save $2 million that could have been saved if they had given the contract to the next lowest bidder who agreed to do the whole job for $3 million? The next lowest bidder had never in previous history assessed any additional charge upon the Army, for any modifications or changes, which are as slight and minor and as insignificant as those indicated by the gentleman in the research and development contract of the M–113 by Food Machinery.

Mr. GUBSER. This was not in any sense of the word a lack of fulfillment of the contract. If the gentleman goes down to a clothing store, he can buy a suit with one pair of pants. He can walk out and in a couple of weeks he thinks he should have gotten the other pair of pants and he says: "I want to amend my contract and get another pair of pants."

That is all we are doing here. We found out something we ought to have and something we need on the basis of our experience, and we said we want that and it is mighty lucky we got it because the net profit to the taxpayers is over $10 million.

Mr. VANIK. Referring to the pants, I want to point out that in the first contract with Food Machinery the Government got pants that were moth eaten. I think they were completely inadequate to perform the function for which they were intended.

Mr. GUBSER. There were a lot of fellows who hit the beaches in the South Pacific, and a lot of them who went to foreign shores in World War II who thought they were riding a pretty good vehicle, and there are a lot of them walking around today who maybe would not have been walking around if it had not been a good vehicle.

Mr. VANIK. You discussed the so-called production celebration. My belief and concept is that Food Machinery, located in the gentleman's district, had full satisfaction that this contract was coming its way. I want to read a telegram which I hold in my hand and which I want to submit to an appropriate congressional committee if I am given the opportunity, and it states as follows. This is a bidder:

> Since there is an existing manufacturing source for this vehicle, the M–113, and since we have been advised a second source is not required—

This goes on to say——

Mr. GUBSER. May I have the name of that individual?

Mr. VANIK. No. I will submit this telegram to an appropriate committee. The gentleman can take my word for it. I will be happy to submit it to a congressional committee.

Mr. GUBSER. It has no validity unless he is willing to give the name of the signator.

Mr. VANIK. I agreed to submit it to an appropriate congressional committee.

Mr. GUBSER. Is the floor of the House a proper place or is a committee a more proper place?

Mr. VANIK. I would not want to expose any particular bidder to the harassment he might receive at the hands of the Department of Defense for crossing up what the Department of Defense has planned. The Department said that it had someone in mind for this contract, there is no use for others to bid.

If you can get a better example of rigging, I want to you to produce it.

Mr. GUBSER. The point the gentleman is making, I am sorry to say, is made more for the benefit of the newspapers than it is to cast light upon this discussion here today. I maintain you have no right to introduce something as evidence unless you are willing to qualify that evidence and give the name of the signator. I think the gentleman has done a disservice in saying that.

Mr. VANIK. I think the gentleman recognizes this is not the proper tribunal. This is not the place at all, and the gentleman is aware of that. The place where the evidence should be submitted and weighed, and where the matter can be thoroughly gone into and investigated is in an appropriate congressional committee which has the power to subpena and which has the power to call witnesses before it.

Mr. GUBSER. And which gets its authority from this body.

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman may be sure that I will be delighted to produce all of the evidence I have in my file, including some evidence which I have not discussed in this case up to this point; because I am trying to get the appropriate congressional committee alerted by this discussion to what I consider the rigging processes that are going on in the Pentagon, to award these contracts in an unfair way, under unfair rules, to bidders or producers who they have predetermined should get the job. I say to the gentleman that I am only seeking economy for my Government, I want to see that the taxpayers' dollar buys the maximum amount of defense and I want to be sure that the bidding procedures are fair so that every bidder and every community in America has an equal opportunity to participate in the matter of defense production.

Mr. GUBSER. May I say for the benefit of my colleagues here that though this discussion between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] and myself has become rather heated and a little vociferous at times, I want it clearly understood that there is absolutely no personal animosity on my part; and I think the gentleman from Ohio feels the same way. We each hold the other in completely high regard. But, as he says, we are both arguing for economy in Government. I intend to conclude my remarks by simply pointing to the record over the years of Food Machinery which has taken the predecessor of the M–113, the M–59, cut the price of it in half through sensible engineering techniques and which today is producing a vehicle, half as heavy, better in every respect, for less than half the money. I maintain that that is a real record. I maintain that if their price is low, after they pay for the use of Government tools and Government facilities, the same as anyone else, and if it appears that they can continue to give the fine record of performance that they have always given to this Nation and its Armed Forces, then they will be justified in receiving the contract.

As I said yesterday, if it happens to be in the gentleman's district, and Cadillac of General Motors or any other bidder happens to be low, and the taxpayer saves the most dollars through their bid, after all proper factors of evaluation are taken into consideration, then I say to Cadillac or to the successful bidder, "Congratulations, and best wishes." We are out to save money. Let the lowest bid get the business.

CONTRACT FOR THE M–113

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, continuing this colloquy with my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. GUBSER], I want to point out that it is not my intention to take all of the time. I merely want to discuss some of the high points in rebuttal to the argument he has made today.

First of all, the gentleman raised the question about Budget Bureau Regulation 60–2 which is cited by Secretary

Douglas and by Courtney Johnson and other people at the Pentagon as being the governing regulation in this matter. I want to point out for the RECORD that in my opinion the Budget Director's Regulation 60–2 does not supersede and is subordinate to the Federal Code which provides that production, as far as the Army is concerned, shall take place in a Government-owned facility so far as those factories can make those supplies on an economical basis. The purpose of 60–2—and it has some commendable purposes—was to eliminate competition between the Government and private enterprise. It was not intended to eliminate competition between other members of private enterprise. And in this argument, in the use of the Government-owned facility at Cleveland, we have a plant which anybody in America can operate. There is no intention anywhere in this proceeding that the Government should operate the arsenal in Cleveland for the manufacture of the M–113 personnel carriers. The only issue involved is whether or not this facility should be used by any of the interested producers who are qualified as bidders on this contract. Earlier the gentleman from California made the point I had nothing to be excited about, that the contract has not been awarded. Does he think I would be on better ground to come here after the contract had been awarded when I would be in the position of expressing sorrow or regret that the economy factor involved and my communities production facilities have been overlooked. I am here at this time because I want to prevent the Defense Department from doing something which will increase costs to the taxpayer, which will disregard the law, the intent of Congress, that insofar as the Army is concerned the Government facilities will be used.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I must ask the gentleman, Has he seen the bid figures? If not, how does he know that if this award goes to Food Machinery, and I do not know whether it is or not, the taxpayer is going to lose money? How does he know that 4532(a) will be violated?

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman is fully aware of the fact that if Food Machinery is using its plant, it is using plant and equipment for which it must assess a charge. I do not believe for one moment that the Food Machinery Corp. is going to be so philanthropic as to fail to charge the Government in its bid for duplicating the same facilities at its San Jose plant. Certainly it is going to charge the Government. It is going to charge the Government at least the $6,500,000 figure which I previously quoted on this floor.

Mr. GUBSER. It is my contention the gentleman has proven my point. Yes, I presume that as a good business concern of course Food Machinery will charge the Government for proper amortization and depreciation and interest on its own investment. I presume that. I presume any company bidding does that.

Mr. VANIK. Does the gentleman also take into consideration the duplicating of facilities which are in being in the Cleveland Ordnance Plant?

Mr. GUBSER. There are Government facilities in the San Jose plant and they are subject to the identical requirements that the facilities in the Cleveland plant are. I say this: No one in the world except possibly one or two people in the Pentagon knows whether or not any money is going to be lost if this goes to Food Machinery. I say you cannot know until you see the figures. 4532(a) says you have to make these supplies on an economical basis. You do not know which is the most economical basis until the bids are opened and the contracts are awarded.

Mr. VANIK. It is quite obvious the gentleman completely overlooks the fact that if these same facilities which will be used in the San Jose plant of the Food Machinery Corp., for which he so ably speaks today, were used, obviously the great cost of those facilities will simply be added to the cost of the facilities which the Government already owns and which are in being in the Cleveland plant. It is duplicating a facility which is unnecessary and unneeded and which is an added cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman talks about duplication of facilities. We have a tank production line, an M–113 production line in being. It is opening. It is being celebrated today. Tanks are rolling off the end of the line. At Cleveland you have an empty building with a few tools which might be utilized but to a lesser extent than the gentleman thinks. Now if you are going to talk about duplication of facilities here you are proposing to build another one that is expensive.

Mr. VANIK. I must say to the gentleman that these tools and the equipment which he says are in being at the Food Machinery plant were duplicated, an unnecessary expense to the taxpayers because somebody in the Pentagon insisted that this work be done at the San Jose plant of the Food Machinery Corp.

Mr. GUBSER. Back in World War II and Korea we needed plants to build defense items. They are up in the gentleman's district, they are up in Detroit, they are all over the United States. Government machine tools are all over the place. This is an old company that has been making defense items for a good long time. I should like to point this out to the gentleman, and it will take me only 30 seconds. Originally there were two buildings in the ordnance department belonging to the Federal Government. I should like to point out to the gentleman that the Food Machinery Chemical Corp. purchased one of those buildings and is under contract to purchase the other. Many of the machine tools have also been purchased by private industry. So we have private capital doing this defense work instead of keeping it as a burden on the taxpayers.

Mr. VANIK. Private capital would be doing the defense work in Cleveland using the ordnance plant and using all the facilities which have already been bought and paid for by the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, the Food Machinery Corp. or any other corporation is qualified to come in and bid on the use of these facilities.

I want to point out something that was not answered in any way by the gentleman in his colloquy. The Ford survey which was made of Government-owned facilities and private facilities, and by his own admission they included the Food Machinery plant, determined it would be most economical and feasible to produce this vehicle in the Cleveland Ordnance Plant. This is how they came to that conclusion. The Ford engineers determined, and they are independent and impartial in this matter, determined that these vehicles were unique in production and in application and that they would not lend themselves to commercial production. Therefore, considering all aspects of the situation and the unique nature of this weapon, and in view of the mobilization base that is required, that is, the capacity to expand production in the event of a mobilization emergency—considering all of these factors in that survey study, this job should have gone to Cleveland and nowhere else. That is the substance of the Ford survey report. This has not been refuted. But it has been ignored. Does the gentleman presume for one moment that this survey would have been ordered simply to have been cast aside and thrown off into the wastebasket? What was its purpose? Can the gentleman tell me? What was the purpose of authorizing a $338,000 survey to determine the feasibility of production in a plant that was apparently never considered seriously for this job? What was the purpose of this survey? Why undergo and undertake this tremendous expense to determine the economic productive points for this production—if they did not intend to follow the recommendations?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman has again unequivocally stated that the Ford study showed that this production should be carried on at the Cleveland Arsenal and nowhere else. He is in direct contradiction to the statement made by Assistant Secretary of the Army Courtney Johnson at about 11 o'clock this morning. This we cannot resolve. I cite my authorities. You cite yours.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman, at this point, please find out for me why, if he has this telephone relationship with Mr. Johnson, if he can find out for me on an official basis; why the $338,000 was spent for a survey which has apparently been discarded by the Pentagon.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is an effective representative of his people and has ample ability to get the same information I do. I am sure he will do it. If he chooses not to do so, I shall be happy to assist him. However, I just have to point out to the gentleman that private industries were not considered as a possibility in this case, and I will speculate with the gentleman as to the reason why the Army ordered this survey.

It was because they were developing a plan. Every day the Joint Chiefs of Staff develop war plans in case certain eventualities occur. As we all know, 99 percent of those plans are scrapped. But those plans must be in being. As I understand it, and I am not speaking for the Army—as I understand it, this was a mobilization study and the proposition of whether the Government arsenals should be utilized for production was under consideration. It was necessary to determine what each of these Government arsenals could do. Under this determination, it was determined that the Cleveland Arsenal could do this M–113 job, but not a thing in the world was said which would indicate that some private company could not do it better and cheaper.

Mr. VANIK. Then, I cannot understand the purpose of the survey. It is completely unreasonable for me to assume that this survey and this great expense would have been undertaken if it would be an incomplete survey and if it was only to take into consideration publicly owned facilities, as the gentleman has said.

I want to point out in closing that in my original charge I stated that the bids were completely rigged against using the Government-owned plant and facilities. I further contend they are designed to increase costs by paying for plant and facilities of another bidder, a second time, by sending this contract to his plant. It is my contention, under the law, under the section of the Code that we have previously cited, that the Army is bound and compelled to use Government facilities—60–2 notwithstanding. Budget Regulation 60–2 provides specifically that if a Government-owned plant was used, there would be competition between private bidders as to who should operate the Government plant. This is how the contract was rigged. The gentleman has asked that this be explained. I want to put this in the RECORD. If the Government-owned plant is used, the rental evaluation must be added to the bid based upon an appraisal, based upon acquisition costs. This completely overlooks the depreciation factor which is considered by every private bidder on his own plant. Thus, anyone who uses the Government-owned plant in Cleveland is penalized by a rental for the entire plant on the basis of 5½ cents per square foot per month regardless of what part of the plant is used in production.

The charge is computed on a 19-month basis notwithstanding the fact that this production contract is for a lesser period of time.

I address this to the gentleman: The rental evaluation I used on the Cleveland plant is based on a 19-month production period notwithstanding the fact that the production period is considerably less. This is admitted by the insertion in the RECORD which the gentleman made from the Food Machinery Corp.'s own statement on yesterday.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. Let me finish.

Mr. GUBSER. Does not the same rule apply to Government-owned tooling for Food Machinery?

Mr. VANIK. I will go into that later. Now, this rental evaluation completely ignores the $760,000 which every year is paid to maintain the Cleveland plant in a state of idleness. This should certainly be applied and deducted from the rental charged.

I charge that the bids were rigged for the benefit of the Food Machinery Corp. because the use of Government-owned facilities and equipment would require in addition rental based on acquisition cost prorated for the full calendar period of 19 months, whether they may be used several hours a week or 18 or 20 hours for the entire life of the contract. It is not possible on these terms to use Government-owned facilities in the Cleveland plant.

The proper charge for the use of these public facilities should be based on the actual time these facilities are used for production and only for such time. This is the only basis on which a charge should be made, not the "jimmied" evaluation procedure. I say it is "jimmied." It is totally unfair in the use of Government facilities to charge a 19-month rental for equipment which may be used only 20 hours during the entire 19-month period. It is eminently, basically, and obviously unfair to penalize the user of Government facilities on a full-time calendar rental without considering the time the equipment is actually used. That is not the generally accepted industrial concept in this regard.

I think the gentleman will agree with me that the bids are rigged when the research and development contractor, which in this case was the Food Machinery Corp., was adequately, completely, and, in my judgment, overly and excessively paid for its work in research and development of this tank. It is unfair when this bidder has exclusive use of the special tools which were paid for by the Federal Government and which are not available to any other bidder under the terms of these specifications. It is impossible, it is absolutely impossible for any other bidder to determine the cost of producing these special tools.

The procedures in this bidding method are clearly established to create a monopoly in the production not only of the M–113, but the entire light tank family, to concentrate that production in the hands of one manufacturer who does not have the mobilization base to take care of this Nation's needs in the hour of mobilization. This is not only much more expensive to the taxpayer, but also it threatens the national security. That is why the Army was so anxious to keep in custody, to keep under control, to keep in use the Cleveland Ordnance tank plant. In this plant we have the ability to concentrate production not only in the orderly and proper needed peacetime requirements of this weapon but in the mobilization day's need if and when that should occur.

So I say to the gentleman that the rigging of these bids is obviously designed to eliminate any chance of using the Government-owned facility in Cleveland and to direct the contract to only one prospective bidder, and that is the bidder the gentleman has defended.

I hope the gentleman will join me if he wants to clarify the matter. If he wants to get down to the bottom of this problem, I hope he will join me in urging that the appropriate congressional committee take this matter in hand so that the facts can be placed in the RECORD under oath, as they should be, as they must be, so that the appropriate people from the Pentagon can be brought in and have their statements placed into the record so they can be studied. In the interests of national security and economy, I hope that the right thing will be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE—I. REGARDING AMENDMENT PROHIBITING USE OF MSP FUNDS FOR INDUS WATERS PROJECT, SECTION 404, MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954—II. USE OF CONTINGENCY FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the minority report on the mutual security appropriation bill did not include additional views by individual members. Because of a technicality, I was unable to present my views yesterday on what I consider a most vital international project. Therefore, I am taking this opportunity to present my additional views and to give substantial reasons for my deep concern over a grave situation which could produce serious consequences.

Section 107 of the bill, which would deny the use of mutual security funds for U.S. participation in a multilateral effort to finance the development of the Indus Basin, is singularly shortsighted in terms of the interests of the United States.

The controversy between Pakistan and India over the use of the Indus Basin waters has been one of the major international conflicts in the past decade. Bitterness and violence have characterized the situation and the possibility of military conflict has been a real one.

Through the good offices and protracted efforts of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 9 years of patient negotiation have resulted in virtual agreement on the terms of settlement of the controversy. Final agreement depends on firm assurances from friendly countries of essential financial assistance required to construct the system of works recommended by the Bank.

The Bank itself plans to contribute to the costs of the development, and five other nations—the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and West Germany—in addition to Pakistan and India have signified their willingness and intention to join in the funding of this project. U.S. participation, which would involve over a 10-year period the provision of $177 million of grant assistance and $103 million in loan assistance, plus the provision of local currency arising from sales of agricultural surpluses from the United States, is essential to the successful completion of this giant international effort.

The provision of funds for this purpose not only would serve to contribute in a major way to the economic development of the vast subcontinent of Asia but would materially contribute to the improvement of relations between the two countries. In the absence of a settlement, no one can predict what the outcome will be; but certainly, the possibility of bitter and prolonged dispute and eventual military conflict could not be excluded. We have an opportunity to make a major contribution to world peace, to strengthen the orientation of over 500 million people to the West, and to secure the participation of other industrialized nations in financing the costs. To cast aside this opportunity would be contrary to the political and security interests of the United States.

Because of the grave consequences which would result should this restriction be allowed to remain in the bill, Thursday of this week I will offer an amendment to delete this limitation. I trust that the House of Representatives, in its wisdom, will concur in the elimination of section 107 of the mutual security appropriation bill.

In addition, I would like to discuss another provision contained in the mutual security appropriation bill as reported. I am referring to section 451(b), the so-called contingency fund, which provides $150 million for assistance under this section. The amount, which is $5 million less than provided last year for these purposes, appears reasonable.

However, the bill contains a restrictive provision:

> That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for any project or activity for which an estimate has been submitted to Congress.

The report accompanying the bill describes this language as "designed to preclude Executive nullification of specific congressional reductions."

This action suggests, first, that the Executive has heretofore used these funds in a manner contrary to that authorized by the Congress, or second, that the authorization previously given and affirmed in this session, is too broad.

As to the first point—that of the authority granted—I believe it is clear that the legislation permits the Executive to use these funds, and I quote "in furtherance of any of the purposes of such acts, when the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States." This authority clearly permits the President to use the Contingency Fund to provide military or economic assistance in addition to amounts specifically otherwise authorized for such purposes. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations has himself recognized that the law provides this authority.

Presumably, from the bill and the report, the majority of the committee considers the authority, provided in the authorizing legislation, to be excessive and that it requires limitation by appropriate action. What standards or criteria are proposed?

The existing law provides that the funds may be used when the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States if such use was for a project or activity for which an estimate was submitted to the Congress. In other words, no adjustment whatsoever in the programs presented to the Congress is to be made through the use of these funds. This assumes an accuracy of judgment as to the future, of which neither the Executive nor the Congress is capable. It provides a measure of rigidity and inflexibility which is neither warranted nor sensible. It is a limitation which prevents responsiveness to changing conditions.

The contingency fund is less than 5 percent of the total appropriations recommended. A margin of 5 percent to permit adjustments in aid when the President determines the national security so requires, is a minimal degree of flexibility.

It is noteworthy that the committee fails to cite any specific instances where it believed the use of contingency funds was not in the security interest of the United States. The record of such uses, which was available to the committee, clearly indicated that each use was justified and that it served our national interests. Rather, the complaint conceals a desire to deny the Executive any real ability to deal with flexibility with any volatile and unpredictable international situation.

During the current year, these funds enabled the President to provide additional military and defense support assistance to Laos when Communist subversion and attack threatened. Under the proposed provision this would not be possible because estimates of requirements for these purposes are included in the presentation to the Congress. Similarly, the President could not have given added support to Greece when its economy began to fail unexpectedly. Added support for Iran's military defenses when threatened by Communist pressures would not have been possible. Additional amounts to assure base rights could not have been provided. In sum, our security interests are not to be measured by a current Presidential assessment, but are limited to previous estimates, however inaccurate they prove to be.

The deletion of the limiting provision is essential if any reasonable degree of flexibility is to be permitted our Government in combating the pressures of international communism. Its inclusion will seriously and adversely hamper the effective use of this program to advance our security interests.

In essence, by inserting this limitation, the Appropriations Committee is telling the executive branch of the Government, "please don't tell the committee how you are going to spend your money, because if you do we will not allow you to use the contingency fund at some future date." This is a bit ridiculous especially when the responsible Appropriations Committee is so opposed to the principles of back-door spending.

The contradiction contained within the provision for the use of the contingency fund must be removed.

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1960]

HAMSTRINGING FOREIGN AID

If there were a better understanding here and abroad of the complexities of American Federal budgetary processes, it might be possible to shrug off at least some of the reduction in foreign aid funds voted by the House Appropriations Committee. Assuming that the administration would use every avenue open to it—such as drawing more heavily upon past appropriations than had been planned—it might be possible to get by on the $3.4 billion in new funds which the committee approved in place of the $4.1 billion requested by President Eisenhower, leaving aside certain crippling restrictions.

But whatever the technical and bookkeeping opportunities that may exist for running an adequate mutual security program in the short term without full-fledged congressional support, such methods would in the long run tend to compromise public confidence in administration and perhaps do truly serious damage to the basic underpinning of the mutual security concept.

The House committee has written into the bill and its report a number of specific restrictions that perhaps do more serious damage to the program than the reductions in funds. The most unfortunate single example of this attempt to manage the details of foreign aid from Capitol Hill is the wholly unwise prohibition against any assistance for the Indus River project. Many years in the planning, and still the subject of negotiation by India and Pakistan, the program for the Indus is to be underwritten by the United States, Australia, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, Britain, India and Pakistan, as well as the World Bank. Of the $1 billion, 10-year outlay that has been envisaged, only $177 million would be in American grants, with additional U.S. help in the form of surplus commodities and repayable, interest-bearing loans. About half the cost would be borne by other governments and the World Bank.

Clearly, if this country were now to withdraw its support, the prospect of solving the Indus waters dispute, which has lately looked so promising, would be measurably lessened, and the framework of free world cooperation on the venture could be shattered. It is scarcely possible to imagine a more insidious scheme to destroy world confidence in American intentions toward the underdeveloped nations than the committee's proposed sabotage of the Indus project.

Equally serious are the body blows which the committee would strike at aid to the emerging nations of tropical Africa. By requiring advance committee approval of every individual project, the House group would rule out for a year or more any start on technical assistance for 10 or a dozen new African nations. Experience has shown that such a void is quickly and effectively filled by the Soviet Union, whereas a timely initiative in such countries often can forestall damaging Soviet inroads.

The reductions in special and technical cooperation funds would fall heavily upon the African programs, since firm commitments to other areas would use up the reduced appropriations proposed. And, as if to foreclose any attempt to ameliorate mistakes that Congress might make in the administrative role that the House Committee has assumed, the committee would prohibit use of contingency funds to make up for specific cuts that might turn out to have serious consequences for this country's interests.

All in all, the House committee's treatment of mutual security would—if it went unchallenged—make democratic calls for "new initiatives" and "bold programs" in foreign policy look pretty transparent. There is virtually unanimous agreement among the experts that the next short-term threat from the Communist bloc will arise in Asia. Yet it is Asia and Africa that the House committee seems to single out for calculated neglect. Congress must right this mischief or forfeit any just claim to wisdom in foreign policy matters.

AMENDING FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT BY PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the two bills which I have introduced, H.R. 12626 and H.R. 12627, would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act by providing assistance to small business in its struggle to overcome unfair trade practices in industry and commerce.

The hearings which have been conducted by the House Small Business Committee's Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry have made it clear that the practice of selling dairy products at unreasonably low prices and frequently as loss leaders far below the level of cost, is widespread. Only a few days ago, it was reported that a large concern was selling milk in Florida at 1 cent per half gallon. Other instances have been brought to the attention of Members of Congress where milk has been retailing at less than one-quarter of the cost of producing the product. Small business concerns are much alarmed about this practice and its effect toward eliminating them and creating monopolies in this great industry. Many States have enacted legislation to combat this practice of selling at prices below cost. Courts have upheld the State laws, but due to the fact that the law of any State does not reach beyond the State line, it can have no application to transactions in interstate commerce. Therefore, the need for Federal legislation on the subject to fill this void is apparent. It is believed that H.R. 10235 will fill this need, and, as I have stated, today I have introduced H.R. 12626, a companion bill identical to H.R. 10235.

Also it is apparent that there is need for legislation which would provide small businessmen with immediate, effective relief from these destructive practices. H.R. 10235 will strengthen the substantive law to provide relief, but it leaves untouched the procedural law. Small businessmen need immediate, injunctive relief from these destructive practices. Therefore, one of the bills I have introduced, today, H.R. 12627, is identical with the provisions of H.R. 8841. It would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders while the issues under its complaint are being litigated. In this way, many small business concerns could be saved during the prolonged litigation of cases which evolve sales at prices below cost.

LEGISLATIVE EXPENSE ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives today, H.R. 12628, which proposes enactment of what would be known as the Legislative Expense Accounting Act of 1960.

For the information of the membership of the House concerning this proposed legislation, I submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the bill as introduced:

ANALYSIS OF BILL TO BE KNOWN AS LEGISLATIVE EXPENSE ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1960, INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

1. This measure would be known as the Legislative Expense Accounting Act of 1960.

2. Section 2 would add a new section to the law to regulate payments from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives. This section would—

(a) Provide that no payment could be made from the contingent fund except in accordance with regulations issued by the House Administration Committee and on vouchers approved by the committee.

(b) Provide that no payment could be made from the contingent fund as additional salary to any officer or employee of the House.

(c) Provide that vouchers (together with all documentation therefor) approved for payment from contingent fund would be available for public inspection.

3. Section 3 of the bill would provide for the Comptroller General to audit all disbursements from contingent fund of the House.

(a) Audits would be not less frequently than once each 6 months.

(b) Comptroller General would report to House Speaker and House Administration Committee the results of each audit not later than 30 days after audit completed.

4. Section 4 is to provide for reports on expenditures by Members of the House and Senate for foreign travel. Provides that within 30 days after return by Member of House or Senate from foreign travel for investigation, study, meeting, or conference (outside United States, District of Columbia, U.S. territories and possessions), such Member would—

(a) File with Senate Committee on Rules and Administration or House Administration Committee a statement of expenses incurred by him or her.

(b) Such statement would include accounting of counterpart funds used for Member's expenses, number and identity of persons in party (including information as to wife or husband of Member, any of their expenses paid from Government or counterpart funds, and services, if any, performed by such person for the Government).

5. Section 5 is to provide that the expense statement required under section 4 of the bill would be included in statements required under present law (Title 2 U.S.C. 102) by Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives at the commencement of each session of Congress, and would be printed as a House Document. Present law requires statements covering report on employment of clerks and other persons during preceding year in the respective Houses, and a detailed statement of the manner in which the contingent fund for each House has been expended during the preceding year.

6. Section 6 of the bill amends and repeals certain present law as necessary. Under present law, basically payments from the contingent fund of the House and Senate are regulated under a provision contained in an 1888 appropriation act (25 Stat. 546; 2 U.S.C., secs. 68 and 95). The pertinent section of the 1888 law, which applies to both the House and Senate, provides that no payment shall be made from the contingent fund of House and Senate unless sanctioned by the Committee on House Administration and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; provides that payments made on vouchers approved by these committees shall be deemed, held, and taken, and are declared conclusive on all the departments and officers of Government (commonly known as the finality clause); provides no payment shall be made from contingent fund as additional salary for officers or employees of either body.

(a) Section 6(a) of the bill, in effect, repeals that part of the 1888 law which applies to the House by rewriting that provision so that the law as it applies to the Senate is left unchanged.

(b) Section 6(b) repeals a provision contained in an appropriation act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1318; 2 U.S.C. 95). The 1911 provision, in providing that payments made from the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the Committee on Accounts shall be deemed, held, and taken, and are conclusive on all departments and officers of Government, for no apparent reason repeats (only with reference to the House) certain provisions in the 1888 act. It is therefore also repealed.

(The net result of section 6 (a) and (b) of the bill, therefore, is to repeal certain sections of present law regulating payments from the contingent fund so far as the House is concerned, but leaves intact the law as it applies to the Senate.)

(c) Section 6(c) of the bill provides that sections 6(a) and (b) would apply only to expenditures made from the contingent fund of the House to pay obligations entered after enactment of the bill, so as to provide that it would not apply to obligations in being.

7. Provides that the bill would take effect 30 days after enactment. This will allow the House Administration Committee time to prepare adequate and suitable regulations as required in section 2 of this bill.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following personal request.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUNE 14, 1960.

Mr. LANE requests, pursuant to rule XXXVII, leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Jean K.

Simmons (H.R. 4825) original affidavit of Agnes Dunn, subscribed to on July 27, 1959, 86th Congress, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

THOMAS J. LANE.

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

There was no objection.

RIGHT OF UNION TO CONVENE AND ELECT ITS OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in line with the American tradition of democracy in action and its aspects of guaranteeing to every individual the opportunity to be heard and to express his opinion, I appeal that any duly constituted body, including unions, functioning in compliance with existing law, be assured of its basic right to convene, not only on a local level, but in national convention, and to elect its officers. I state this in response to the considerable number of letters that I have received from rank-and-file teamsters residing in my district appealing for the right to hold a convention to elect officers and adopt programs.

In answer to these letters, I wish to make my position clear. To me the important consideration is the principle of freedom of assembly and regardless of whether the members of one or a dozen groups are involved the principle should be applicable wherever rights are denied. This is a fundamental privilege guaranteed by law and specifically and clearly spelled out in recent legislation passed by Congress which states:

Equal rights: Every member of a labor organization shall have equal rights and privileges within such organization to nominate candidates, to vote in elections or referendums of the labor organization, to attend membership meetings, and to participate in the deliberations and voting upon the business of such meetings, subject to reasonable rules and regulations in such organization's constitution and bylaws.

Freedom of speech and assembly: Every member of any labor organization shall have the right to meet and assemble freely with other members; and to express any views, arguments, or opinions; and to express at meetings of the labor organization his views, upon candidates in an election of the labor organization or upon any business properly before the meeting, subject to the organization's established and reasonable rules pertaining to the conduct of meeting: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to impair the right of a labor organization to adopt and enforce reasonable rules as to the responsibility of every member toward the organization as an institution and to his refraining from conduct that would interfere with its performance of its legal or contractual obligations.

Every national or international labor organization, except a federation of national or international labor organizations, shall elect its officers not less often than once every 5 years either by secret ballot among the members in good standing or at a convention of delegates chosen by secret ballot.

Regardless of how one feels about the controversy surrounding any particular circumstances, it only seems fair that the rank-and-file members of trade union be given the opportunity under democratic processes to carry out their rights to convene and hold elections, as set forth under the laws.

The officers who are elected would have to comply with the requirements of the Labor-Management Act of 1959, and any derelictions from duty would subject them to the penalties of the act. Suppression of the rights of the rank and file which have been granted by Congress through legislation is not the way of America.

I hope that, wherever and whenever any instance of denial of such rights occurs, it will be remedied immediately in line with our American way of life.

FRANKLIN, KY., WINS AGAIN

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I cite the fact that Franklin, Ky., has won first place in group 2 of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce 5-year community development contest. For this victory, which attracted the competition of cities of 3,500 or more in population, an award of $1,000 will be presented to Franklin in September at the State fair on Kentucky Chamber of Commerce Day.

This award marks the happy completion of 5 successful years of Franklin's participation in this long-range community planning contest with year-to-year continuity and certainly this city, which is the county seat of one of the outstanding counties in Kentucky—Simpson County—is fully deserving of this distinction and merits heartiest congratulations. Franklin captured three first places and two seconds over a 5-year period, and the total earnings of $5,400 have been put to good use in furthering the community's development.

Many accomplishments have made possible this victory for Franklin—notably among these is a new junior high school building, the opening of several new industrial plants and numerous stores, as well as the development of a number of attractive residential subdivisions. Moreover, the people of Franklin have demonstrated that they know their responsibilities as good citizens by annually cooperating in approving an adequate budget for their schools. Scrapbooks, which were also included as entries in the contests over the years, were well prepared by the Franklin Business and Professional Women's Club.

It is crystal clear that the residents of Franklin have not permitted themselves to become so absorbed in the privileges of American citizenship that they forget the responsibilities and duties that go with this blessing. I am sure that none of those who live in this fair city have ever taken their community for granted—they know that there is no magic that can automatically solve the inevitable problems that arise and so they have, as it were, adopted a "do-it-yourself" spirit to promote their city's progress and improve the local economy. These efforts have indeed brought enviable results and proved once again that communities—large and small—can always profitably take inventory of their local potentials, looking toward bolstering the economy and enhancing community conditions generally.

Franklin, Ky., is indeed fortunate in having as its mayor, Mr. Paul B. Massey, a thoroughly dedicated public official, who is equally fortunate in having highly qualified individuals serving with him in the city's government. Assisting these officials in all their endeavors are the various civic clubs, the local chamber of commerce, the Franklin Favorite, one of Kentucky's outstanding weekly newspapers, radio station WFKN, and the Franklin Industrial Board.

Certainly this small city, conspicuous for its excellent school system, lovely homes and churches, may well be proud of this latest honor and I want to reaffirm the genuine happiness that I derive in being privileged to represent Simpson County in the Congress of the United States. May the guidance of providence lead Franklin onward to even greater and brighter achievements.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for Wednesday, June 15, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania), for June 14 and 15, on account of death in family.

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. CONTE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, June 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROCK and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SAYLOR, to include in the remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today the proclamation of President Wilson of 1915 and the proclamation of President Roosevelt of 1938.

Mr. LANE.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. BRADEMAS in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. CURTIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mrs. WEIS.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 15, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2257. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2258. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

2259. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2260. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 1, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Redwood River at Marshall, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted on June 20, 1957, and authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2261. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the administration of unclaimed funds held and owing by life insurance companies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2262. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2263. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2264. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2265. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1502. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disabilities system without amendment (Rept. No. 1626, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2174. An act to permit the filing of applications for patents to certain lands in Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 3226. An act to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 900. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of August 18, 1941, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the United States from certain recreational activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the State; to validate certain payment; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 1821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 2178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at Whites Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10598. A bill to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C. 42(a), 42(b); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C. 43), and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11813. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 12346. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; without amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12417. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength; with amendment (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 12465. A bill to provide for a simpler method of determining assessments under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12530. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Virginia-North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12532. A bill to provide compensation for certain property losses in the Tuttle Creek Reservoir project, Kansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12564. A bill to authorize multiple-purpose development at Victory Reservoir site, Vermont; without amendment (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3106. An act to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10876. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3900. A bill to permit the use of foreign-built hydrofoil vessels in the coastwise trade of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 808. A bill to authorize the Secretary

of State to evaluate in dollars certain financial assistance loans expressed in foreign currencies arising as a result of World War II and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 3072. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1283. An act to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use; with amendment (Rept. No. 1861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12539. A bill to implement section 4 of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 12117. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1863). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 556. Resolution for consideration of S. 1898, an act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1864). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 557. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11123, a bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for construction and equipment of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; without amendment (Rept. No. 1865). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 558. A Resolution for consideration of H.R. 2467, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for Chantilly Airport for their moving expenses; without amendment (Rept. No. 1866). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 559. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7624, a bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, in accordance with regulations prescribing the conditions (including maximum tolerances) under which such additives may be safely used; without amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12620. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Ireneo D. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit; without amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Teri Miyamoto (nee Ikeda); with amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2705. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Paternostro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Miss Elisabeth Hollander; without amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Luciano Di Franco; without amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Epifanio Trupiano; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 3804. A bill for the relief of Rosolina Ciuferri; with amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4236. A bill for the relief of Woo Bow Land; with amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4555. A bill for the relief of Anatolijs Janitis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Groutas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5647. A bill for the relief of Wong Gee Sing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6804. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Tighe Crespo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary: H.R. 7425. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Humiko Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8253. A bill for the relief of Pierre R. DeBroux; with amendment (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8384. A bill for the relief of Otto Small; without amendment (Rept. No. 1816. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9610. A bill for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrini (Virginia Bilbao); with amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10002. A bill for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio); without amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1765. An act to authorize and direct the Treasury to cause the vessel *Edith Q.*, owned by James O. Quinn, of Sunset, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; with amendment (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 762. An act for the relief of Manuel Alves de Carvalho; without amendment (Rept. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2089. An act for the relief of Henry K. Lee (Hyun Kui); without amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2106. An act for the relief of Emiko Nagamine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset; without amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2639. An act for the relief of Mo Tong Lui; without amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2646. An act for the relief of Lloyd C. Kimm; without amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An; without amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2768. An act for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikolija Lazic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2918. An act for the relief of Boris Priestley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2942. An act for the relief of Eugene Storme; without amendment (Rept. No. 1842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2964. An act for the relief of Kang Sun Ok; without amendment (Rept. No. 1843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2991. An act for the relief of Ah See Lee Chin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Julius F. Steinhoff; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Maurice Devlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3016. An act for the relief of Walter F. Beecroft; without amendment (Rept. No. 1847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3038. An act for the relief of Jung Hi Pak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3049. An act for the relief of Oh Chun Soon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3091. An act for the relief of Pasquale Mira; without amendment (Rept. No. 1850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3130. An act for the relief of Anne-Marie Stehlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cecilia Rubio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2740. An act for the relief of Julia Sukkar; with amendment (Rept. No. 1858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ming-Chen Hsu (nee Nai-Fu Mo); with amendment (Rept. No. 1859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2967. An act for the relief of Huan-pin Tso; with amendment (Rept. No. 1860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12620. A bill 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 12621. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiment and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H.R. 12622. A bill to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 12623. A bill to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 12624. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for 1 year; to authorize Presidential action during the time Congress is not in session if such action is in the national interest or is necessary to insure an adequate supply of sugar; to stabilize the quota for Cuba; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12625. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 12626. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12627. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 12628. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 12629. A bill for the establishment of a Resources Planning Commission for the Lower Colorado River Basin, to study the multipurpose resources of public lands and other land and water areas in and near the Colorado River between Hoover Dam and the Mexican boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12630. A bill for the establishment of a Resources Planning Commission for the Lower Colorado River Basin, to study the multipurpose resources of public lands and other land and water areas in and near the Colorado River between Hoover Dam and the Mexican boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12631. A bill to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 12632. A bill 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 12633. A bill 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 12634. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Aquarium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 700. Concurrent resolution to designate the first day of May each year as Law Day in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H. Con. Res. 701. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 12635. A bill for the relief of Tio Sien Tjiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12636. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lopinto Arzaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12637. A bill for the relief of Marieta Fernandes Patricio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12638. A bill for the relief of Bishara Hanna Iqal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12639. A bill for the relief of Imre Tokodi, Piroska Tokodi and Eva Tokodi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 12640. A bill for the relief of Jacinto Machado Ormonde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12641. A bill for the relief of Jeffrey J. Powder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonore Sidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12643. A bill for the relief of Miss Liu Lai Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 12644. A bill for the relief of Robert H. McNeill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 12645. A bill to provide tax relief for the annuity fund of the slate, tile, and roofing industry of New York City and the contributors thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 12646. A bill for the relief of Vicente Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 12647. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Giuseppe) Frija (Frijia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 12648. A bill for the relief of Ryoko Shiozaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12649. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Prokop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 12650. A bill for the relief of Ho Ching Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12651. A bill for the relief of Jozef Gromada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12652. A bill for the relief of Jorge Alberto De Sousa Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

492. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Edith McCauley Provost and other members of the Omaha Tribe, in opposition to H.R. 11782; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

493. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution adopted by the New York Board of Trade, New York, N.Y., expressing its opposition to the passage by the U.S. Congress of any bills now before it which would extend medical, surgical, and hospital care to those persons now covered by the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Stupidity or Madness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the recent summit meeting and the events preceding and subsequent thereto have been distressing to all of us, the Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the American public.

Time and history alone will eventually relate the circumstances, the fault, or the blame, if such can be properly characterized, for the incidents which the Soviet Union so conveniently utilized to disperse the scheduled talks dwelling upon peace in the troubled world, dispelling the cold war and lowering the Iron Curtain.

In all this history of international relations, and particularly those involving the very personages of the heads of government, has there been such abuse and vilification heaped upon the head of a sovereign people, as has occurred in the series of irresponsible, vitrolic, and extremely vulgar utterances by Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

While we, as officials of this Government, and the citizens of this great Republic have the constitutional right to our thoughts and expressions, if you will, as to the rights or wrongs leading to the summit collapse, we should meditate very seriously on the immediate tensions that have arisen out of this situation. Further, this is the time that, "we, the people," should unite and stand fast in support of our Chief Executive and our Government until these tensions subside and the vitriolic and polluted air is cleared.

We should bear in mind that right or wrong, he is our President and this is our Government. United, we stand but divided, we shall fall.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in this House the purpose of an editorial published on June 6 in the Norfolk Daily News, Norfolk, Nebr., a progressive daily with an enterprising editorial staff.

The editorial, entitled "Stupidity or Madness?" is an excellent treatise on the summit and postsummit actions and utterances of one Nikita Khrushchev. It is a courageous piece of writing, one that endeavors to reflect our national thinking on the ultimate results therefrom.

May I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of my colleagues in the House, include these portions of a fine editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may be available for all to read and give sober reflection to the threat about us.

The article, in part, reads:

The world, or, at least, that decent portion of it which still believes in manners and morals, was gagged by his vitriolic attack on President Eisenhower at Paris following the collapse of the summit meetings. But his freelance repeat performance in Moscow the other day was even worse.

Khrushchev has been so arrogant and ill mannered against the man whose efforts for peace have given the world its great hope that he no longer can be regarded as a responsible leader of a major nation.

The world hasn't seen such a disgusting display of irresponsibility since Adolf Hitler was spouting curses at all who stood in the way of his designs for world conquest.

Immediate war was Hitler's aim. We cannot believe that Khrushchev really wants war. The only conclusion to be drawn is that we are watching the spectacle of a world leader roaring into the winds, cloaked in a mantle of stupidity and madness.

President Eisenhower Thanks Democratic Congressmen for Their Assurance of Support of Mutual Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of great importance to the security of the United States and the defense of the free world, for we are to begin debate on the bill providing appropriations for the mutual security program.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to be one of a group of Democratic Members of Congress who on May 25, 1960, wrote a letter to President Eisenhower assuring him that, in spite of criticisms we felt with respect to the handling by his administration of the foreign policy of our country, we would oppose any unwise cuts in the mutual security appropriations bill.

We told the President of our pride in the support which the Democratic Party has given to the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4 and the mutual security program. We concluded:

We wish to reaffirm the policy of the Democratic Party in past years of resisting the encroachment of communism and stimulating the advance of democracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the text of the letter to President Eisenhower to which I have referred:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Democratic Members of Congress, are writing to you concerning the mutual security appropriations bill shortly to be considered by the House of Representatives.

We take note of the letters many of us have received from your Deputy Assistant expressing your gratification and appreciation for our support of the mutual security authorization bill. We take note as well of the action of the Vice President in urging Republican Members of the House Appropriations Committee to resist massive reductions in this program.

We have for the past 7 years been critical of the handling by your administration of the foreign policy of our country and in recent days we have been deeply distressed by the conduct of our affairs before the summit meeting. Indeed, some of us have just written to you a series of questions concerning the collapse of the summit conference.

We nonetheless believe the mutual security program an indispensable part of our foreign policy and we wish to advise you that we shall oppose any unwise cuts in the mutual security appropriations bill.

We are proud of the support which the Democratic Party has given to the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4 and the mutual security program. We wish to reaffirm the policy of the Democratic Party in past years of resisting the encroachment of communism and stimulating the advance of democracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Respectfully,

CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; CHESTER BOWLES, Second District, Connecticut; STEWART L. UDALL, Second District, Arizona; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; CLEMENT W. MILLER, First District, California; CHARLES O. PORTER, Fourth District, Oregon; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, 17th District, Michigan; EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District, New York; GEORGE A. KASEM, 25th District, California; CHARLES C. BIGGS, JR., 13th District, Michigan; ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Third District, Connecticut; THOMAS J. LANE, Seventh District Massachusetts; LEONARD G. WOLF, Second District, Iowa; LEE METCALF, First District, Montana; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Fourth District, New Jersey; JOHN BRADEMAS, Third District, Indiana; EDITH GREEN, Third District, Oregon; JEFFREY COHELAN, Seventh District, California; JOSEPH KARTH, Fourth District, Minnesota; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Eighth District, Minnesota; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, 19th District, New York; HERMAN TOLL, Sixth District, Pennsylvania; RALPH J. RIVERS, At Large, Alaska; JAMES G. O'HARA, Seventh District, Michigan; JOHN R. FOLEY, Sixth District, Maryland; EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth District, New York; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Fifth District, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland, also asked to be associated with the letter.

Under date of May 31, 1960, I received, as the signatory of the May 25 letter on behalf of my colleagues, a letter from President Eisenhower expressing his appreciation for our assurances of support for this program.

Said President Eisenhower, "It is gratifying to me, and reassuring, that we are in full accord in respect to this activity so basic to our security and the future of freedom everywhere."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD

President Eisenhower's letter of May 31, 1960:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1960.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I hope you will advise the cosigners of your May 25 letter of my appreciation of their assurance, and of yours, that your group will steadfastly support adequate funds for the mutual security program. Of course I am aware that we may differ on certain aspects of the Nation's affairs, but it is gratifying to me, and reassuring, that we are in full accord in respect to this activity so basic to our security and the future of freedom everywhere.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

REPUBLICAN EX-CONGRESSMAN STRONG ON WORDS, WEAK ON DEEDS

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a personal reference, as I listen to some of the criticism directed at me by my Republican predecessors in Congress because I am among those Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle interested in having more facts about the U-2 incident—as I listen to some of my Republican predecessor's criticisms, I am constrained to point out that the voice of the demagog is once more heard in the land.

For the Republican ex-Congressman who seeks to cover with a blanket of silence an honest and essential discussion of foreign policy events that may deeply affect the security of our country is very strong on words but very weak on deeds in the support of freedom against the menace of communism.

REPUBLICAN EX-CONGRESSMAN VOTES AGAINST EISENHOWER PROGRAM

For, Mr. Speaker, the Republican ex-Congressman to whom I refer on May 14, 1958, voted for the mutual security authorization bill but on July 2, 1958, turned right around to vote against the mutual security appropriation bill. This Republican ex-Congressman thus cast his vote against a program which President Eisenhower has repeatedly insisted is essential to the defense of the free world against the forces of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the mutual security authorization bill and I shall vote for the mutual security appropriations bill as well. The times are too dangerous to be able to afford the doubletalk of voting for the first and against the second.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point the text of a letter to me dated May 17, 1960, from Bryce N. Harlow, deputy assistant to the President, concerning my vote in support of the mutual security authorization bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 17, 1960.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: On Saturday last, as he completed preparations for the summit conference in Paris, President Eisenhower requested me to send to you, in his behalf, this note of gratification and appreciation for your support of the mutual security authorization bill. He stressed once again his profound conviction that this program is indispensable to our own and free world defense against Communist imperialism, and indispensable also in encouraging struggling millions in less fortunate nations in their effort to live their lives in freedom. It is a program requiring, he said, unreserved support by all of our informed citizens and officials, and he feels it would be the height of folly to allow isolated administrative shortcomings and disappointments, or local considerations, political or otherwise, to tempt anyone to jettison or cripple the entire undertaking.

Especially the President voiced this hope, and asked that it be communicated to you in his behalf: that your responsible act of support for the mutual security authorization be matched by a determined resistance to any effort to effect massive reductions in the mutual security appropriations soon to be considered by the House. Massive reductions, he pointed out, can be accomplished only by undermining our own security, free world security, and the cause of human freedom everywhere in the world.

The President asked me to explain that he would have advised you himself of these views had his time permitted before leaving for Paris.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that we Democrats will support adequate funds for the mutual security program. It is in the interest of our country and of the cause of human freedom that we do so.

"Genocide Day" for Baltic Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the understanding of current world problems is facilitated by placing them in a historical sequence since the events of the past, when duly documented, are a great aid to us in the consideration of current problems and plans for the future.

Today, June 14, sadly and with a sense of frustration, we make note of what is historically described as Genocide Day. In June 1941 the forces of the Soviet Union conducted mass deportations of Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians to central Russia from which area very few ever returned to their homeland. The purpose of these deportations was to complete the consolidation of control of the Communists over these previously independent Baltic peoples. Each of the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, had a long history of nationalistic opposition to Russian control, inspired, in a great part, by the religious structures of the countries which provided the people additional strength and the will to resist. In the previous period from 1918 to 1940, they made remarkable strides in developing as free nations.

Mr. Speaker, we, in these days of renewed international tensions should reiterate our solemn promise to these brave peoples that the conduct of our foreign policy pledges us to work so that they may eventually regain their freedom from the present oppressive Communist slave regime.

Million Filipinos Greet President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, relevant to the visit of the President to the Far East including the Philippines, there appeared a leading editorial in the Journal of Commerce of New York in its issue of Tuesday, June 7, 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith this timely editorial:

A PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE

In a letter to Senator WALLACE BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, last week, President Eisenhower said he attaches "particular interest" to congressional enactment of a 4-year extension to the Sugar Act together with flexible authority for the President to change U.S. quotas for foreign producers.

We should think he would attach particular importance to it. We should think Congress would, too, including the House Agriculture Committee, which just voted a simple 1-year extension of the act, and the Rules Committee, which is now considering what priority, if any, the subject should be given on the floor.

For as matters stand today, what the Agriculture Committee has done has been to vote a handsome dividend for Mr. Fidel Castro, that well-known exponent of the democratic way of life in Cuba, while threatening to deprive the President of something that could prove very valuable to him and to American foreign policy generally in the course of his forthcoming visit to the Philippines and the Far East.

As the law stands today, and as it would stand until the end of 1961 under the 1-year extension of the Sugar Act approved by the Agriculture Committee, whenever any domestic sugar-producing area cannot fill its assigned quota, the Secretary of Agriculture must award a substantial proportion of the shortfall to Cuba.

And right now it looks as though Puerto Rican output will fall short of its quota by 300,000 tons and the Hawaiian crop by 200,000 tons.

So the prospect is that unless Congress as a whole overturns this ill-advised move on the part of the House Agriculture Committee, Dr. Castro's regime will automatically get a bonus of 160,000 tons as a reward for his confiscatory attacks on American business and for his incessant vilification of the United States and its institutions. This assumes, of course, that Cuba could actually supply that much, which is very doubtful.

As we previously remarked in discussing this subject, if anyone has ever demonstrated the need for an extensive overhaul of U.S. legislation on sugar quotas, it is Dr. Castro. It is ridiculous that U.S. controls should be so rigidly fixed that they cannot be adapted to changing circumstances in general, and to deal with as consistently bad an actor as Castro in particular.

But the shortcomings in the present Sugar Act were evident long before the present Cuban regime shot its way into power.

President Eisenhower himself called attention to some of these when in signing the present act 4 years ago, he said explicitly that in any further extensions of the act, provision ought to be made to permit the Philippines to enjoy the same proportionate share of increasing American consumption as is enjoyed by other countries.

Not only is the present system too rigid, but its rigidity is fixed in such a way that it discriminates painfully against a country whose steady friendship and cooperation is of the utmost importance to the United States.

It would be one thing to be caught in a situation in which a rigid system of controls permitted no change to be made for a period of years, as might be the case if, say, the Sugar Act had 2 or 3 years to run.

But it is quite another to find the way open to such a change, and then fail to make it. The way is now open, for the 1956 Sugar Act (which was of 4 years' duration) expires at the end of this year, so Congress must deal with it in one way or another during 1960 or the whole quota system will collapse.

But here we face a peculiar situation. Congress has ordered the administration to stop all foreign aid to Cuba—an action we thought and still think unwise because we believe the administration should have more discretion in such matters. Now, the House Agriculture Committee, and some other legislative circles, seem bent on refusing the President the discretionary powers he needs to cut down on the quota bonuses that would automatically go to Cuba under the existing law. Moreover, he is still frustrated in his efforts to achieve a better break for the Philippines, which certainly deserve one.

It certainly doesn't make sense, unless it is expressed in terms of a conviction that Congress is better-equipped than the President to handle the day-to-day twists in our foreign relations, economic as well as political, a conviction from which we heartily dissent.

We very much hope that more responsible quarters in the Senate and House will grasp that "particular importance" of passing a sensible 4-year sugar bill, and of doing so before the President sets off for the Philippines.

On Sunday, June 12, the New York Times carried two articles datelined Havana entitled "Reds Stepping Up Missions to Cuba" and "American Hotels Seized in Havana."

How much more of the Castro regime can the American people stand?

On the other hand, we were told a few days ago by Secretary of State Herter who spoke before the SEATO Council, that further Communist activity in the Far East is likely as an aftermath of the failure of talks at the summit. We have our firm friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines, with 600 million Chinese Reds breathing down the back of her neck. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we had a reevaluation of the world situation with respect to the United States and the millions of our friends in the Far East, especially the Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine-American relations have rather been subjected to a rough beating. Long unresolved problems between the two countries have generated irritants which in turn have developed into big thorns in the side of Philippine-United States friendship. Most of these irritants are caused by misunderstandings. President Eisenhower can do much to dispel these misunderstandings.

As a matter of fact, in the statement made by President Eisenhower as his reasons for the trip he stated and I quote:

I am going to these countries: Because with the Republic of the Philippines we have the closest ties of association beginning six decades ago, and because it was in the Philippines many years ago that we launched our first major program to help a developing people achieve a prosperous independence.

PHILIPPINE SUGAR

Every American is aware of the sacrifices of our friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines made during World War II. The sacrifices of the Philippine sugar industry because of its experience during World War II is even more pronounced when you consider that sugar lands and processing factories were devastated and destroyed. Recovery and rehabilitation were slow because of the shortage of machinery and the lack of cane seeds, work animals, and agricultural implements. It actually consumed more than the proverbial 7 lean years by Philippine sugar producers to attain their prewar position. In the period from 1941–53, the Philippines shipped to the United States only 4,433,501 short tons out of what would have been their share of 12,376,000 short tons. Other foreign sources, principally Cuba, supplied the difference of almost 8 million tons lost by the Philippine sugar interests through no fault of their own. The facility with which U.S. sugar users were able to obtain the sugar supply curtailed by the war in the Fart East is commendable and has been recognized and rewarded. The Philippine sugar industry by the same token should not be deprived of its opportunity to come back to some extent through sharing with other foreign suppliers the increased demand in U.S. sugar consumption.

During 8 years after the liberation of the Philippines, sugar lost its preeminent position as a Philippine export product and ranked second to copra in importance. Today, however, the sugar industry is again on its prewar productive capacity and from now on will provide the country with a source of dollar income of $100 million annually. Moreover, the industry is a major source of revenue to the Philippine Government. According to recent estimates 25 percent of its total receipts is derived from the sugar industry.

Among all foreign suppliers no other country occupies the position of the Republic of the Philippines in its relationship with the United States and no fair analogy might be drawn between United States-Philippine relations and other international connections and loyalties. For more than 50 years the Philippines to all intents and purposes were a part of the United States and the continuing interest of the Government and citizens of the United States in promoting the welfare of the relatively new Government of the Philippines has been manifested in many generous gestures. To detach sugar legislation from a broad program of diplomatic, legislative, political, economic and social collaboration and cooperation, and to adopt standards based on such considerations as the payment of duties, the assistance to other countries in exploitation of agricultural resources or in other respects on an arms length basis affords an anomaly in U.S. official and unofficial conduct.

At this point it may be well again to clarify what seems to be an impression, mistaken though it is, that the fixed Philippine quota of 980,000 tons annually cannot be increased due to the provisions of the Sugar Act and the trade agreement in force between our country and the Philippines. Article II of the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955 specifically provides:

The establishment herein of the limitation on the amounts of Philippine raw and refined sugar that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, in the United States for consumption, shall be without prejudice to any increases which the Congress of the United States might allocate to the Philippines in the future.

There are many other strong economic and political reasons for including in any revisions which this Congress makes of the Sugar Act for the period commencing January 1, 1961, an increase in the Philippine quota commensurate with other foreign suppliers to meet the annual increased sugar needs of the United States. I shall not elaborate upon them, but point again only to the moral obligation which we have to act in this manner in fulfillment of the promise of the President of the United States reflected in the editorial which I have quoted to the effect that at this very time we would allow the Philippines to share in increased consumption.

Address by James C. Oliver Before the Ahepa Tristate Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, at the Ahepa Tristate Convention, Portland, Maine, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], made a noteworthy address which I feel could give inspiration to all of us and which I deem a pleasure to include in this RECORD. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of humility that I speak here today before you, a distinguished assembly of American citizens of Greek-American extraction.

Yet, it is most appropriate that I, as an elected public official, holding office through the indulgence of a free electorate in one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all assemblies of free men, the U.S. House of Representatives, should take advantage of this great privilege which you have accorded me to address you, the dedicated members of Ahepa.

For, as your freely elected Representative, here in this meeting assembled today, I take this opportunity to speak to you of liberty and freedom, as fought for and practiced by the ancestors of all of us. I, also, must avail

myself of this opportunity to warn you that the threat of loss of freedom hangs heavily over us and, in fact, over the entire world.

Today we face a common foe, not only in Greece and in America but in every section of the world, more ruthless, more cunning, more determined, more barbarously willing and eager to enslave mankind than were the Huns, the Slavs, the Persians, and all the other power-drunk conquerors of the ages.

The Soviets and the Red Chinese, ladies and gentlemen, have never changed their spots. These despoilers of freedom are dedicated to the conquest of peace-loving and freedom-worshipping peoples of the Western World. Their boast that they will bury us is no idle talk. This is no game which they are playing for mere marbles of gain. They are playing in deadly earnest and for keeps. We are fat, we are complacent, we are unwilling to listen to the hard facts and the harsh realities of the world in which we live today.

Your family ancestors in Greece for centuries faced up to the facts of life, as for example at Thermopylae and Salamis. A small and battered slab of marble discovered about a year ago in Troizen, just south of Athens, tells, through its inscription, of the battle orders issued by Themistocles when the Persians were on the march from Sardes, the seat of their government.

This slab and its inscription of fighting words has been described by its discoverer as the Athenian equivalent of our Declaration of Independence.

In truth, this battle order cut in marble backgrounds the crucial victory of the Greeks that followed at Salamis over the greatest empire of that period of history. It gave your ancestors command of the sea. It restored their freedom to pursue their ideals of liberty and made possible their golden age for which mankind has ever since gained the political and cultural inspiration which will never be extinguished.

So, my friends, we know from the past that we must fight for freedom and the heritage of liberty which, in fact, have been passed to us in this generation on a silver platter and which we are destined to lose if we fail to wake up to the threatening clouds which are becoming ever blacker, almost daily.

Then, again, as we refer in rather inadequate words to another episode in the glorious history of your great fatherland, we are once more inspired by the bravery and the indomitable courage of the Greek people and its leadership of the past.

It was 139 years ago when Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the standard of revolt in his monastery at Kalavryta against the Turks on March 25, and his people joined him in this national struggle against their oppressors, his daring act ushered in a new day for the Greek people. That courageous deed by a stouthearted dignitary of the Greek Church marked a sharp break from the events of preceding centuries when Greeks were subjected successively to the Romans, the Frankish kings and the Turks. That day became the independence day of the Greeks.

We in this country have always held the Greeks in exceptionally high esteem. We have always had great sympathy for them, and have done our utmost to help them whenever we could. In their fight for freedom and independence against the tyranny of the Turks, and especially in their desperate struggle to maintain their independence against fascism, nazism, communism, and all forms of totalitarianism, they have counted upon our sympathy and on our aid. We are proud to say that fortunately we have been in a position to help them and have not disappointed them. And this has been true in the past as it is at present.

In the early days of the Greek war of independence a number of philhellenic groups were formed in this country for the purpose of raising funds and thus extending material aid to the fighting Greeks. A wave of philhellenic enthusiasm swept over America. President Monroe himself was not immune to the contagion of this philhellenism. This is clearly shown in his annual message on December 3, 1822, when he gave some reasons for our interest in the Greek cause. "The mention of Greece," he said, "fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

This was an eloquent and welcome explanation. As the elected head of the government of this country, he expressed the feeling of our people. No less eloquent was Daniel Webster, perhaps the most illustrious statesman-orator of his day, when he characterized the Greek War of Independence as part of a greater struggle between the absolute and the regulated governments. He stated that America could not and should not hold aloof from world affairs, and it was time for the people and the Government of this country to take a stand. "As one of the free states among the nations," he declared, "as a great and rapidly rising republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were not disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world." "Our side of this question," he added, referring to the Greek War of Independence, "is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions."

There are many fine thoughts and noble ideals in these few sentences of that inimitable orator-statesman, but the core is found in the last sentence, for it reflects the full and free American spirit; our place is, and has always been, on the side of free institutions, erected and kept erect by free men. And the Greeks were among the forerunners of free men who founded free institutions and fought for their preservation.

Nor has our expression of sympathy and our show of kinship of ideas with the Greeks been limited to mere words and declarations. It is well known that whenever Greeks have been in trouble, in need of material aid, we have been generous in helping them. This has been particularly true at the end of the First World War, and, of course, more so during and since the end of the last war. Early in the course of that war, when Greece was overrun by the Axis forces, our wartime President, the late Franklin Roosevelt, declared confidently that Greece would be liberated and rewarded for her heroic fight on the side of democracies against the forces of barbarism and darkness. He certainly echoed the true and genuine sentiment of the people of this country when he said: "I am glad to have the opportunity to reassure my friends of Greek origin and Greek birth everywhere that it is the desire of the American Government to help Greece to the utmost of its capabilities."

Our postwar role in Greek affairs, our aid to Greece, both financially and militarily, is rather widely known and I need not dwell upon them in detail. As soon as circumstances permitted, toward the end of the last war, we were more generous in aiding Greece than at any time in our history. In March 1947 when we were asked by the hard-pressed Greek Government for urgent emergency and military assistance, we felt that it was our duty to comply with this request. The then President Truman felt that it was our solemn responsibility to give all we could to save Greece from the tightening clutches of communism. In his message to Congress on March 12, the President declared: "I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government."

Here again the President was echoing the sincere wishes of our people. We could not turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government, even though we had already expended more than $500 million in the form of supplies, lend-lease aid, and under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Fortunately, we had some more expendable dollars, and we did not seem to mind to add close to $3 billion worth of aid to the Greeks. Yes, the Greeks have deserved well of us. I am indeed glad to say that we were able and willing thus to pay at least a part of our intellectual debt which we all feel humanity owes to Greece and to the Greek genius.

In their enthusiasm for creative things of lasting value, the attainments and accomplishments of the Greeks remain unsurpassed and unequaled. In their fervent enthusiasm for liberty and democracy, they have struggled against great odds, have fought bravely and have guarded their democratic institutions tenaciously. For almost 2,000 years, from 146 B.C. to A.D. 1821, Greece was ruled by the Romans, the Frankish kings, and by the Ottoman Turks. From the Battle of Corinth in 146 B.C. when Greece was overrun by Roman legions to the Battle of Navarino in 1827 when the tyranny of the Ottoman Turks was finally brought to an end in Greece, Greeks lived under alien rule, but during those centuries their spirit of freedom was not extinguished; their dauntless will to fight never deserted them. And the best proof of that was the long, often despairing, and almost endless fight which they carried on for 8 years before they could attain their freedom and independence.

While we are discussing the Greek heritage to the civilization of the free world it would be most remiss of me to neglect a brief reference to the tragedy of Cyprus where the Greek majority have been frustrated for too long in their legitimate fight for this preponderantly Greek area. The gallant struggle, symbolized by the dedicated efforts of that great patriot, Archbishop Markarios, will eventually succeed and the ends of justice will be served. Of this, I feel certain.

Today, my friends of Ahepa, these memorable events of history inspire us to defend our freedom and liberty, eternally, against the impending and potential dangers of totalitarian tyrants.

I should speak, if time permitted, of the great contributions which have been made to America by those in your families who came to our shores and now comprise in every center of population in the United States the core of God-loving, law-abiding, public spirited citizenry, which has helped to make and will continue to help to keep America great.

I would speak, my friends, if time permitted of the cultural contributions which America has gained from the illustrious his-

tory of Greece and its people down through the centuries. For these America is profoundly grateful.

But the greatest contribution of all is the philosophy of the dignity of man and of the freedom of the individual. It is for these that freedom loving people all over the world must be the most grateful. It is for these priceless values that we must prepare to fight when threatened. It is for this heritage which our forefathers died to preserve that we will fight to defend against any and every enemy of human self-respect wherever and whenever he shows his ugly head and his rocket rattling belligerency.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, my friends of Ahepa, may that day never come again when we shall be compelled to fight in defense of these greatest of all assets of mankind, freedom and liberty, but, if, God forbid, it does come then in the philosophy of the song of the Greek heroes of the ages, we shall find this to be our one and only reply:

I may have a rock for my pillow
And only the snow for my cover
But I will never serve as a slave!
Dig a grave for me
Large and deep,
That I may stand with my gun—
Ready to fight.

The Baltic Peoples and Their Tragic Fate in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians has been fraught with much tragedy relieved by occasional triumph. Centuries before World War I they had lost their independence and lived under foreign regimes.

The end of that war ushered in a new era for these peoples. All three regained and proclaimed their independence in 1919, established their own democratic governments. These governments were duly recognized by other countries and they became members of the world community of nations.

During the period of freedom which they enjoyed during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged countries, and were perfectly content with their lot. Unfortunately, however, in the larger world of international politics and diplomacy they were not masters of their fate.

With the rise of totalitarian governments both in Germany and in Russia the Baltic peoples found themselves in a very precarious position. They succeeded in maintaining their independence until the outbreak of the last war, and then brute Soviet force became the arbiter of their fate.

As the friends of these peoples in the West became involved in the war, the Soviet Union felt free to deal with the Baltic peoples as its dictator wished—to occupy and annex these countries and enslave their inhabitants. This was done not only in a high-handed manner but by resorting to barbaric methods.

By early June 1940 these countries were occupied by the Red army and at about the middle of the month the Soviet authorities in these countries rounded up all those suspected of opposing communism, numbering hundreds of thousands, and exiled them to the distant corners of the Soviet Union. From that day to this, 20 years after that tragic event, we still do not exactly know the fate of these helpless and unfortunate people who were arrested, herded into freight cars and destined to incarceration, servitude, and even death in desolate parts of the Soviet Union.

Today it is possible that some of these people, who survived the terrible years in exile, have returned to their homeland, but it is more probable that most of them have died in exile and misery, far away from their beloved homeland.

In observing the 20th anniversary of that tragic event, the Soviet deportations of men, women, and children by the hundreds of thousands in 1940 from the Baltic States, we pray for the souls of these brave but helpless people.

Sound Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took note of the recent Treasury offering to exchange up to $5½ billion of new 4-year notes and 8-year bonds for outstanding securities maturing on November 15, 1961. The gentleman views this offering as a giveaway, inasmuch as the existing bonds are earning interest at 2½ percent, whereas the new notes and bonds will earn rates of 3¾ percent and 3⅞ percent, respectively.

The gentleman's predilection for perpetually low interest rates, which could only lead to disastrous inflation, are well known to us, and need not be repeated at this time. It is important that the record be set straight, however, and that the current Treasury operation be judged for exactly what it is—a sound and imaginative debt management transaction that will ease the task of the next administration and benefit the American people.

The facts are these. On November 15, 1961, $11.2 billion of 2½-percent bonds come due, of which almost $11 billion are held by public investors. This huge amount is the largest publicly held maturity now outstanding. The easiest course for Secretary of the Treasury Anderson to take would be to do nothing, but simply ignore the problem that will confront the Treasury in November 1961.

If the size of this maturity is not in some way reduced, the pressure on the Government securities market in November 1961 could be almost unbearable. As anyone even vaguely familiar with the market mechanism knows, $11 billion of securities is simply too much to refinance efficiently at one time. Any attempt to do so would shoot interest rates upward and could greatly disrupt the market. This could do serious damage to the cause of sound Government finance. It would not be responsible for Secretary Anderson to ignore this problem.

The gentleman from Texas implies that it is foolish to offer securities with higher interest rates for outstanding bonds with lower rates. He attempts to compare the situation with an individual who might voluntarily refinance a home mortgage or an automobile loan at a higher rate. But I am sure that all of us would agree that such an action, rather than being improvident, would be quite appropriate if the individual were confronted, as is the Treasury, with a huge amount of debt coming due all at once. Such an individual would be wise to arrange for refinancing some of the debt well in advance, even if he had to pay a little more in interest to do so. Moreover, there is no assurance at all that the Treasury will be paying more interest for this necessary debt extension than if it waited until November 1961 to meet the problem. In fact, the necessary rate of interest to refinance $11 billion of securities at one time could be very high indeed.

There is another important reason for the Treasury offering. The refusal of the Congress to remove the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling has forced the Treasury to sit by while the outstanding marketable debt has grown shorter and shorter in maturity. Today, almost 80 percent matures within 5 years. This progressive shortening of the debt cannot be viewed with complacency; it is highly dangerous. It forces the Treasury to come into the market more frequently and for larger amounts, and it complicates the problems of avoiding inflation, because the shorter a security gets, the more like money it is.

Thus, the current offering is a sensible and well-designed attempt to stretch out some of this ever-shortening debt. The Treasury is offering a coupon rate of 3⅞ percent on the new 8-year bond. It is willing, as stated many times, to sell a reasonable amount of such bonds, and would have done so in the past year, but the 4½-percent ceiling has prevented such action.

The record should also be set straight on the net interest cost of this operation. The gentleman from Texas maintains that the extra interest payable between June 23, 1960, and November 15, 1961, to those holders who elect to exchange will come to $130 million on the whole $5.5 billion. The gentleman's arithmetic confuses me, because I come up with an additional cost, for that period alone, of about $99 million. But this is not the significant figure, if we agree, as we should, that some debt extension at this time is imperative, lest our huge public debt grows ever shorter in maturity. The true net cost, then, must be judged in terms of what it would cost the Treasury today to obtain the debt extension beyond November 1961

represented by the new 4-year notes and 8-year bonds. Assuming market conditions in November 1961 are as they are today, such securities would have to carry interest rates no less than 4½ percent and 4⅛ percent, respectively. On this basis, the net cost to the Treasury of achieving this valuable debt extension is less than $25 million, a modest amount indeed in view of the good that will be achieved.

Finally, note should be made of the reference of the gentleman from Texas to this offering as a "big giveaway." If such were the case, we would expect current holders of the 2½-percent bonds to be clamoring to exchange for the new securities. But the New York Times noted the other morning—June 9—that, as the books opened yesterday, "dealers in Government securities continued to sense that the Treasury invitation would meet largely with indifference." This is hardly a picture of a gigantic giveaway.

Mr. Speaker, the man who occupies the position of Secretary of the Treasury in November 1961, regardless of party, will owe a large debt of gratitude to Secretary of the Treasury Anderson for his courage and imagination in making this current offering. Rather than criticizing this action, the Members of this body should rise up with a resounding vote of thanks.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to the insistence on the part of the Democratic Party leaders to ignore the taxpayers and suspend congressional work for purpose of their preconvention activity, I would call the attention of the Members to a very important commemorative occasion which deserves our complete attention and support.

I hope that we can all put aside partisan feelings and cooperate in the observance of Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, to display to the world the concern of individual U.S. Congressmen for lack of freedom that exists in these unfortunate countries now engulfed behind the Iron Curtain.

I need not remind you of the tragic consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements that drove these people into political slavery. Groups of dedicated American citizens who are concerned with the plight of people in Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Ukraine, and other segments of the Russian Empire will be using that week to remind all Americans of the desire to maintain interest in these Iron Curtain countries and work effectively toward their eventual freedom.

Since freedom is such a precious thing, we who often take its blessings for granted could learn much observing and understanding the suffering of those who have lost their freedom to the ruthless atheistic Communist regimes.

Captive Nations Week must be remembered by all of us. I appeal to you to give it your attention in the period between the national conventions.

Massachusetts 1960 Convention of Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of my remarks as guest speaker at the department of Massachusetts 1960 convention held on June 11, 1960, at Springfield, Mass.:

Greetings, the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A., is less than 2 years old.

Even though the average age of our membership is in the sixties, we believe that our greatest period of growth is just ahead of us. In fact, there will be a few of our comrades left to remind the Nation of our service, and to our ideals, in the year 2000.

To those who say that our organization exists for one purpose only, I say that during the next 10 to 20 years we shall develop a fullbodied program to strengthen our national heritage, and to protect our freedom.

In line with this, we have taken steps toward the creation of a memorial to the veterans of World War I.

It is likely that it will be built in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., near the site of a famous Civil War battlefield. Its proximity to Arlington National Cemetery and other heroic shrines will emphasize the courage which unites all who have fought in defense of our liberties, through the generations.

This is a good beginning.

World War I had its special goals, that gave a new vision to our national purpose.

Under the farseeing leadership of President Wilson, we were in step with the future. Although the cause for which we fought and bled was betrayed by politics at home, and by conspiracies abroad, we know that we did not sacrifice in vain. The enemy of 1917–18 is the friend of today—and one of the allied powers of those days, seized by the new tyranny of communism—has become the oppressor that would conquer the world.

In this age of swift communications, and of missiles that leap across the oceans, the need becomes more imperative for a world organization to eliminate warfare. And when that time comes, the world can look back to Woodrow Wilson and to the men who fought to make the world safe for freedom.

Before we achieve that goal we shall have to overcome many dangers, and to learn new techniques for turning back the Communist challenge to our survival.

Around the clock, communism is waging war against us with economic and political, and psychological weapons.

And because of this invisible but unrelating strategy, many of our people find it hard to comprehend that we are presently engaged in a war where we could suffer defeat and slavery without a shot being fired.

The zigs and zags of Communist policy are directed against the minds of the free world in order to confuse, disarm, and demoralize us for the Communist takeover.

We were shocked and dismayed when Khrushchev sabotaged the summit conference and insulted the President of the United States.

But we should have been prepared for any eventuality, including that one, and should have been ready with measures to counteract it.

Our great weakness is the belief that the Communists will respond to reason, when we should know by this time that they will exploit every sign of weakness or indecision on our part.

In the field of psychological warfare we sometimes help them without realizing it.

When Khrushchev wrecked the summit conference it was news—sensational news—but we did not have to play it up to the extent that we did. I noticed on one day that a highly respectable New York newspaper carried six separate stories on its front page, each one of them containing the name of Khrushchev in its headlines. This overemphasis gave to the Communist dictator the recognition and the prestige that he does not deserve. In other words, he scored a propaganda victory, and this newspaper helped him to exploit it—by featuring him in six front-page stories.

This is but one example of how the Communists play upon your gullibility, and use us to further their own ends.

For several years I have been disturbed by our preoccupation with the defense. This is a negative frame of mind, that gives every advantage to the Communists. It betrays fear of initiative, and fear of mounting the counteroffensive to win the minds of men.

The Communists spend on brainwashing, $2 a year for every person in the free world, while we spend only 2 cents for each person within the Communist orbit in an effort to reach them with the truth.

To expose the lies of Communist propaganda which so often hypnotize innocent people and then to advance the missionary work of freedom, we must enlarge and intensify our program not only to help the underdeveloped countries, but to nourish and strengthen the underdeveloped minds, in the West as well as in the East.

Remember how the Communists promoted the so-called Stockholm peace petition a few years ago and induced millions of well-meaning people in the free world to sign it? Under the cloak of the word "peace" which appeals to most of humanity, they sought to lull the free world into a sense of false security. Fortunately, more realistic minds saw through this clever maneuver, and were not fooled by it.

Although myself and a few other Congressmen vigorously protested against the invitation of the White House to have Khrushchev visit the United States, we opened the doors of our hospitality to him.

Many Americans deluded themselves with the hope that he would be impressed and softened by the evidence of our material prosperity. But in one of his tantrums at Los Angeles he threatened to "bury us," if we failed to appease him by concessions that would mean surrender on the installment plan.

Soviet diplomacy is not diplomacy in the accepted meaning of that term. It is a principal weapon among the many used by Soviet propaganda. "Every form of exchange between Communist and other countries, whether diplomatic, cultural, commercial or technical, is conceived and worked out with propaganda in mind." According to Suzanne Labin who wrote "The Unrelenting War," a study of the strategy and techniques of Communist propaganda and infiltration.

"All members of Soviet missions abroad are trained primarily to charm and hoodwink high political or financial circles in the countries they are to undermine."

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, aptly described the Communists as "masters of deceit."

But, in spite of these warnings, too many Americans are apathetic toward the danger.

The Congress is forcing the administration to strengthen our retaliatory power in order to discourage and prevent a massive surprise attack upon the free world.

But this is not enough.

Our one, dangerous, unprotected front is psychological, political.

On the battlefield of "the war of minds" it is folly to sit back and wait. We must advance toward definite goals and with firm purpose.

Earlier in my remarks, I mentioned the need of a well-rounded and positive program for the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A.

As we are the older veterans, we must assume the responsibility of leadership in order to make our country strong and to keep it vigilant.

But we also have needs of our own, and those needs have been neglected by the Federal Government. Our self-respect requires that we battle to overcome the benefits deficit that has discriminated against the veterans of 1917–18.

We shall attain equality with our fellow veterans of other wars only when we finally succeed in winning a service pension for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I.

The Trail of Hoover's Life an American Heritage—Speech at the Dedication of the Hoover Boy Scout Trail at West Branch, Iowa, Saturday, June 11, 1960, by Congressman Fred Schwengel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, I was privileged to be the principal speaker at the dedication of the Hoover Trail for the Boy Scouts of Iowa at Herbert Hoover's birthplace in West Branch, Iowa.

On this occasion it was only fitting that I pay tribute to the wonderful force for good which President Hoover has been, not only in the Boy Scout program, but in the lives of all Americans.

It is my feeling that Herbert Hoover is one of the greatest living Americans and the attributes which have marked his distinguished career provide guidelines for all of us in becoming better citizens and in dedicating ourselves in serving our fellow man.

With that thought in mind, I would like to bring my address to the attention of my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks, ask that the speech appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TRAIL OF HOOVER'S LIFE, AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

(Speech at the dedication of the Hoover Trail, June 11, 1960, by the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL)

This dedication of this Hoover Trail is a historic, meaningful event in the life of this Nation and it will prove to be a picturesque feature of your Boy Scout program.

The appeal of Iowa's countryside is strong, but the citizenship values that we can get from appropriate thoughts during this dedication can likewise be very important.

The combination of the life of Herbert Hoover, the Scout program, and the Iowa woodlands and countryside is a rare and beautiful combination that should give to us a special message of confidence in and hope for the future of America.

It is my desire that we may receive from this dedication a little of what the surroundings of West Branch gave to Herbert Hoover as a boy, and in turn what Herbert Hoover has given to America and the world. He has already testified to the early influence of this community on his life.

I invite you to explore with me for a few moments the trail that President Hoover took through life—a trail that began in this peaceful and charming community.

For centuries before the advent of Herbert Hoover, his ancestors had been Quaker pioneers. The American part of their story started in 1725—half a century before the Boston Tea Party. America was still the red man's country White settlements, except for the outposts of fur traders and explorers, were scattered only along the Atlantic coast. Trails were important then—not only as routes to adventure, but as the routes of travel—there were no roads as we know them today.

It was in 1725, according to family tradition, that three small boys landed in Boston from a sailing vessel just in from England. Their father and mother had died during the hard 3-month voyage, and they were taken into religious, kindly, stern New England homes. Papers in their baggage showed their name to be Minthorn and the oldest of the three, William, was Herbert Hoover's great-great-great grandfather—his first ancestor to live in America.

Many trails were followed by the Minthorns and the Hoovers from the eastern seaboard into Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Ohio, and eventually across the Mississippi to a spot they decided to call home. The little community in Iowa named West Branch grew quickly. It was not long before there appeared a Quaker meeting house, frame homes, stores, and a blacksmith shop. These were in the midst of some of the most fertile land in America.

West Branch and surrounding settlements never became a metropolis but it did grow into a pleasant, prosperous town and the good Quakers carried their faith into their relations with one another. They did not consider written agreements necessary to bind any business deed—an oral promise was all that was asked. And as the boy Herbert Hoover grew to manhood, his world held high the Quaker tradition of honesty.

The ability to stand and walk erect is the most distinguishing characteristic of man. The best books of travel have been largely views afoot. One gets only passing views and superficial knowledge from automobiles, planes, and trains. There is no other way to acquire a true love of nature or an intimate acquaintance with birds and flowers and rocks and trees. Trails are a necessary laboratory to the study of botany and biology.

The trail also has an intimate social side. It tends to develop comradeship and intimacy. One can walk 10 miles on a trail with less fatigue than would grow out of a 5-mile hike on the concrete.

The boyhood of Herbert Hoover in the atmosphere of West Branch of that time taught him to follow the trail, to stand erect, to dig deeply for the knowledge that lies alongside the path, to hold with high regard comradeship and respect for the dignity of his fellow man, and to let the trail yield beneath his feet as a source of relaxation and introspection.

A great deal of America has been lost to view. It is behind our fences, over our hills, down our old tangled trails. The broadening aspects of exploring, as the Scout well knows, the education to be had from nature at firsthand, the joy one gets from being in the open, all were a part of Herbert Hoover's youth. In later years President Hoover said of the Scout program, "I know of no other form of Americanization that so produces real Americans."

In 1927 in a speech to the Iowa Society in Washington, D.C., Mr. Hoover spoke of the old swimming hole near West Branch under the railroad bridge "which needs to be deepened" because it was "hard to keep from pounding the mud with your hands and feet when you shove off for the 30 feet of a cross-channel swim." He spoke of fishing with his friends in the creek for "sunfish, suckers, and catfish with a willow pole, a line of butcher's string, a cork salvaged from a rubbish heap, an angleworm and a 1-cent hook." He recalled in the wintertime "sliding down Cook's Hill in a homemade sled and thawing our young chilblains with ice water." He remembered the tasty wild strawberries and wild grapes to be had for the picking along the trail he followed; the skating in winter over the frozen swimming hole on a pair of heelplate skates and the collection of fragments of coral, agate, or other bright-colored stones from the ballast along the railroad tracks. Perhaps here is the introduction of Herbert Hoover, the mining engineer.

Apart from these outdoor pastimes and school attendance there was the quiet, gentle, home life, with its family Bible reading at the day's close. But you good people of West Branch know the detailed story of Herbert Hoover better than most.

Herbert Hoover followed the trail across America to Oregon when his parents died. He earned his way through Stanford University, graduating with a degree in geology and engineering. He was employed in mines in several Western States and then in Australia, and held numerous important mining jobs around the world.

It was when World War I broke out that Mr. Hoover's trail took him to Europe. Thousands of Americans were stranded in London. Herbert Hoover organized resources to help them back home, and then worked to send relief to the overrun population of Belgium and France. His success in this endeavor brought him wide fame and led to his appointment as U.S. Food Administrator in 1917. He was able to get cooperation from the United States and successfully supplied the Allied food demands. The war over, he headed the American Relief Administration and when that agency was liquidated he raised a private fund for the same purpose.

Ambassador Walter Hines Page wrote President Wilson when Hoover had completed the refugee job:

"Life is worth more, too, for knowing Hoover. * * * He's a simple, modest, energetic man who began his career in California and will end it in heaven; and he doesn't want anybody's thanks."

A Secretary of Commerce under both Harding and Coolidge, Hoover reorganized the Department and sought to maximize its usefulness to business. At the same time he organized several famine relief campaigns. Four years later, in 1928, he was the Republican nominee for President and won the election.

Many of the disturbing factors prevailing in 1929 were international in character while others were manifestations of domestic trends in particular countries. Basically, World War I had thrown the economic and financial organization of the entire world completely out of balance. It was difficult to maintain the balance of economic and financial equilibrium in the United States.

Before he took the oath of office as President, Mr. Hoover stated and I quote that he "conceived the Presidency more than an administrative office; it is a power for leadership bringing coordination of the forces of business and cultural life in every city, town, and countryside. The Presidency is more than executive responsibility. It is the symbol of America's high purpose. The President must represent the Nation's ideals and he must also represent them to the nations of the world."

After 4 years in the White House Herbert Hoover still regarded the Presidency "as a supreme obligation."

A basic tenet of his faith in the American way of life—a phrase which he is said to have originated—was "voluntary cooperation within the community." It included perfection of the social organization, care of those in distress, advancement of knowledge, scientific research, education, and the many phases of economic life.

"This," and I again quote President Hoover, "is self-government outside of government; it is the most powerful development of individual freedom and equal opportunity that has taken place in the century and one half since our fundamental institutions were founded."

Mr. Hoover believed in voluntary cooperation of all the people in all of the Nation's communities, along with a growing sense of individual responsibility, rather than an extension of government into our social and economic life which would find the correct "solution of many of our complex problems."

He once stated before a group of Young Republicans:

"While the inspiration to reform comes from the human heart, it is achieved only by the intellect. Enthusiastic hearts have flooded us with illusions. Ideals without illusions are good. Ideals with illusions are no good."

This advice is timeless, indeed, and we with the complexities of our age could really make something of this earth if we approached the solutions of our problems with high ideals and advanced programs with intelligence and enthusiasm.

Enthusiasm is an earmark of youth. It is an earmark of the Boy Scouts of America. As the Scouts of this area grow in stature to man's estate, it is my fond hope that they will study the life of Herbert Hoover so that they may become intimate with the trail that he has followed throughout his great and good life—a life he has shared with so many with completely unselfish motives.

Mr. Hoover has always been concerned with the kind and sort of men we place as leaders of America's youth. His stamp of approval would be placed upon those leaders who are sterling, clean, genuine—successful men, capable men, leaders in their own field—sympathetic and patient with boys. He has recognized that scouting is more than building a fire without a match along life's trail. That is only a part of the initiative needed to keep America strong.

During Herbert Hoover's term as President of the United States he was honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America. As you know, it is the custom of scouting to confer this honor and privilege upon the President of the United States. He is currently your honorary vice president. It is interesting, however, to glance over our shoulders today and recall a message from Honorary President Hoover which came from his heart in 1929—the first year of his Presidency. I quote as follows:

"I have gladly assumed the honorary presidency of the Boy Scouts of America because the first ideal of our democracy is that each individual shall have opportunity to take that position of leadership in the community to which his character, his ability, and his ambition entitled him; and because the progress of our country is thus directly related to the training in leadership we can give to the youth of the Nation. In meeting the vital need that when the oncoming generation takes over our national affairs it shall be a generation bulwarked with character, the Boy Scout movement plays a most useful part. I wish all success to the boys themselves and to the scoutmasters who lead them, and I commend both to the unwearied support of the public that they so inspiringly serve."

The American Boy Scouts have done millions of good turns, from helping someone to cross the street to saving lives; but the greatest achievement is the millions of better men they have made, or are making of themselves by daily discipline and struggle toward an ideal. I refer especially to that quiet and determined discipline and struggle which Herbert Hoover learned so well from the trails he followed as a boy around West Branch.

Many years ago—it was either in the late twenties or early thirties—Herbert Hoover composed a "bill of rights" for boys which I give you today:

"1. Like everybody else, he has a right to the pursuit of happiness.

"2. He has the right to play that will stretch his imagination and prove his prowess and skill.

"3. He has a right to the constructive joy from adventure and thrills that are a part of an opening life.

"4. He has a right to affection and friendship.

"5. He has a right to the sense of security in belonging to some group.

"6. He has a right to health protections that will make him an inch taller than his dad.

"7. He has the right to education and training that amplifies his own natural bents and that will fit him into a job.

"8. He has a right to a chance in getting a job."

Mr. Hoover has commented that these are not all the "rights" of an American boy, but they are the ones which should be of deep concern to all.

The direction which individuals and nations have traveled has always been of tremendous concern to Mr. Hoover. The direction of the trail that he took through life has continued to keep him active and interested in public affairs through his boyhood days into the present. He was born August 10, 1874, in West Branch, and we now find him in his 86th year, still alert with the characteristics that took him to the White House, to head the Hoover Commission, and again in more recent years as Chairman of a Famine Emergency Committee to serve the food requirements in 38 countries around the globe.

I could do no greater service to you today in the dedication of this Herbert Hoover Trail than to close with the following words from an address prepared by Mr. Hoover in February of this year. He wisely advised America and I quote:

"In looking over the current scene in our national life, if we take a worm's-eye view of the crises and forces which surround us, we may worry that we are approaching the decline and fall of the greatest nation in history. If we take a bird's-eye view, we see the fundamental strength of the American people."

These words of admonition come from one who followed the trail with an aim so high and so clear, with the spirit of the out-of-doors filling his being, that his usefulness to mankind will continue to reverberate for years to come.

Learning from the life and work of men like Herbert Hoover and the training and experiences that shaped their destinies can be very important in retaining and promoting those ideals that made and can keep us the great nation that we are.

Results of Poll on President and Issues in Third Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in April I mailed questionnaires to some 160,000 registered voters in the Third Congressional District of Indiana, asking my constituents to register their opinions on major issues facing this Congress and also requesting them to indicate their preference for President of the United States. More than one of every eight persons receiving the poll responded.

Because the Third District of Indiana is considered a representative cross-section of public opinion, I believe the tabulation of the 23,485 replies may be of interest to my colleagues.

POLL PREDICTS ACTUAL PRIMARY VOTE WITHIN 1 PERCENT

I point to the fact that the poll, which was taken before the May 3 presidential preference primary in Indiana, predicted within 1 percent the actual Democratic and Republican Party votes in the Third District.

The poll showed 55 percent of the voters indicating a preference for President favoring Democratic candidates while 45 percent favored Republican candidates. The actual primary vote in the district on May 3 in the presidential race was 56 percent Democratic and 44 percent Republican.

The apparent accuracy of the poll's presidential results strongly suggests that the answers to questions on issues should provide a fair and reliable measurement of public opinion in my district.

SUMMARY OF SOME RESULTS ON MAJOR ISSUES

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize some of the more interesting results of the poll. Substantial voter approval was given to such programs as health insurance for the elderly, Federal support of education, loans and grants to depressed areas, and amendments to the minimum wage law.

Nearly two-thirds of all voters were for using Federal funds for classroom construction. Democrats favored such aid by a margin of 5 to 1, Republicans by 5 to 4, and independents by 5 to 3; 53 percent of all voters approved the use of Federal help to improve teachers' salaries as well.

Voters strongly supported—by 2 to 1—a Federal program of health insurance for social security beneficiaries—70 percent approved an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour as well as extension of coverage to more workers.

Opinions were most divided on the issues of agricultural policy and the missile gap. Nearly one-third of the voters expressed "no answer" on the complex issue of farm policy. A slim majority of

51 percent felt the United States was keeping up with Russian space and missile developments.

Because voters were asked to indicate their party preference, the following tables of the results of the poll are divided into these categories: Democratic, Republican, independent, and total of all replies.

TABLE 1

Questions	Democratic			Republican			Independent			Total of all replies (23,485) and percentages					
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Do you favor legislation to guarantee all Americans, regardless of race or color, the right to vote in State and Federal elections?	8,699	445	199	5,233	278	117	7,754	492	268	21,686	92	1,215	5	584	3
2. Do you favor reducing the national debt in preference to cutting taxes if the budget shows a surplus?	5,681	3,243	419	4,317	1,112	199	6,036	2,056	422	16,034	68	6,411	27	1,040	5
3. Do you favor an agricultural program providing:															
A. Price supports and limitations on production?	3,750	2,889	2,704	1,141	2,595	1,892	2,003	3,647	2,864	6,894	29	9,131	39	7,460	32
B. No supports and unlimited production?	4,353	1,955	3,035	3,645	824	1,159	5,151	1,245	2,118	13,149	56	4,024	17	6,312	27
4. Do you favor providing health and hospitalization insurance to social security beneficiaries?	7,507	1,702	234	2,564	2,852	212	4,841	3,325	348	14,912	63	7,879	33	794	4
5. Do you feel confident that the United States is keeping up with Russian space, missile, and other defense developments?	3,843	4,779	721	3,658	1,451	519	4,596	2,885	1,033	12,097	51	9,115	39	2,273	10
6. Provided there is a guarantee against Federal control, do you favor Federal support of State and local efforts to:															
A. Build more classrooms?	7,503	1,460	380	2,928	2,460	240	4,947	3,095	472	15,378	65	7,015	30	1,092	5
B. Improve teachers' salaries?	6,000	2,528	815	2,424	2,871	333	4,069	3,697	748	12,493	53	9,096	39	1,896	8
7. Do you favor a program of loans and grants to areas of serious and persistent unemployment?	6,862	1,912	569	2,299	2,846	483	4,302	3,375	837	13,463	57	8,133	35	1,889	8
8. Do you favor:															
A. Raising the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour?	7,801	1,145	397	3,126	2,171	331	5,451	2,515	548	16,378	70	5,831	25	1,276	5
B. Extending coverage of workers not now covered?	7,533	832	968	3,449	1,507	672	5,638	1,672	1,204	16,620	71	4,011	17	2,844	12
9. Do you believe we should seek an agreement with the Russians for nuclear disarmament with effective inspection?	7,203	1,660	480	4,333	1,030	265	6,357	1,589	568	17,893	76	4,279	18	1,313	6

TABLE 2.—*Results of presidential preference poll*

Candidates for President	Democrats	Republicans	Independents	Total	Percent
Humphrey	866	26	330	1,222	5
Johnson	331	35	173	539	2
Kennedy	4,572	232	1,488	6,292	27
Nixon	382	4,789	2,897	8,068	34
Rockefeller	165	276	416	857	4
Stevenson	1,201	29	431	1,561	7
Symington	1,003	19	302	1,324	6
No answer	823	222	2,477	3,522	15

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to present these questions on issues as fairly and objectively as possible, and I am glad to say that the reaction of my constituents as well as the press in this regard was excellent. I cite the following editorial which appeared in the LaPorte, Ind., Herald-Argus on May 20 as an example of the nonpartisan reception given the poll:

BRADEMAS' POLL

For several years Third District Congressmen have sent questionnaires to register voters of the district to try to get voter reaction on various issues. Returns on the recent one of Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS were the most extensive of all with 23,485 persons responding. This represented about one out of every eight to whom the questionnaire was sent.

Questionnaires which require straight yes or no answers are not wholly satisfactory. A weakness of any such query is also that so few voters out of the total electorate respond at all. Once a Congressman gets the returns, he will if he is honest with himself be somewhat in doubt as to just what he has on his hands.

However, just as only a relatively small percentage of the registered voters go to the polls in any election so the fact that only one of eight voters responded to the questionnaire does not mean it is valueless. That 34 percent of those responding indicated Nixon as their choice for President seemed to dampen the effectiveness of any charge that inasmuch as BRADEMAS is a Democrat only Democrats would respond to the queries.

If we can accurately assume that those replying constitute a cream of the crop of registered voters in that they give more attention to issues and tend to think them through and are willing to express themselves, then the results give some solid food for political thought.

Substantial majorities of those replying favor hospital and health insurance for social security beneficiaries, Federal aid for more school classrooms and improvement of teachers' salaries, legislation to guarantee full voting rights in Federal and State elections for all persons regardless of race or color, raising the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour, Federal loans and grants to areas of serious and persistent unemployment.

In short, those replying feel rather strongly that responsibilities of the Federal Government for the general welfare should be extended rather than cut back. Those replying in this Third District poll apparently don't take seriously the cries of those Hoosiers who would turn back the calendar to a rapidly receding States rights era.

The 185th Birthday of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, 185 years ago today, on June 14, 1775, the Continental Congress established the U.S. Army to protect the freedom of our Nation. Since this date, the Army has met every test both in peace and in war. Today, in a world unsettled by tension due to threats of war and the ever-present specter of communism, our Army continues to provide for our freedom by guarding the frontiers of the free world.

To celebrate this occasion here in Washington, the Army is holding a special retreat review at Fort Myer, Va., at 5 p.m., to which the public is invited and a One-Army Birthday Ball at the Willard Hotel at 9 p.m.

I rise to extend congratulations to the U.S. Army on the occasion of their 185 years of faithful service to our Nation and to wish them well in all future undertakings.

The 185th Birthday of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, today June 14, 1960, marks the 185th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army. The Continental Congress in 1775 established the U.S. Army and since that date the relationship between the Congress and the Army has been both close and cordial.

I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to the Army on this anniversary

of their 185 years of faithful service to our great Nation. In the celebration of this event, marked in our Capitol by a retreat parade at historic Fort Myer this afternoon at 5 p.m. and at the one Army birthday ball this evening at the Willard Hotel, the best wishes of a grateful Nation should be extended to the dedicated men of the U.S. Army who are today continuing to provide for the security of our country by standing firm on the borders of freedom throughout the world.

Words To Tell Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Honorable CATHERINE MAY, of the State of Washington, on May 28, 1960, delivered the commencement address to the graduating class of Marjorie Webster Junior College here in Washington, D.C. Because I feel that this address carries a message of great importance, not only to our youth, but to every American, under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAN YOU SELL THE TRUTH?

(Hon. CATHERINE MAY'S commencement address given May 28, 1960, Marjorie Webster Junior College, Washington, D.C.)

Graduates, Dr. Webster, Dean Dumas, Mrs. Smart, parents and friends, I am honored to be the speaker for your 1960 commencement. This is an important day in the lives of you young women who are members of the graduating class, and I am proud to share it.

Traditionally, commencement speakers refer to this day as a milestone, a point of departure into a new life. Timeworn as the statement may be, it is very true—this day is the door into your world of tomorrow. And you will go by many different paths on to more education perhaps, many of you into careers, and most of you eventually into marriage and motherhood. Wherever you go, you will have an influence on those around you. You will become the center of an orbit where, very much like a pebble dropped into water which sends ever-widening circles onto the water's surface, your words and actions will reach out to touch the lives of others. And those lives, thereby, will be changed and influenced to some degree. Thus, I feel that my responsibility as your graduation day speaker, is to convey to you, if I can, in the next few minutes some special message, an idea, an inspiration that you may carry away with you today to be used as a contribution to your world of tomorrow.

Now, as members of the 1960 graduating class of the Marjorie Webster Junior College, already you have been well educated and trained to contribute much to the good of society here at home and abroad. To this special knowledge and preparation for your life ahead there is probably little I could add that would not be duplication. But, the other day as I sat in my office trying to string together some thoughts for this address to you, I recalled a meeting I attended in June of last year in London. In particular, I remembered with great clarity sitting in a room with 30 or 40 other people, men and women from many nations, and discussing with them the youth of our countries. Because this was a meeting of the Atlantic Congress where 14 member nations of NATO—in other words, 14 of our free world countries—had sent over 600 citizen delegates to discuss, among other things, how well we were doing in the great war that rages, as you well know, out in that world you are about to enter—the war for men's minds. The war between two great ideologies—that of freedom, as exemplified by our American way of life versus the Communist doctrine. Now, as it happened, as a delegate to this Atlantic Congress from the United States, I was appointed to work on a subcommittee which had as its subject of study a most fascinating and frightening subject—Communist propaganda.

The work of our committee was based on some excellent depth studies that had been made on the extent of the Communist propaganda penetration into our free world countries, as well as our uncommitted countries. The studies presented proven and factual information on the thousands of agents and provocateurs who were trained and sent out by the Soviet into the world to spread Communist propaganda. It presented the actual figures of the millions of dollars being spent by the Soviet on their propaganda program alone. In addition, the material on the extent of the success of Communist propaganda penetration pointed up the fact that the youth of Russia were highly trained as Communist crusaders. A basic aim of Russian education for its youth is to instill in them a burning dedication to the Communist way of life. As a result, young men and women of Soviet countries are extremely effective, convincing and articulate in persuading youth of other nations to their beliefs.

It was then that we started this discussion which made such an impression on my memory. We had just agreed that we should be providing more opportunities for our citizens and our young people to go into uncommitted countries, to youth festivals, to cultural exchange meetings so they might tell the story of freedom.

Then, a delegate from Norway pointed out, "Ladies and gentlemen, I think we are agreed that the doctrine of a free world democracy has far more appeal for humanity than the Communist doctrine. And, I know the young people of my country are just as dedicated to their beliefs as are the young Communists. But, when it comes to telling and selling the great truth of a free way of life I don't think they are prepared. I am afraid a great many of them could not find the words.

"Tell me, is this true of the young people in your countries?"

A thoughtful silence followed his words. Then, one of the other delegates spoke up and said: "I am afraid it's quite true, not only of our youth, but of our adult citizens, too." And, one by one, all of us nodded in serious and even shocked agreement.

I think by now you young women know what message and what idea I wish to try and leave with you today. You see, this episode I have just related taught me first of all something about myself that I had not known. In evaluating how well we Americans do as ambassadors for our country and its free way of life, I was brought to the shocking realization that I myself was sadly lacking in effective word weapons to fight against the Communist ideology. To admit this on behalf of myself, as well as my fellow countrymen, was both puzzling and frightening. Puzzling, because I knew I was a patriotic American, a loyal American, with a deep and abiding love for my country. Frightening, because for many years now we have recognized that the great world struggle in which we are engaged is not alone one of military might. Beyond that, and even bigger than that, is the power of an idea. And our opposition in this struggle is so well organized that they can train and support their spokesmen all over the world while they spread their Red death among the brain cells of humanity.

Since my return from the Atlantic congress, I have brought this subject up for discussion and study wherever I could. I have done this, because it seemed to me that I had no more significant contribution to make my country as a result of this free world meeting than to try and influence the young people of America to prepare themselves to sell the truth better than their elders have done.

Now, in bringing you a few thought-provoking ideas on how you might best do this:

In one group where we were discussing this, a friend of mine said: "We Americans are a funny lot. We have such great dedication to freedom, for others as well as ourselves, that we would fight for it and even die for it, but, by gum, we can't tell others what it is." Partly, I think we can agree, this is because we've had the plain good fortune to be born Americans. We have just always taken for granted the air of freedom which we breathe. There may have been a time when it was apathy, but, with two great world wars in the past, and with the present serious international tension, I cannot believe this is true now. I am certain that the generation which you young women represent does not look at what's going on in the Iron Curtain countries and say smugly, "This cannot happen here." I think that is perhaps why I have such high hopes that some of the ideas I leave with you will fall on fertile ground. With things as they are today, and as they have been since the day you were born, never has a generation in this country had a heavier burden of responsibility for learning to sell the truth laid upon them.

I can't give you any set words to use for expressing your beliefs, but I think maybe I can try to set up a few thinking guidelines for you.

First, I would sincerely hope that, in the busy lives that lie ahead of you, you would take some time out and search deeply into your hearts and minds for the answer to the question, What do I truly believe? Start with thinking of the basic beliefs which all of the free world countries engaged in this struggle against communism have in common—respect for the freedom of the individual, for the dignity of human nature, and a simple faith in God. Then, go behind these words in a search for their real meaning. Because, at this point, I would remind you of what I hope you already know—that the words of the Communist manifesto are beautiful words, too, apparently offering a wonderful life to those who would follow the creed, unless one went behind them and realized how the goals were to be accomplished.

So, having found the words for our basic beliefs, how then do we communicate to someone else what we in America mean by freedom and democracy, as opposed to what Communists mean by these words? We know that, in the hearts of all men, there is a universal and unquenchable longing for an atmosphere of freedom, for equality of opportunity, and the establishment of human dignity. How can we communicate the truth that these goals can be reached only through nontotalitarian government—with words that are the same words that the enemies of this way of life also use?

One night, when a group of us were discussing this problem, we came up with what I think is a pretty good idea. It was decided that we might start with the material approach to life, because something that everyone understands, regardless of race or language barriers, is hunger and cold and the desire for possessions and good things around us.

Frankly, I have never been exposed to a debate with a dedicated Communist over the virtues of a totalitarian form of government versus democracy, but, since the episode I related earlier in my talk to you, I've put myself through a lot of mental practice as to what I might say if such an occasion should arise. And, by the way, I recommend this mental exercise to you. It's not only challenging, but it's kind of fun.

But, to go back to preparing myself for this imaginary debate, one day I discovered a book that to me provides the perfect approach to telling our freedom story so that anyone can understand its basic truth. That book is called "The Mainspring of Human Progress," and it was written by Henry Grady Weaver. And, after reading it, I decided that I would present my argument as he does by posing a question to my imaginary opponent in this way: Why did men die of starvation for 6,000 years? And, why is it that we in America have never had a famine? For 60 known centuries, this planet we call earth has been inhabited by human beings not much different from ourselves. Their desire to live has been just as strong as ours. They have had at least as much physical strength as the average person of today, and among them have been men and women of great intelligence. But, down through the ages, most human beings have gone hungry, and many have always starved. The ancient Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, and Greeks were intelligent people, but, in spite of their intelligence and their fertile lands, they were never able to get enough to eat. The Roman Empire collapsed in famine, the French were dying of hunger when Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States. As late as 1846, the Irish were starving to death, and, it is only within the last century that Western Europeans have had enough food to keep them alive. Even in this century, famines have killed multitudes, in China and India and Africa, and, as late as the 1930's thousands starved to death on the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

Down through the ages, countless millions, struggling unsuccessfully to keep bare life in wretched bodies, have died young in misery and squalor. Then, suddenly, in one spot on this planet, people eat so abundantly that the pangs of hunger are forgotten. Just think, for 6,000 years, men died of starvation. For 6,000 years, families lived in caves and floorless hovels without windows or chimneys. Then, within a few generations, we in America take floors and rugs and chairs and tables for granted, and regard electric lights, refrigerators, running water, and porcelain bathtubs as common necessities. For 6,000 years, men and women and children toiled desperately from dawn to dark to eke out their meager existence, and then, suddenly, in one place on earth, there is an abundance of such things as radios and TV sets, nylon hose and shower baths, and ice cream sodas and lipstick, and permanent waves. If you just think about it, it's almost incredible. In less than 100 years, Americans have conquered the darkness of night, from pine knots and candles to neon lights and fluorescent tubes, from fireplaces and stoves to automatic burners and air conditioners. We are conquering pain and disease and prolonging life. We've made stupendous attacks on space, from oxcarts to airplanes, and attacks on time, from pony express to telephone and television.

Now, it's true that many of these developments originated in other countries, but new ideas are of little value in raising standards of living unless and until something is done about them. The plain fact is that we in America have outdistanced the world in extending the benefits of inventions and discoveries to the vast majority of people in all walks of life. How did it happen? Well, perhaps the best way to find the answer is to first rule out some factors that were not responsible. To say that it was because of our natural resources is hardly enough. The same rich resources were here when the mound builders held forth. Americans have had no monopoly on the metals. China, India, Russia, Africa all have great natural resources. Crude oil oozed from the earth in Baku 4,000 years ago. And, when Julius Caesar marched west into Gaul, Europe was a rich and virgin wilderness inhabited by a few roving savages, much as America was when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth.

Is it because we work harder? Again, the answer is no, because in most countries people work much harder on the average than we do.

Can it be that we are people of inherent superiority? That sounds fine in after-dinner oratory, and goes over big at election time, but the argument is difficult to support. Our own ancestors, including the Anglo-Saxons, have starved right along with everyone else.

Can it be that we have more energy than any other peoples of the world? That's not the answer either, but it's getting pretty close. We are not endowed with any superior energy, mental or physical. But, it is a fact that we in the United States of America have made more effective use of our human energies than have any other people on the face of the globe anywhere or at any time. That's the answer, the real answer, the only answer.

Now, I would remind you that I'm saying all this in my mythical debate with a dedicated Communist in trying to explain what we mean in America by freedom. But, I think you gather that my real purpose is to offer you here today a starting place in your thinking and in your search for words to sell the truth.

Let me lead you down this path a little further, before I set you out on your own. Why does human energy work better here than anywhere else? Well, now the answer here is actually a study in physics with which I won't attempt to bore you. But, as simply as I can tell you, it is that the nature of human energy is controlled by yourself—nothing else can control it. The decision to use your energy to act or not act is always under your own control. And, this leads to two important points. One is that individual freedom is the natural heritage of each living person. And, second, freedom cannot be separated from responsibility. Your natural freedom—your control over your own life energy—was born in you along with life itself. It is a part of life itself. Any time you try to turn the control over to someone else, or any time anyone tries to take the control of your energy from you, something happens. It just can't be used effectively. For centuries, it's been tried. Every conceivable form of authority has been tried. Every conceivable form of unified control that takes this individual's use of his own energy away from him. But, each time, the experiment has failed, because only an individual human being can generate human energy, and only an individual human being can control the energy he generates.

The lack of understanding of these simple basic truths has for over 6,000 years stagnated human progress, kept the vast majority of people underfed, poorly clothed, and embroiled in wars and dying from famine and pestilence.

Don't take my word for it. Just take some time to study world history, going back to the pagan days, right up through all this whole history of all the dictator forms of government that rose and fell over a span of 6,000 years. And, then think of the history of your own Nation, which had its beginning just a little over 160 years ago. As John Gunther once said: "Ours is the only country deliberately founded on a good idea."

I realize that, by this time in your education, you've had a pretty good grounding in American history. But, I promise you that, if you'll spend sometime going back over this rich and wonderful heritage of every American, you'll find it very exciting to find out how every move our Founding Fathers made was with this great idea in mind.

I think with this approach you'll see the history of your country with entirely different eyes. You'll realize, maybe for the first time, that the great fact of our history is that the American Revolution had no leader. To again quote from Mr. Weaver's book—"This fact is the hope of the world, because human freedom is a personal matter. Only the individual can protect human rights in the infinite complexity of men's relationships with each other. Nothing on earth is more valuable than the person who knows that all men are free and who accepts the responsibilities that go with freedom." As I said, the war for American independence was begun by an individual. He was asleep in bed when someone pounded on his door, and shouted in the night—"The Redcoats are coming." Well, what could he do? He was not a king or a governor. He was not rich or important. He was just one little man, unknown to anyone outside his neighborhood. Should he take the initiative? Such things usually cleared up. They always had. He must keep calm, consider the practical aspects, think of his family. Most men felt that way. They knew they could do nothing, and they had better sense than to try. And, that night in Lexington, many of them stayed in bed.

But, the unknown individual chose between submission that looked like safety, and rebellion that seemed utterly helpless. He had the courage of his convictions. He got up, put on his clothes, took his gun, and went out to meet the British troops. And, I like to think that he had a good wife there helping him put on his boots, as she said: "This is the right thing, and you must do it, John."

Not acting under orders, not being led, or wanting to be the leader, he stood on his own feet, a responsible, self-controlling person, and fired the shot heard round the world. And, the sound of that shot said that man is a free agent, that government is the servant, rather than the master. You know, it's men like this, and the thousands of others we find in the pages of history—the Washington and Lincoln and Jefferson and Lee—with whom you and I walk today, and we walk because of them carefully and proudly and also humbly, lest we fail them. And, because of this knowledge of our past, with a keen sense of the present and the future, we should each say to ourselves: "I am an American, and therefore, what I do, however small, is of importance."

It just seems to me that, once we grasp this root idea of our freedom, it becomes much easier to explain the tree of liberty that has grown from it.

For instance, words to explain to somebody about the form of government we set up to protect our idea of freedom. "Mainspring" says it this way: "America was to be set up as a republic, which means that the laws would be made and administered by representatives chosen directly or indirectly by the people to protect the interests of all the people. In the last analysis, any government, regardless of what it may be called, must be one man or a small group of men in power over many men. That being the case, how is it possible to transfer the power of the ruler to each man of the multitude? The answer is that it's not possible. The only solution lies in the direction of destroying power itself. The only way in which men can remain free and left in control of

their own individual energies is to cut the power of the government to its smallest degree."

The answer was simple, once it was found by our Founding Fathers. The head of a state is a human being, and a human being's thinking and deciding and acting and judging are inseparable. But, in this new American Republic, no top official would ever be permitted to act as a whole human being. The function of government would be divided into three parts:

1. The first part was to think and decide, and it would be called Congress.

2. The second part was to be responsible for getting action. It would be headed by the Chief Executive, the President.

3. And the third part was to serve as a judge or a referee, known as the Supreme Court.

Each of these three parts was to act as a check on the other two, and over the three was set a written statement of political principles, intended to be the strongest check on them all. There was to be government by law, with clearly defined rules of the game, rather than government by whim—the Constitution. The dangers of dictatorship must be avoided for all time to come. No one person or small group of persons must ever be permitted to get too much power, and the minority, even down to the last individual citizen, must be protected against oppression by the majority, or by any organized pressure group.

And these objectives made it possible for our American Revolutionary leaders to draw the blueprints for this new and completely different political structure—our unique form of government, not only in the world of today, but in all time.

I said when I began this that all I would even try to do this afternoon was to offer you a few guidelines to follow on your search for words to sell the truth. My mission is accomplished if I start you on that exciting journey. It is accomplished if I have succeeded in getting you to look at your country and your birthright of freedom with new eyes—eyes that are both critical and understanding, because it is very important that you know that America is far from perfect.

And, I'm sure you do. Otherwise, we wouldn't get from your generation what our country must always have to keep progressing—ideas for a much better world. But, as you find our shortcomings, and think of plans to overcome them, be sure you always ask to what degree are our shortcomings traceable to the form of political structure under which our country was founded—are they due to having drifted away from that concept, and how does our record compare with the records of countries which have tried to operate under the opposite philosophy?

Godspeed you, graduates of 1960, in your world of tomorrow. As students seeking more knowledge, as successful career girls, as happy wives and mothers, and as enthusiastic ambassadors for freedom. If you understand, and believe because you understand, you will find the words, and I guess I don't have to tell you how very important it is for you and the young people of all free world nations to find those words. Because it may well be that, in your generation, this great war for men's minds will be decided. Remember, your battleground is wherever you go. Use your voice, with your heart and beliefs behind it, among your fellow citizen and fellow workers, family and friends, and—very importantly—on the children you raise.

Thank you again for giving me the privilege of sharing this important day with you. You have my congratulations on winning your diplomas, and my very best wishes for your future.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1960

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

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

O Thou God of our fathers, help us to be spiritually aware that when Thy voice was heard in ages past it did not cease to speak. Give us to know that for those who become quiet enough to listen, Thy word for this day resounds clear and sure above all the tumult and shouting of the confused babel of human folly.

In all our deliberations and appraisals of the affairs of state having to do with the tangled relationships of men, forbid that we should be insensitive to voices other than our own, and which make the world about us a whispering gallery telling of divine realities that surround us.

Give us open ears, alert and quick to hear each whisper of Thy word.

With hearts tuned to the unseen presence which enfolds our days with a love that never forgets, a light that never fails, and a life that never ends, may we face life's changing scenes with the radiant faith that—

This is my Father's world,
He shines in all that's fair.
In the rustling grass
I hear Him pass—
He speaks to me everywhere.

To that glad truth our hearts respond, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 14, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, and to enfranchise the people of the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, early today we hope to complete action on the NATO joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170), on which we have a unanimous-consent agreement.

Then we expect to proceed to consider the Kennedy-Clark loyalty measure.

We have ready the Department of Defense appropriation bill. It is a very important measure, and we want to get to it as early as we can. We shall meet early and shall remain in session late, if necessary, in order to take action on that bill this week.

We also would like to proceed with consideration of the housing bill, and the postal and classified workers pay increase bill.

Then there is the proposed constitutional amendment relating to the District of Columbia, which will be before us.

So I should like to say to all Members of the Senate that I think they can count on long meetings for the remainder of this session and much hard work, including Saturday sessions and early morning meetings and late evening meetings, if necessary.