SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 22, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

O God, so far above us, center and soul of every sphere, and yet who dwellest in us:

In the face of the One in whom Thy fullest glory is revealed, Thou has told us that we are not to look for Thee out on the rim of the universe—although the spangled heavens and the fruitful earth showeth Thy handiwork—but that the deepest knowledge of Thee is hidden in our own hearts and in the hearts of comrades who walk this earthly pilgrimage with us. For—

Every virtue we possess,
And every victory won,
And every thought of holiness
Are Thine alone.

Wherever truth is spoken, Thou dost speak. Wherever deeds are brave and selfless, Thou art revealed.

In the unfolding pages of life's ripening experiences, we have learned that living by the best we know is the path to more certain knowledge; that in spiritual apprehensions it is the pure who are sure and who sense and see Thee everywhere.

Breaking away from the pull of small concerns which tie us to the ground, help us to be done with lesser things, as, yielding to Thy will, our lives are put in orbit around the mastering purpose of Thy redeeming love.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 20, 1960, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have a request from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which my distinguished friend the minority leader agrees, for permission to meet between 10:30 and 12 o'clock this morning. The request is made by the chairman of the committee, and I submit it on his behalf.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SILK WASTE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,950,000 pounds of silk waste now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the second quarter of 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1663. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak. (Rept. No. 1861).

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

S. 2761. A bill to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (Rept. No. 1862);

S. 3040. A bill for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry (Rept. No. 1863);

S. 3433. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States (Rept. No. 1864);

S. 3591. A bill for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt (Rept. No. 1865);

S. 3609. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Pendell (Rept. No. 1866);

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley (Rept. No. 1867);

H.R. 2074. An act for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe (Rept. No. 1868);

H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde (Rept. No. 1869);

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot (Rept. No. 1870);

H.R. 7242. An act to amend sections 1, 57j, 64a (5), 67b, 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1871);

H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp. (Rept. No. 1872);

H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea (Rept. No. 1873);

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich (Rept. No. 1874);

H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver (Rept. No. 1875);

H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson (Rept. No. 1876);

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman (Rept. No. 1878);

H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Harry Kaloian (Rept. No. 1879);

H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Maj. Edmund T. Coppinger (Rept. No. 1880);

H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co. (Rept. No. 1881);

H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka) (Rept. No. 1882);

H.R. 10598. An act 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 (Rept. No. 1883);

H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves (Rept. No. 1884);

H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt (Rept. No. 1885);

H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker (Rept. No. 1886);

H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret (Rept. No. 1887);

H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power (Rept. No. 1888);

H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski (Rept. No. 1897);

H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark, O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army (Rept. No. 1889);

H.R. 12475. An act for the relief of Claude L. Wimberly (Rept. No. 1890); and

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline (Rept. No. 1891).

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

H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson (Rept. No. 1898).

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

S. 2902. A bill for the relief of Leo Shoenholz, Tobias Kaplan, the Kroger Co., and Cleveland State Bank, all of Cleveland, Miss. (Rept. No. 1896).

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

S. Res. 288. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 3199) for the relief of the Adler Construction Co. (Rept. No. 1892).

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

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor (Rept. No. 1895).

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

H.R. 5396. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims (Rept. No. 1894).

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 4059. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States (Rept. No. 1877); and

S. Res. 334. Resolution opposing the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court (Rept. No. 1893).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 368), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 238, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, agreed to February 8, 1960 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration), is hereby amended by striking out "$425,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$450,000".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Rawson Bennett II, and sundry other officers of the line and staff corps of the Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3872. A bill for the relief of Barbara W. Trousil and her son, Edward G. Trousil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3873. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 27 acres of land at Fort Crowder Military Reservation to the city of Neosho, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3874. A bill for the relief of Douglas Der-Young Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 3875. A bill to authorize grants for construction of medical and public health teaching facilities and to provide scholarships for students of medicine and public health; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS

JOHN T. KNIGHT—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 366); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3868) entitled "A bill for the relief of John T. Knight", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX OF SENATE RULES, RELATING TO DEBATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 367) to amend paragraph No. 1 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 368) providing additional funds for the investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws and their administration, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 12580, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12580, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 12580, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12580, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

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

By Mr. MOSS:

Address delivered by Senator KEATING to the conference of the National District Attorneys' Association, Boston, Mass., on August 13, 1960.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from interview between him and Dr. T. Keith Glennan, of NASA.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Great Challenge to the U.N.—Africa," written by Representative CHESTER BOWLES and published in the New York Times Magazine of August 21, 1960.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Telegram dated August 22, 1960, addressed to "All Congressmen," relating to proposed citation for contempt of Congress of members of the Port of New York Authority.

TRAGIC BURDEN OF AGED PARENTS' ILLNESS ON CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in most cases families of elder citizens who are ill are anxious to care for their parents, but the enormous cost of any serious illness and lengthy convalescence makes it impossible even for a family of moderate means to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from a constituent that tells this story in human, personal terms be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SENATOR: A 90-year-old lady fell and suffered fractures in the hip and upper leg. In the emergency, she was rushed to a certain hospital in an ambulance.

There the nominal charges were $23 a day for room; the surgical and medical bills for the 30-day stay were in excess of $600.

Her daughter, out of filial loyalty, had her brought to her home to convalesce. But the daughter is employed, so she had to hire two nurses 5 days a week. She still needs to devote all her spare time to her mother, however.

NATIONAL ECONOMY STALLED—FAILS TO MEET RUSHING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Sylvia Porter, who is certainly one of the most expert and objective commentators on the state of our economy, writes an analysis of the economy of what kind of business outlook, job outlook, and employment outlook, we can expect in the coming months, taking into account the present statistics on income, employment, and economic growth.

A superficial analysis of the statistics may suggest to many people that we are in the midst of prosperity if not boom. But Sylvia Porter, who certainly

has no political ax to grind, suggests that when we go beneath the surface of these statistics, we can see that this country is in serious economic difficulty.

Sylvia Porter shows that, although we have had a record rise in employment, that rise has been only seasonal, and if we recognize the increase in the work force, the statistics which should really catch our attention is that of unemployment which, as she says, is far too high.

In the second place, Sylvia Porter discusses the problem of personal income, which has been the steady source of strength in our economy, and which has been increasing very steadily in good times and bad during the last 10 or 15 years with very little letup. She points out the rise has lost its momentum, that it is slowing down, and now practically standing still.

In the third place, she discusses the gross national product, which is the overall measure of our economy, and shows that while it has indeed increased in the last quarter, the increase is so small as to be almost imperceptible, and shows that our economy now braking to a standstill.

Finally Sylvia Porter discusses prices, and states that, while the stable price level has been encouraging, rising costs have been increasing, causing a squeeze on corporations and dwindling profits.

It seems to me the conclusion we can draw from these facts is that at a time when we are facing rising competition from European countries and other countries in the free world—competition which we welcome—our economy is not keeping pace. Certainly it is not moving ahead enough to face the Russian economic forced draft, the economy of tyranny, and meet that challenge and beat it. It is time we seriously recognize our economic problems and are willing to act on them.

I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Miss Sylvia Porter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATISTICS DECEPTIVE

(By Sylvia Porter)

The business headlines appear to say as we approach Labor Day that never has the workingman been so well off.

The headlines are saying that employment is at an alltime record of over 68.7 million. Personal incomes are running at an unprecedented high of $406 billion. Gross national product is at an unparalleled $505 billion annual rate. Prices at the consumer, wholesale and manufacturers' level are the steadiest in years.

This combination of record employment and incomes, high production and stable prices is the economic ideal of private enterprise systems. The statistics seem to say we're just about reaching it.

But no responsible authority in industry or labor or Government is claiming that this is the ideal and that the statistics are telling the whole tale.

For the headlines aren't disclosing that for months business has been losing momentum. They're not revealing that many recent increases are reflecting strictly seasonal improvements. They're not showing the soft spots beneath the bright statistical surface. They're not indicating the extent to which the psychology of businessmen has deteriorated since the start of 1960 and to which the psychology of consumers has deteriorated in the last few months.

What is not in the headlines explains why the Federal Reserve System and the administration are now pushing hard on the antirecession button. What is not apparent in the current statistics explains why there has been scarcely a murmur in conservative business and financial circles against new increases in Federal spending and why, in fact, the higher spending is being welcomed.

Consider, first, the rise in employment in July to a alltime record. It was entirely a seasonal increase. Moreover, while joblessness among teenagers fell, unemployment among the over-20 age group rose contraseasonally for the second straight month and the national unemployment rate remained at an uncomfortably high 5.4 percent of the work force. After more than 2 years of business advance, this unemployment rate is just too high.

Consider, second, the climb in personal incomes to an unparalleled peak. The pace of rise has been slowing to a crawl in recent months. Income losses due to heavy unemployment and short workweeks in basic industries are being offset by increases in Government payrolls, social security payments, the like—but there's no mistaking the loss in momentum.

Consider, third, the unprecedented size of our output. A $505 billion gross national product seems fantastic, but the gain between the first and second quarters of this year was only 0.7 percent—which is practically equivalent to standing still. We're still stalled.

Consider, fourth, the stable price level. That's great news for consumers, but many corporations are holding the price line at the expense of their profits. The number of corporations reporting falling net profits in the face of peak sales is mounting disturbingly fast.

You can see why the Federal Reserve System is pouring money into the banking system to encourage banks to make more loans at cheaper rates and why the administration is speeding up spending, trying to spur housing. The antirecession package is growing bigger to help make what the headlines seem to say, actually so.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 18 entitled "Limited Problem, Collectivist Remedy," and immediately following that editorial an article by James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck entitled "The Aging: Neither Indigent Nor Childlike, They Want Government Aid as Very Last, Not First, Resort."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 18, 1960]

LIMITED PROBLEM, COLLECTIVIST REMEDY

Almost all Americans agree that it is the responsibility of the community to take care of the truly needy who have nowhere else to turn. That being so, it is sensible to put such help on a systematic rather than haphazard basis.

Thus the argument over medical care for the aged is an argument over means. On the one side are those who wish to make it a compulsory program under social security; on the other, those who want it voluntary for people who actually want and need it.

Need, it seems to us, is the only reasonable basis on which the matter can be considered; why should a new blanket of social security be spread over the whole population to take care of a problem that concerns only a small proportion of a minority of the population?

For the truth is that this problem of medical care for the aged has been inexcusably exaggerated by the politicians and commentators. Indeed, the whole picture of the over-65 group in this country that is usually drawn is nothing more than a caricature. That is the word used by Professors Wiggins and Schoeck, social scientists of Emory University, in their revealing report on the aging—a report based on a careful interview-survey of a large cross-section of people outside of hospitals or institutions. Part of the report appears on this page this morning.

These researchers discovered that the over-65 population of the United States enjoys a high level of health; 90 percent of all respondents reported they were in either good or fair health. And not only in good health but in cheerful moods; "they appear self-reliant and disdainful of efforts to single them out for special consideration."

Almost 80 percent of the aging, the report continues, did not feel they had acquired special needs simply because of age. When specifically asked, "Do you have any medical needs that are not being taken care of?" Ninety-two percent said "No." For the 8 percent who said they had such needs, financial reasons were the least important ones.

Asked how they would pay a big medical bill in the absence of medical insurance, most said they would do it by what the study calls conventional and personal means. In fact, however, 64 percent did have health insurance.

All this calls into grave question the arguments advanced for compulsory medical care. It even calls into question the proposition that the Federal Government should take on this responsibility. For everyone except Socialists would think it better to deal with the problem through private insurance than through a vast and costly Washington program—especially if the Government would live up to its responsibility to keep money sound. Interestingly enough, many of those interviewed volunteered their concern over the ravages of inflation which has reduced the value of social security along with everything else.

Most of those in the cross-section thought the Government should meet the minimum needs of the genuinely destitute aging only "if there are no children," or "if the children can't help." And if we are to have a Government program, surely it should be designed just that way.

If it were so designed, the help could be greater to the relatively few dependent on such help. In the same way we could do much more for our deserving veterans or their survivors if we would stop wasting billions on healthy, self-supporting veterans. If we are a mature people, we should begin to realize that the right answer to limited social problems is not a new rush toward collectivism.

And which is the more humanitarian approach? A social security pittance for all regardless of need? Or appreciable help to those in actual need?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 18, 1960]

THE AGING: NEITHER INDIGENT NOR CHILDLIKE, THEY WANT GOVERNMENT AID AS VERY LAST, NOT FIRST, RESORT

(By James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck)

Seen from our sample, the aging population of the United States enjoys a high level of health. Some 90 percent of all respondents said they were in either good or fair

health. Two-thirds of our sample declared themselves in good health. Only 10 percent said they were in poor health.

The statements about their good health by the respondents are supported by the concluding observations written by the interviewers. Reading those final remarks, we see a profile of the aging that shows them to be in good health and in cheerful moods; they appear self-reliant and disdainful of efforts to single them out for special consideration.

About two-thirds of our respondents had neither seen a doctor nor talked with one on the telephone, in regard to their health, during the 4 weeks preceding the interview. Only 28 percent were planning to see a doctor in connection with their health during the 2 weeks following the interview.

Almost 80 percent of the aging in our sample had never heard from anyone that they might need certain things at their present age which they did not need when they were younger.

When we asked the respondents: "Do you have any medical needs now that are not being taken care of?"—92 percent said, "No." However, for the remaining 8 percent who knew of some unfilled medical needs, we have to distinguish various reasons for the failure to relieve the need. Financial reasons were the least important ones. Often the respondent would point out that a certain operation or artificial aids, such as glasses, teeth, or hearing equipment, had been recommended but that some other doctor, or friend, had advised against it as not worth the risk or trouble.

MEETING AN EMERGENCY

This picture of a healthy and well-cared-for aging population in the United States is fully supported by the economic data on their medical care. Only 5 percent of all respondents in our sample had spent over $100 for themselves or their spouses during the month preceding the interview. In fact, of the 94.7 percent who reported expenditures for medicines and medical care below $100, the majority had either no expenses or only a few dollars. Only 1 percent in our sample reported medical expenses in excess of $500.

So much for the realities. But how would the modal (occurring oftenest) aged person cope with a medical emergency? To receive an answer to that question, the interviewer had to phrase his question with regard to the social class of the respondent. He asked: "Suppose you had a large medical bill and no medical insurance, how would you pay the bill?" In the case of the lower-class respondent, he would specify: "Let us say, a bill of $1,000"; for middle-class people the amount was $2,000; and for the upper-class persons hypothetical bill of $5,000.

Combining the responses from all three social classes, 42 percent of our respondents would use cash or a check to pay the bill, 11 percent would mortgage their homes, and 15 percent would use cash value of insurance or sell stocks and bonds. Fewer than one-third of the respondents gave various other ways of paying such a large bill. Thus we can say that the modal aging person in the United States can cope with a large medical bill by conventional and personal means. We should note that the question specifically inquired about the method of payment in case there was no medical insurance. However, 64 percent of our respondents did report insurance for medical purposes.

The modal annual cash income reported was between $2,000 and $3,000. Half of the respondents reported incomes in excess of $2,000 per year, and 1 out of 20 reported more than $10,000 annual income. One interviewer was uncertain of the applicable socio-economic category when she found a respondent who reported no cash income, but owned 300 acres of valuable farm lands in a Mountain State. We assured the interviewer that lack of cash income did not place this man in the lower class. Another respondent reported his cash income as $400 per year, and, when asked later what he did for the community, replied that he helped the poor. The modal respondent reported that he had no income other than cash, but nearly one-third did report other income.

Cash income is, however, an inadequate measure of the financial position of any population, and particularly the older population. Ownership of a fully furnished home, the completion of responsibility for children, completion of premium payments on life insurance, and similar consideration enter the picture.

A very significant index to financial independence is the statement of net worth. The aging were asked to estimate their net worth, that is, the cash value of their assets minus their liabilities. The modal aging respondent reported his cash-equivalent assets over liabilities to be in excess of $10,000. This figure referred to assets of the living respondent, not "estate at death," which would have included life insurance death benefits. Almost 60 percent of the sample made up this modal group.

Significantly, a large number of respondents spontaneously and energetically stated that they did not have any debts, and did not believe in buying on credit. This reinforces the data on medical and related debts described above.

Since economic crisis may hit the aged as it does the young, respondents were asked where they might get a "lot of money for an emergency * * * with least embarrassment." The modal group (53.8 percent) listed children and other relatives as preferred sources. Friends, church groups, and lodge brothers came next, with 12 percent. The only impersonal source suggested with any frequency was the small loan company.

WORRIES OVER INFLATION

Concern was expressed by many respondents over inflation, even before the interviewer reached the question dealing with it. The decade of the 1940's was the most frequently named period for the first significant awareness of the declining value of money. The explanations given by the aging for inflation have not yet been fully analyzed, but the respondents usually cited government, war, labor unions, and big business. The individual who was blamed most often by name was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The modal member would expect the Government to meet the minimum needs of the genuinely destitute aging. But for this group the proviso was added, "if there are no children," or "if the children can't help." When asked where the respondent would want to obtain housing in case he could not finance it himself, the modal member of the sample (43 percent) preferred housing under church auspices. Less than one-fourth chose Government housing, even in case of great need. One interviewer, a trained sociologist, reported that in his rural sample the mere suggestion of housing by the State or Government as a possibility often provoked a fright reaction.

The modal two-thirds (66.4 percent) are in retired status, although a number in this category are still gainfully employed. The typical respondent did not wish to continue working after retirement, but nearly half did wish to continue. Of the 33.6 percent still working, 70.4 percent are working on the same job held prior to reaching age 65.

The modal person in our aging population has religious affiliation. Over 80 percent are members of a church. If special care was needed from outside the family, twice as many elderly Americans would prefer to get it from their church rather than from the State. However, they are far from being dependent on the church. They would not want the church to assume or proffer family or welfare functions.

Contrary to the usual stereotypes held today, the aging, even in our large cities, are far from being doomed to loneliness. Horizontal mobility, urbanization, the much-cited but rarely specified social change have all failed to break or even to weaken the bond between aging parents and adult children. Moreover, it is a social relationship of true reciprocity. When asked: "Do you ever help your children or other close relatives in any way?" 72 percent of our respondents replied, "Yes."

Peter Townsend, reporting from his survey in East London, did not find much "hard evidence of neglect on the part of old people's children. * * * Widespread fears of the breakdown of family loyalties and of married children's negligence seem to have no general basis in fact. Doctors, social workers, and others who express such fears may sometimes forget they are in danger of generalizing from an extremely untypical subsection of the population or from a few extreme examples known personally to them. * * * So far, at least as the old are concerned, therefore, there is no justification for an attempt to supplant the family with state services."

LIFE IS SIMPLER

Our data indicate that very similar conclusions can be drawn for the United States. In fact, when the respondents in our survey were asked, "Do you believe that a new department of government could do something important for you personally that is not being done now?" the majority (60 percent) said, "No."

Social workers and other interest groups often insist that "modern life has become so complicated" that our aging citizens need someone else to tell them how to take care of themselves. But our survey suggests that the majority of our older people do not seem impressed by an increasing complexity of life, nor do they expect this problem to loom large within the next 10 to 20 years. On the contrary, they can think of many chores and problems of daily life that have become much easier for them than they were for their own parents and grandparents.

In conclusion, the data presented in this paper strongly supports a reexamination of the conceptions of the aging in the United States. It may be seriously questioned whether increasing age is pathological, per se, as is implied by the alarm with which it is viewed by many researchers, professional helpers, and policymakers. While attempting to study the aging, the social scientists may make them objects, rather than persons, and in so doing produce problems where none previously existed. There seems little doubt that the (widespread) caricature of the aging derives from application of the experience of a generation ago to a new type of over-65 population.

Finally, it must be emphasized that this paper does not deny that parts of our population of all ages, including old age, are dependent, inadequate, ill, and unemployed. The authors share feelings of sympathy for such persons. The study here reported, however, shows that the aging, like others in our population, are not characteristically dependent, inadequate, ill, or senile.

It is hoped that further research into the normal can be carried out. Since all resources are limited, whether of family, kin, private or public agencies, the recognition that the dependent and helpless in our aging population are limited in number will allow available resources to be applied with discrimination, with far greater hope of return to the society and to its people.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Calendar under rule VIII be dispensed with.

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

MEANING OF COMMUNISM TO AMERICANS—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, leadership, in our times, is a great and challenging responsibility. Among men of honest hearts and good will, the definition of leadership may, and does, differ.

For those in the Nation, in politics, or in other walks of life who are fulfilling the responsibilities of leadership within the full range of their potential, however, we can be deeply grateful.

The parrotlike critics who echo the cry of lack of leadership in others should, I believe, ask of themselves, "Am I, in my role of life, providing leadership, creating new understanding, offering constructive solutions to problems, contributing new ideas for progress, attempting to build a better road for ourselves, the Nation, for the future?"

Unless this is being done, criticism of others contains the seeds of self-condemnation.

Yesterday Vice President NIXON released a statement entitled "The Meaning of Communism to Americans." In my humble judgment, this excellent effort to create a better understanding of the blight and threat that is communism is a distinctive service, not only to the American people, but to the free world.

As Vice President NIXON pointed out, the question is no longer, are we against communism. Rather, the question looms high, and we have not yet found all the answers: How can we most effectively understand communism's weaknesses and prepare counterattacks in the ideological battle to win men's minds?

Naturally, there will be varying viewpoints on this analysis of the meaning of communism. Nevertheless, I believe that the address represents a constructive, creative, practical contribution to filling a void in our understanding of a menace to freedom and constructing a better foundation upon which to counter the Communists' multipronged efforts—ideological, cultural, military, economic—to take over the world.

Reflecting a quality of real leadership, and a new, worthwhile effort by a candidate for public office, this represents a unique kind of contribution to public thinking that could profitably, for all of us, be continued and emulated, by both Republicans and Democrats.

Reflecting a creative contribution to the West's efforts not only to better understand how to stop the outspreading of communism but eventually to establish a climate in which the people themselves now under Communist control can recapture freedom and regain a voice of self-determination, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the Vice President's statement on the meaning of communism to Americans printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MEANING OF COMMUNISM TO AMERICANS

(By RICHARD NIXON, Vice President, United States of America)

The major problem confronting the people of the United States and free peoples everywhere in the last half of the 20th century is the threat to peace and freedom presented by the militant aggressiveness of international communism. A major weakness in this struggle is lack of adequate understanding of the character of the challenge which communism presents.

I am convinced that we are on the right side of this struggle and that we are well ahead now in its major aspects. But if we are to maintain our advantage and assure victory in the struggle, we must develop, not only among the leaders, but among the people of the free world a better understanding of the threat which confronts us.

The question is not one of being for or against communism. The time is long past when any significant number of Americans contend that communism is no particular concern of theirs. Few can still believe that communism is simply a curious and twisted philosophy which happens to appeal to a certain number of zealots but which constitutes no serious threat to the interests or ideals of free society.

The days of indifference are gone. The danger today in our attitude toward communism is of a very different kind. It lies in the fact that we have come to abhor communism so much that we no longer recognize the necessity of understanding it.

We see the obvious dangers. We recognize that we must retain our present military and economic advantage over the Communist bloc, an advantage which deters a hot war and which counters the Communist threat in the cold war. In the fields of rocket technology and space exploration, we have risen to the challenge and we will keep the lead that we have gained. There is no question that the American people generally will support whatever programs our leaders initiate in these fields.

What we must realize is that this struggle probably will not be decided in the military, economic, or scientific areas, important as these are. The battle in which we are engaged is primarily one of ideas. The test is one not so much of arms but of faith.

If we are to win a contest of ideas we must know their ideas as well as our own. Our knowledge must not be superficial. We cannot be content with simply an intuition that communism is wrong. It is not enough to rest our case alone on the assertions, true as they are, that communism denies God, enslaves men, and destroys justice.

We must recognize that the appeal of the Communist idea is not to the masses, as the Communists would have us believe, but more often to an intelligent minority in newly developing countries who are trying to decide which system offers the best and surest road to progress.

We must cut through the exterior to the very heart of the Communist idea. We must come to understand the weaknesses of communism as a system—why after more than 40 years on trial it continues to disappoint so many aspirations, why it has failed in its promise of equality in abundance, why it has produced a whole library of disillusionment and a steady stream of men, women, and children seeking to escape its blight.

But we must also come to understand its strength—why it has so securely entrenched itself in the U.S.S.R. why it has been able to accomplish what it has in the field of education and science, why in some of the problem areas of the world it continues to appeal to leaders aspiring to a better life for their people.

It is to find the answers to these questions that in this statement I want to discuss communism as an idea—its economic philosophy, its philosophy of law and politics, its philosophy of history.

This statement will admittedly not be simple because the subject is complex.

It will not be brief because nothing less than a knowledge in depth of the Communist idea is necessary if we are to deal with it effectively.

In discussing the idea I will not offer programs to meet it. I intend in a later statement to discuss the tactics and vulnerabilities of the Communist conspiracy and how we can best fashion a strategy for victory.

I anticipate that some might understandably ask the question—why such a lengthy discussion of communism when everybody is against it already?

If the free world is to win this struggle, we must have men and women who not only are against communism but who know why they are against and who know what they are going to do about it. Communism is a false idea, and the answer to a false idea is truth, not ignorance.

One of the fundamentals of the Communist philosophy is a belief that societies pass inevitably through certain stages. Each of these stages is supposed to generate the necessity for its successor. Feudalism contained within its loins the seed of capitalism; capitalism was, in other words, to supplant feudalism. Capitalism, in turn, moves inevitably toward a climax in which it will be supplanted by its appointed successor, communism. All of these things are matters of necessity and there is nothing men can do to change the inflexible sequence which history imposes.

It is a part of this philosophy that as society moves along its predestined way, each stage of development is dominated by a particular class. Feudalism was dominated by the aristocracy; capitalism by something called the bourgeoisie; communism by the proletariat. During any particular stage of society's development the whole of human life within that society is run and rigged for the benefit of the dominant class; no one else counts for anything and the most he can expect is the leftover scraps. In the end, of course, with the final triumph of communism, classes will disappear, what was formerly the proletariat will expand so that it is the only class, and since there are no longer any outsiders that it can dominate, there will in effect be no classes at all.

Now this theory of successive stages of development makes it clear that if we are to understand communism, we must understand the Communist view of capitalism for, according to Communist theory, capitalism contains within itself the germs of communism. The Communist notion of capitalism is that it is a market economy, an economy of "free trade, free selling, and buying" to quote the Manifesto again. It follows from this that since communism inevitably supplants and destroys capitalism, it cannot itself be anything like market economy.

The fundamental belief of the Communist economic philosophy therefore is a negative one; namely, a belief that whatever the economic system of mature communism may turn out to be, it cannot be a market economy, it cannot—in the words of the Communist Manifesto—be an economy based on "free trade, free selling, and buying."

It may be well at this point to digress for the purpose of recalling the curious fact

that the literature of communism contains so many praises for the achievements of capitalism. The Manifesto contains these words about the market economy of capitalism and its alleged overlords, the bourgeoisie:

"It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former migrations of nations and crusades. * * * The bourgeoise, during its rule of scarce 100 years (the Manifesto speaks from the year 1848), has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labor?"

Marx and Engels could afford this praise for capitalism because they supposed it would everywhere be succeeded by communism, a stage of society whose glories would in turn dwarf all the achievements of capitalism. Communism would build on capitalism and bring a new economy that would make the capitalist world look like a poorhouse. Those who constituted the dominant class of capitalism, the bourgeoisie, would have performed their historic mission and would be dismissed from the scene—dismissed without thanks, of course, for after all they only accomplished what was foreordained by the forces of history, forces that were now to throw them into the discard like the husk of a sprouting seed.

One of the most startling gaps in the Communist theory is the lack of any clear notion of how a Communist economy would be organized. In the writings of the great founders of communism there is virtually nothing on this subject. This gap was not an oversight, but was in fact a necessary consequence of the general theory of communism. That theory taught, in effect, that as a society moves inevitably from one level of development to another, there is no way of knowing what the next stage will demand until in fact it has arrived. Communism will supplant and destroy the market economy of capitalism. What will its own economy be like? That we cannot know until we are there and have a chance to see what the world looks like without any institution resembling an economic market. The Manifesto, in fact, expresses a deep contempt for "utopian socialists" who propose "an organization of society specially contrived" by them, instead of waiting out the verdict of history and depending on the "spontaneous class organization of the proletariat." The Communist economy would organize itself according to principles that would become apparent only when the arena had been cleared of the market principle.

Operating then, in this vacuum of guidance left behind by their prophets, how did the founders of the Soviet Union proceed to organize their new economy? The answer is that they applied as faithfully as they could the teachings of their masters. Since those teachings were essentially negative, their actions had to have the same quality. They started by attempting to root out from the Russian scene every vestige of the market principle, even discouraging the use of money, which they hoped soon to abolish altogether. The production and distribution of goods were put under central direction, the theory being that the flow of goods would be directed by social need without reference to principles of profit and loss. This experiment began in 1919 and came to an abrupt end in March of 1921. It was a catastrophic failure. It brought with it administrative chaos and an almost inconceivable disorder in economic affairs, culminating in appalling shortages of the most elementary necessities.

Competent scholars estimate its cost in Russian lives at 5 million.

The official Russian version of this experiment does not deny that it was an enormous failure. It attributes that failure to inexperience and to a mythical continuation of military operations, which had in fact almost wholly ceased. Meanwhile the Russian economy has been moving steadily toward the market principle.

The flow of labor is controlled by wages, so that the price of labor is itself largely set by market forces. The spread from top to bottom of industrial wages is in many cases wider than it is in this country. Managerial efficiency is promoted by substantial economic incentives in the form of bonuses and even more substantial perquisites of various kinds. Enterprises are run on a profit-and-loss basis. Indeed, there are all the paraphernalia of an advanced commercial society, with lawyers, accountants, balance sheets, taxes of many kinds, direct and indirect, and finally even the pressures of a creeping inflation.

The allocation of resources in Russia probably now comes about as close to being controlled by the market principle as is possible where the government owns all the instruments of production. Russian economists speak learnedly of following the method of balances.

This impressive phrase stands for a very simple idea. It means that in directing production and establishing prices an effort is made to come out even, so that goods for which there is an insufficient demand will not pile up, while shortages will not develop in other fields where demand exceeds supply. The method of balances turns out to be something a lot of us learned about in school as the law of supply and demand.

All of this is not to say that the Russian economy has fully realized the market principle. There are two obstacles that block such a development. The first lies in the fact that there is a painful tension between what has to be done to run the economy efficiently and what ought to be happening according to orthodox theory. The result is that the Russian economist has to be able to speak out of both sides of his mouth at the same time. He has to be prepared at all times for sudden shifts of the party line. If today he is condemned as an unprincipled revisionist who apes capitalist methods, tomorrow he may be jerked from the scene for having fallen into a sterile orthodoxy, not realizing that Marxism is a developing and creative science.

The other obstacle to the realization of a free market lies in the simple fact that the government owns the whole of industry. This means, for one thing, that the industrial units are huge, so that all of steel, or all of cosmetics, for example, is under a single direction. This naturally creates the economic condition known as oligopoly and the imperfectly functioning market which attends that condition.

Furthermore, a realization of the market principle would require the managers of the various units of industry to act as if they were doing something they are not, that is, as if they were directing independent enterprises. Understandably there is a considerable reluctance to assume this fictitious role, since the manager's reward for an inconvenient independence may well be a trip to Siberia where he is likely nowadays, they say, to be made chief bookkeeper in a tiny powerplant 300 miles from the nearest town. Meanwhile, a constant theme of complaint by Moscow against the managers is that they are too "cousinly" with one another and that they are too addicted to "back scratching." They ought to be acting like capitalistic entrepreneurs, but they find this a little difficult when they are all working for the same boss.

One of the most familiar refrains of Communist propaganda is that "capitalism is dying of its internal contradictions." In fact, it would be hard to imagine a system more tortured by internal contradictions than present-day Russia. It constantly has to preach one way and act another. When Russian economists and managers discover that they have to do something that seems to contradict the prophets, they usually don't know which of three justifications—all hazardous—they ought to attempt: (1) To explain their action as a temporary departure from Marxist propriety to be corrected in a more propitious future; (2) to show that what they are doing can be justified by the inherited text if it is read carefully and between the lines; or (3) to invoke the cliche that Marxism is a progressive science that learns by experience—we can't, after all, expect Marx, Engels, and Lenin to have foreseen everything.

These inner tensions and perplexities help to explain the startling "shifts in the party line" that characterize all of the Communist countries. It is true that these shifts sometimes reflect the outcome of a subterranean personal power struggle within the party. But we must remember that they also at times result from the struggles of conscientious men trying to fit an inconvenient text to the facts of reality.

The yawning gap in Communist theory, by which it says nothing about how the economy shall be run except that it shall not be by the market principle, will continue to create tensions, probably of mounting intensity, within and among the Communist nations. The most painful compromise that it has so far necessitated occurred when it was decided that trade among the satellite countries should be governed by the prices set on the world market.

This embarrassing concession to necessity recognized, on the one hand, that a price cannot be meaningful unless it is set by something like a market, and, on the other, the inability of the Communist system to develop a reliable pricing system within its own government-managed economy.

The Communist theory has now had a chance to prove itself by an experience extending over two generations in a great nation of huge human and material resources. What can we learn from this experience? We can learn, first of all, that it is impossible to run an advanced economy successfully without resort to some variant of the market principle. In time of war, when costs are largely immaterial and all human efforts converge on a single goal, the market principle can be subordinated. In a primitive society, where men live on the verge of extinction and all must be content with the same meager ration, the market principle largely loses its relevance. But when society's aim is to satisfy divers human wants and to deploy its productive facilities in such a way as to satisfy those wants in accordance with their intensity—their intensity as felt by those who have the wants—there is and can be no substitute for the market principle. This the Russian experience proves abundantly. That experience also raises serious doubt whether the market principle can be realized within an economy wholly owned by the government.

The second great lesson of the Russian experience is of deeper import. It is that communism is utterly wrong about its most basic premise, the premise that underlies everything it has to say about economics, law, philosophy, morality, and religion. Communism starts with the proposition that

there are no universal truths or general truths of human nature. According to its teachings there is nothing one human age can say to another about the proper ordering of society or about such subjects as justice, freedom, and equality. Everything depends on the stage of society and the economic class that is in power at a particular time.

In the light of this fundamental belief—or rather, this unbending and all-pervasive disbelief—it is clear why communism had to insist that what was true for capitalism could not be true for communism. Among the truths scheduled to die with capitalism was the notion that economic life could be usefully ordered by a market. If this truth seems still to be alive, orthodox Communist doctrine has to label it as an illusion, a ghost left behind by an age now being surpassed. At the present time this particular capitalist ghost seems to have moved in on the Russian economy and threatens to become a permanent guest at the Communist banquet. Let us hope it will soon be joined by some other ghosts, such as freedom, political equality, religion, and constitutionalism.

This brings me to the Communist view of law and politics. Of the Communist legal and political philosophy, we can almost say that there is none. This lack is, again, not an accident, but is an integral part of the systematic negations which make up the Communist philosophy.

According to Marx and Engels the whole life of any society is fundamentally determined by the organization of its economy. What men will believe; what gods, if any, they will worship; how they will choose their leaders or let their leaders choose themselves; how they will interpret the world about them; all of these are basically determined by economic interests and relations. In the jargon of communism: religion, morality, philosophy, political science and law constitute a superstructure which reflects the underlying economic organization of a particular society. It follows that subjects which fall within the superstructure permit of no general truths; for example, what is true for law and political science under capitalism cannot be true under communism.

I have said we can almost assert that there is no Communist philosophy of law and political science. The little there is can be briefly stated. It consists in the assumption that after the revolution there will be a dictatorship (called the dictatorship of the proletariat) and that this dictatorship will for a while find it necessary to utilize some of the familiar political and legal institutions, such as courts. (There is an incredibly tortured literature about just how these institutions are to be utilized and with what modifications.) When, however, mature communism is achieved, law and the state, in the consecrated phrase, "will wither away." There will be no voting, no parliaments, no judges, no policemen, no prisons, no problems. There will simply be factories and fields and a happy populace peacefully reveling in the abundance of their output.

As with economic theory, there was a time in the history of the Soviet regime when an attempt was made to take seriously the absurdities of this Communist theory of law and state. For about a decade during the thirties an influential doctrine was called the commodity exchange theory of law. According to this theory, the fundamental fact about capitalism is that it is built on the economic institution of exchange. In accordance with the doctrine of the "superstructure" all political and legal institutions under capitalism must therefore be permeated and shaped by the concept of exchange. Indeed, the theory went further. Even the rules of morality are based on exchange, for is there not a kind of tacit deal implied even in the Golden Rule, "Do unto others, as you would be done by"? Now the realization of communism, which is the negation of capitalism, requires the utter rooting out of any notion of exchange in the Communist economy. But, when exchange has disappeared, the political, legal, and moral superstructure that was built on it will also disappear. Therefore, under mature communism there will not only be no capitalistic legal and political institutions, there will be no law whatever, no state, no morality—for all of these in some measure reflect the underlying notion of an exchange or deal among men.

The high priest of this doctrine was Eugene Pashukanis. His reign came to an abrupt end in 1937 as the inconvenience of his teachings began to become apparent. With an irony befitting the career of one who predicted that communism would bring an end to law and legal processes. Pashukanis was quietly taken off and shot without even the semblance of a trial.

As in the case of economics, since Pashukanis' liquidation there has developed in Russian intellectual life a substantial gray market for capitalistic legal and political theories. But, where Russian economists seem ashamed of their concessions to the market principle, Russian lawyers openly boast of their legal and political system, claiming for it that it does everything that equivalent bourgeois institutions do, only better. This boast has to be muted somewhat, because it still remains a matter of dogma that under mature communism law and the state will disappear. This embarrassing aspect of their inherited doctrine the Soviet theorists try to keep as much as possible under the table. They cannot, however, openly renounce it without heresy, and heresy in the Soviet Union, be it remembered, still requires a very active taste for extinction.

One of the leading books on Soviet legal and political theory is edited by a lawyer who is well known in this country, the late Andrei Vishinsky. In the table-pounding manner he made famous in the U.N., Vishinsky praises Soviet legal and political institutions to the skies and contrasts their wholesome purity with the putrid vapors emanating from the capitalist countries. He points out, for example, that in Russia the voting age is 18, while in many capitalist countries it is 21.

The capitalists thus disenfranchise millions of young men and women, because, says Vishinsky, it is feared they may not yet have acquired a properly safe bourgeois mentality. As one reads arguments like this spelled out with the greatest solemnity, and learns all about the safeguards of the Soviet Constitution, it comes as a curious shock to find it openly declared that in the Soviet Union only one political party can legally exist and that the Soviet Constitution is the only constitution in the world which frankly declares the directing role of the party in the state.

One wonders what all the fuss about voting qualifications is about if the voters are in the end permitted only to vote for the candidates chosen by the only political party permitted to exist. The plain fact is, of course, that everything in the Soviet Constitution relating to public participation in political decisions is a facade concealing the real instrument of power that lies in the Communist Party. It has been said that hypocrisy is vice's tribute to virtue. The holding of elections in which the electorate is given no choice may similarly be described as an attempt by communism to salve its uneasy conscience. Knowing that it cannot achieve representative democracy, it seems to feel better if it adopts its empty forms.

When one reflects on it, it is an astounding thing that a great and powerful nation in the second half of the 20th century should still leave its destinies to be determined by intraparty intrigue, that it should have developed no political institutions capable of giving to its people a really effective voice in their government, that it should lack any openly declared and lawful procedure by which the succession of one rule to another could be determined. Some are inclined to seek an explanation for this condition in Russian history with its bloody and irregular successions of czars. But this is to forget that even in England, the mother of parliaments, there were once in time long gone by, some pretty raw doings behind palace walls and some unseemly and even bloody struggles for the throne.

But where other nations have worked gradually toward stable political institutions guaranteeing the integrity of their governments, Russia has remained in a state of arrested development. That state will continue until the Russian leaders have the courage to declare openly that the legal and political philosophy of Marx, Engels and Lenin is fundamentally mistaken and must be abandoned.

How heavy the burden of the inherited Communist philosophy is becomes clear when the concept of law itself is under discussion. Throughout the ages, among men of all nations and creeds, law has generally been thought of as a curb on arbitrary power. It has been conceived as a way of substituting reason for force in the decision of disputes, thus liberating human energies for the pursuit of aims more worthy of man's destiny than brute survival or the domination of one's fellows. No one has supposed that these ideals have ever been fully realized in any society. Like every human institution, law is capable of being exploited for selfish purposes and of losing its course through a confusion of purposes. But during most of the world's history, men have thought that the questions worthy of discussion were how the institutions of law could be shaped so that they might not be perverted into instruments of power or lose the sense of their high mission through sloth or ignorance.

What is the Communist attitude toward this intellectual enterprise in which so many great thinkers of so many past ages have joined? Communism consigns all of it to the ashcan of history as a fraud and delusion, beneath the contempt of Communist science. How, then, is law defined today in Russia? We have an authoritative answer. It is declared to be the totality of the rules of conduct expressing the will of the dominant class, designed to promote those relationships that are advantageous and agreeable to the dominant class.

Law in the Soviet Union is not conceived as a check on power, it is openly and proudly an expression of power. In this conception surely, if anywhere, the bankruptcy of communism as a moral philosophy openly declares itself.

It is vitally important to emphasize again that all of the truly imposing absurdities achieved by Communist thought—in whatever field: in economics, in politics, in law, in morality—that all of these trace back to a single common source. That origin lies in a belief that nothing of universal validity can be said of human nature, that there are no principles, values or moral truths that stand above a particular age or a particular phase in the evolution of society. This profound negation lies at the very heart of the Communist philosophy and gives to it both its motive force and its awesome capacity for destruction.

It is this central negation that makes communism radically inconsistent with the ideal of human freedom. As with other "bourgeois" virtues, once dismissed contemptuously, Soviet writers have now taken up the line that only under communism can men realize true freedom. This line may even have a certain persuasiveness for Russians in that individuals tend to prize those freedoms they are familiar with and not to miss those they have never enjoyed. A Russian

transplanted suddenly to American soil might well feel for a time unfree in the sense that he would be confronted with the burden of making choices that he was unaccustomed to making and that he would regard as onerous. But the problem of freedom goes deeper than the psychological conditioning of any particular individual. It touches the very roots of man's fundamental conception of himself.

The Communist philosophy is basically inconsistent with the ideal of freedom because it denies that there can be any standard of moral truth by which the actions of any given social order may be judged. If the individual says to government, "Thus far may you go, but no farther," he necessarily appeals to some principle of rightness that stands above his particular form of government. It is precisely the possibility of any such standard that communism radically and uncompromisingly denies. Marx and Engels had nothing but sneers for the idea that there are eternal truths, such as freedom, justice, etc., that are common to all states of society.

They contend that there are no eternal truths. All ideas of right and wrong come from the social system under which one lives. If that system requires tyranny and oppression then tyranny and oppression must within that system be accepted; there can be no higher court of appeal.

Not only do the premises of Communist philosophy make any coherent theory of freedom impossible, but the actual structure of the Soviet regime is such that no true sense of freedom can ever develop under it. To see why this is so, it is useful to accept the Communist ideology provisionally and reason the matter out purely in terms of what may be called human engineering. Let us concede that a struggle for political power goes on in all countries and let us assume in keeping with Marxist views that this struggle has absolutely nothing to do with right and wrong. Even from this perversely brutal point of view, it is clear why a sense of freedom can never develop under the Soviet regime. In a constitutional democracy the struggle for political power is assigned to a definite arena; it is roped off, so to speak, from the rest of life. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, there is no clear distinction between politics and economics, or between politics and other human activities. No barriers exist to define what is a political question and what is not. Instead of being ordered and canalized as it is in constitutional democracies, the struggle for political power in Russia pervades, or can at any time, pervade every department of life. For this reason there is no area of human interest—the intellectual, literary, scientific, artistic or religious—that may not at any time become a battleground of this struggle.

Take, for example, the situation of a Soviet architect. Today without doubt he enjoys a certain security; he is not likely to lie awake fearing the dread knock at the door at midnight. Furthermore, he may now see opening before him in the practice of his profession a degree of artistic freedom that his predecessors did not enjoy. But he can never be sure that he will not wake up tomorrow morning and read in the papers that a new line has been laid down for architecture, since his profession, like every other, can at any moment be drawn into the struggle for power. He can never know the security enjoyed by those who live under a system where the struggle for political power is fenced off, as it were, from the other concerns of life. When Soviet politics invades a field like architecture, it cannot be said to spread beyond its proper boundaries, for it has none. It is precisely this defect in the Soviet regime that in the long run prevents the realization of the ideal of freedom under communism.

It is only in the constitutional democracies that the human spirit can be permanently free to unfold itself in as many directions as are opened up for it by its creative urge. Only such governments can achieve diversity without disintegration, for only they know the full meaning of those wise restraints that make men free.

Since the Communist philosophy of history is the central core of its ideology, that philosophy has of necessity permeated every theme I have so far discussed. Briefly stated, the Communist philosophy of history is that man does not make history, but is made by it.

Though communism denies to man the capacity to shape his own destiny, it does accord to him a remarkable capacity to foresee in great detail just what the future will impose on him. The literature of communism is full of prophecies, tacit, and explicit. Probably no human faith ever claimed so confidently that it knew so much about the future. Certainly none ever ran up a greater number of bad guesses. On a rough estimate the Communist record for mistaken prophecies stands at about 100 percent.

Among the conclusions about the future that were implicit in the Communist philosophy, or were drawn from it by its prophets, we can name the following:

That communism will first establish itself in countries of the most advanced capitalism;

That in such countries society will gradually split itself into two classes, with the rich becoming fewer and richer, the laboring masses sinking steadily to a bare level of existence;

That under capitalism colonialism will increase as each capitalistic nation seeks more and more outlets for its surplus production;

That in capitalist countries labor unions will inevitably take the lead in bringing about the Communist revolution;

That as soon as communism is firmly established steps will be taken toward the elimination of the capitalist market and capitalist political and legal institutions; et cetera.

As with other aspects of communism, this record of bad guesses is no accident. It derives from the basic assumption of Marxism that man has no power to mold his institutions to meet problems as they arise, that he is caught up in a current of history which carries him inevitably toward his predestined goal. A philosophy which embraces this view of man's plight is constitutionally incapable of predicting the steps man will take to shape his own destiny, precisely because it has in advance declared any such steps to be impossible. Communism in this respect is like a man standing on the bank of a rising river and observing what appears to be a log lodged against the opposite shore. Assuming that what he observes is an inert object, he naturally predicts that the log will eventually be carried away by the rising flood waters. When the log turns out to be a living creature and steps safely out of the water, the observer is, of course, profoundly surprised. Communism, it must be confessed, has shown a remarkable capacity to absorb such shocks, for it has survived many of them. In the long run, however, it seems inevitable that the Communist brain will inflict serious damage upon itself by the tortured rationalizations with which it has to explain each successive bad guess.

This brings us to the final issue. Why is it that with all its brutalities and absurdities communism still retains an active appeal for the minds and hearts of many intelligent men and women? For we must never forget that this appeal does exist.

It is true that in the United States and many other countries the fringe of serious thought represented by active Communist belief has become abraded to the point of near extinction. It is also the fact that many people everywhere adhere to groups dominated by Communist leadership who have only the slightest inkling of communism as a system of ideas. Then again we must remember that in the Communist countries themselves there are many intelligent, loyal, and hard-working citizens, thoroughly acquainted with the Communist philosophy, who view that philosophy with a quiet disdain, not unmixed with a certain sardonic pleasure of the sort that goes with witnessing, from a choice seat, a comedy of errors that is unfortunately also a tragedy. Finally, we must not confuse every gain of communism with a gain of adherents to Communist beliefs. In particular, we should not mistake the acceptance of technical and economic aid from Moscow as a conversion to the Communist faith, though the contacts thus established may of course open the way for a propagation of that faith.

With all this said, and with surface appearance discounted in every proper way, the tragic fact remains that communism as a faith remains a potent force in the world of ideas today. It is an even more tragic fact that that faith can sometimes appeal not only to opportunists and adventurers, but also to men of dedicated idealism. How does this come about?

To answer this question we have to ask another: What are the ingredients that go to make up a successful fighting faith, a faith that will enlist the devotion and fanaticism of its adherents, that will let loose on the world that unaccommodating creature, the true believer?

I think that such a faith must be made up of at least three ingredients.

First. It must lift its adherents above the dread sense of being alone and make them feel themselves members of a brotherhood.

Second. It must make its adherents believe that in working for the objectives of their faith they are moving in step with nature, or with the forces of history, or with the divine will.

Third. It must be a faith that gives to its adherents a sense of being lifted above the concerns that consume the lives of the nonbelieving.

All of these ingredients are furnished in abundance by communism. In the Communist philosophy the first two ingredients are fused into one doubly effective amalgam. To become a Communist is no longer to be alone, but to join in the march of a great, oppressed mass of humanity called the proletariat. This silent, faceless army is being carried inevitably to its goal by the unseen forces of history. There is thus a double indentification. History belongs to the proletariat, the proletariat belongs to history. By joining in this great march the Communist not only gains human companions but a sense of responding to the great pull of the universe itself.

Now, the picture I have just painted is not one that even the most devout Communist can comfortably carry about with him at all times. Indeed, there are probably few Communists who do not, even in their moments of highest faith, sense some of the fictions and contradictions of the dogma to which they are committed. The absurdities of the Communist ideology are, however, by no means immediately apparent to the new convert, who is likely to be intrigued rather by the difficulty of understanding them. The old believer sees no reason to point out these absurdities, partly because he does not wish to undermine the faith of the young, and partly because he

has become inured to them, has learned to live with them at peace, and does not want to disturb his own adjustment to them.

One of the key fictions of the Communist edifice of thought is the belief that there is in modern industrial society an identifiable class of people called the proletariat. That such a class would develop was not a bad guess in 1848 and Marx had other economists with him in making this guess. As usual, history perversely took the wrong turn. And as usual, this has caused communism no particular embarrassment, for it continues—with diminished ardor, to be sure—to talk about the proletariat as if it were actually there. But professing to see things that are not there is often a sign of faith and furnishes, in any event, a bond of union among believers.

To many of its American critics, communism has appeared as a kind of nightmare. Like awakened sleepers still recoiling from the shock of their dream, these critics forget that the nightmare is after all shot through and through with absurdities. The result is to lend to the Communist ideology a substance that in fact it does not possess. If in moments of doubt the Communist is inclined to feel that his philosophy is made of air and tinsel, he is reassured and brought back into the fold when he recalls that its critics have declared this philosophy to be profoundly and powerfully vicious.

Part of the tarnish that an uncompliant history has visited on the Communist prophecies has in recent years been removed by the achievements of Russian technology. It is now possible to identify communism with the land that has the highest school buildings, the hugest outdoor rallies, the most colossal statues and the space satellites that weigh the most tons. It is not difficult to make all this appear as a kind of belated flowering of the promises communism began holding out more than a hundred years ago. It is easy to make men forget that none of the solid accomplishments of modern Russia came about by methods remotely resembling anything anticipated by Marx, Engels, or Lenin.

In suggesting the ingredients that go to make up a successful fighting faith, I stated that such a faith must be one "that gives to its adherents a sense of being lifted above the concerns that consume the lives of the nonbelieving." I have purposely left this aspect of the Communist faith to the last for it is here that the truly nightmarish quality of that faith manifests itself.

Not that it is any objection to a faith that it enables those sharing it to be indifferent to things that seem important to others. The crucial question is, what is it that men are told not to heed? As to the Communist faith there is no ambiguity on this score. It tells men to forget all the teachings of the ages about government, law and morality. We are told to cast off the intellectual burden left behind by men like Confucius, Mencius, Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas, Kant, and Bentham. There are no "eternal truths" about society. There is no science of social architecture. Only the simple minded can believe that there are principles guiding the creation of sound legal and political institutions. For the enlightened there is only one rule: Smash the existing bourgeois economic and legal order and leave the rest to the spontaneous class organization of the proletariat.

In diplomatic dealings the Russians display great respect for American military and economic power, but consider us hopelessly naive in matters political. We are still concerned with trifles they feel themselves long since to have left behind, trifles like: How do you help a people to realize self-government who have had no experience with its necessary forms and restraints? How following the overthrow of a tyranny do you suggest steps that will prevent an interim dictatorship from hardening into a second tyranny?

It is not that the Communists have ideas about sound government that differ from ours. According to strict Communist theory there can be no ideas on such a subject. If a gray market for such ideas has gradually developed in Russia it has not yet reached the point of being ready for the export trade. Russia has engineers able to help the underdeveloped countries build roads and dams, and there is no reason to question the competence of these engineers. But whoever heard of Russia sending an expert in political institutions to help a new country design an appropriate form of representative self-government? Not only would such a mission stand in ludicrous incongruity with the present situation of the Communist countries in Europe; it would be a repudiation of the basic premises of the whole Communist philosophy.

Even in the economic field, Russia really has nothing to offer the rest of the world but negations. For a long time after the establishment of the Soviet regime it was actively disputed in Russia whether for communism there is any such thing as an economic law.

Communistic ideology has had gradually to bend before the plain fact that such laws exist. But Russia has as yet developed no economic institutions that are more than distorted shadows of their capitalist equivalents. Russia may help a new country to develop electric power. It has nothing to say about the social institutions that will determine how that power will be utilized for the good of the whole people.

This great vacuum that lies in the heart of communism explains not only why its philosophy is in the long run so destructive of everything human, but why in the short run it can be so successful. Consider, for example, what it can offer to the leader of a successful revolution. A cruel dictatorship has been overthrown. It had to be overthrown by force because it permitted no elections or never counted the vote honestly. Following the successful revolt, there must be an interval during which order is kept by something approaching a dictatorship. Sooner or later, if the revolution is not to belie its democratic professions, some movement must be made toward representative self-government. This is a period of great difficulty. There is no mystery about its problems. They fit into an almost classic pattern known from antiquity. The revolutionary leaders must find some accommodation with what is left of the old regime. Sooner or later the firing squad must be retired. Even when this is done vengeful hatreds continue to endanger the successful operation of parliamentary government. Among the revolutionary party, men who were once united in overthrowing plain injustice become divided on the question what constitutes a just new order. Militant zealots, useful in the barricades, are too rough for civil government and must be curbed. If curbed too severely, they may take up arms against the new government, et cetera. What can communism offer the revolutionary leader caught in this ancient and familiar quandary? It can, of course, offer him material aid. But it can offer him something more significant and infinitely more dangerous, a clear conscience in taking the easy course. It can tell him to forget about elections and his promises of democracy and freedom. It can support this advice with an imposing library of pseudo-science clothing despotism with the appearance of intellectual respectability.

The internal stability of the present Russian Government lends an additional persuasiveness to this appeal. If Russia can get along without elections, why can't we? Men forget that it is a common characteristic of dictatorships to enjoy internal truces that may extend over decades, only to have the struggle for power renew itself when the problem of a succession arises. This is a pattern written across centuries of man's struggle for forms of government consistent with human dignity. It is said that the struggle for power cannot under modern conditions, with modern armies and modern weapons, take the form of a prolonged civil war. That is no doubt true in a developed economy like that of Russia. The shift in power when it comes may involve only a few quick maneuvers within the apparatus of the party, which have their only outward manifestation in purges or banishments that seal the results. But the fact remains that the fate of millions will be determined by processes which take no account of their interests or wishes, in which they are granted no participation, and which they are not even permitted to observe.

It must not be forgotten that modern Russia was for an indefinite period prior to 1953 governed by a tyranny. This is admitted in Russia today. To be sure, the term "tyranny" is not used, because according to the Communist philosophy a term like that betokens a naive and outdated view of the significance of governmental forms. The Soviet term is "the cult of personality." According to the official explanation Stalin and his followers in some mysterious way became infected with a mistaken view of Stalin's proper role. According to ancient wisdom this was because Stalin ruled without the check of constitutional forms and without effective popular participation in his government. In the words of Aristotle, written some 23 centuries ago, "This is why we do not permit a man to rule, but the principle of law, because a man rules in his own interest, and becomes a tyrant."

It is plain that Stalin at some point became a tyrant. According to Aristotle this was because Russia did not base its government on the principle of law. According to the Communist theory some inexplicable slippage of the gears, some accidental countercurrent of history, led Stalin to embrace incorrect notions about himself.

If mankind is to survive at a level of dignity worthy of its great past, we must help the world recapture some sense of the teachings of the great thinkers of former ages. It must come again to see that sound legal and political institutions not only express man's highest ideal of what he may become, but that they are indispensable instruments for enabling him to realize that ideal. It would be comforting to believe that the forces of history are working inevitably toward this realization and that we too are cooperating with the inevitable. We can only hope that this is so. But we can know that the forces of human life, struggling to realize itself on its highest plane, are working with us and that those forces need our help desperately.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

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

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

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580), the social security amendments of 1960.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is my happy personal recollection that 25 years ago I was a Member of the Congress that overwhelmingly enacted the

most humane and advanced social legislation in our Nation's history—the Social Security Act.

I have stated before, and I shall again, that this is one of the many imprints Franklin D. Roosevelt has left upon the pages of our Nation's history, an imprint that we hope and believe will endure forever.

Also, it is a happy recollection that later, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I helped draft the present liberalized and expanded social security program. In fact, some of the paragraphs that are now in the Social Security Act were originally in my own handwriting and produced as 25 of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, sat in a nonpartisan and a nonpolitical manner, in our shirt sleeves, and helped draft the amended and liberalized social security law during the 81st Congress.

Mr. President, America has never been a Nation content to stand still and rest on the laurels of the past.

It has been our tradition and our history always to move forward, always to take newer and greater steps in the interest of the welfare of the American people. Piecemeal, patchwork and after-the-fact legislation has proved to be inadequate to meet the needs of our elderly citizens. We must learn to anticipate needs, not to be tangled in the confusion of interpreting them long after they have swept onto the scene.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the legislative proposal reported from the Committee on Finance and now before the Senate, will not meet, nor does it seriously attempt to meet, the needs of the day. It represents, however, a step in the right direction. The same is true with regard to the proposed substitute offered by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Frankly, I do not particularly like the approach of the substitute proposal, but I intend to be present and to listen to all of the arguments made for and against it before the vote is taken.

The bill before us at least recognizes the need for a medical care plan for the aged. I suppose this is in itself somewhat of an achievement, considering the tremendous opposition to the concept from the American Medical Association and from other "ice age" oriented groups.

In speaking in this manner of the American Medical Association, Mr. President, I am not referring to the fine professional men who are the physicians and surgeons of the United States. I am referring to the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, the little group of willful men in control of the American Medical Association who operate one of the most powerful lobbies in Washington, D.C.; men who are not truly representative of the physicians and surgeons of this country.

The fact is that in my State of Ohio, in the neighborhood State of Pennsylvania, in the State of New Jersey, and I believe in the State of New York, and elsewhere, physicians and surgeons on every occasion, when a referendum has been taken on the question, "Do you desire to join the social security system?" have voted in every instance in the affirmative as they did in Ohio by 68 percent, expressing the will of the rank and file of the medical men of the country to join the social security system. Despite this, the reactionary House of Delegates of the American Medical Association is constantly lobbying to prevent the inclusion of physicians and surgeons under the beneficient provisions of our social security law.

In fact, we have reached the situation where practically the only group of professional men in the United States not included within the social security system are the physicians and surgeons.

Mr. President, I am one who believes that our social security system should be made universal, that it should apply to all employees and to all self-employed. We should provide that upon retirement or upon disability those who are covered by the social security program will receive not a mere handout but an adequate sum, in order that, with whatever little savings they have been able to acquire during lifetimes of constructive effort, they may live in some comfort and with dignity.

The simple fact, Mr. President, is that medical expenses rise with a person's years. At the same time, for most people, the ability to meet those needs declines rapidly once the person is off the payroll as an employee.

Mr. President, it is a unique circumstance that in the other body a bill has been introduced to permit physicians and surgeons to be covered by social security on an optional basis instead of on a compulsory basis. Think of that sort of outrage which is sought to be perpetrated upon our social security system, which all of us desire to continue to be actuarially sound.

Our social security system was actuarially sound and is actuarially sound.

Of course, this proposal for optional coverage for physicians and surgeons will not get to first base. It will be shelved in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, as it should be. Assuming any group of professional men could get away with going into the social security system on an optional basis instead of on a compulsory basis, all the young men in that profession would not be at all interested in doing so. Naturally they would wait until they became 63½ years of age to join the social security system, and then would soon share in its benefits.

If the medical profession really has the audacity to claim it is entitled to that treatment, where would we stop? Why should not a garage mechanic or anyone else be entitled to go into the system on a voluntary basis instead of on a compulsory basis? Within 6 months' time the social security system would no longer be actuarially sound.

Mr. President, we sometimes lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with people, with human beings instead of mere statistics. In this expanding system of safeguards against the hazards, the cruelties, and the penalties of old age new concepts of security and human dignity are involved, as well as a new relationship between the individual and his Government.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end men and women toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more. The dignity of every American is involved in the legislative proposals which we in the Senate shall be considering during the present week.

The bill before us, as reported from the Committee on Finance of the Senate, provides a "means test," sometimes called a "needs test," which would be applied before an individual could receive some of the benefits. A sick, elderly person would be forced to acknowledge publicly that he himself could not afford to take care of his medical and surgical needs before he could receive some of the benefits under the act. In effect, he would be receiving charity, a handout from our good Uncle Sam.

Mr. President, something deep inside a person is offended if, after a lifetime of productive effort, all a retired or disabled person gets is a handout.

Charity should never be the answer of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problems of unemployment and indigent old age.

The German Chancellor Bismarck, has been regarded by some people as the one who originated the first social security system. The fact is that Thomas Paine, the American Revolutionary War patriot, in 1795, while recuperating from an illness in the home of the U.S. Ambassador to France, James Monroe, wrote:

> To preserve the benefits of what is called civilized life and to remedy at the same time the evil which it has produced, ought to be considered as one of the first objects of reform legislation.

He then proposed to create a national fund out of which a sum would be paid each year to every person living at the age of 50 years.

It is noteworthy that in revolutionary times, 50 years of age was considered rather old. Just as noteworthy, in 1870, at the time that Otto von Bismarck was Chancellor of Germany, it was considered that 65 was elderly, and that the German Government should step in and with a social security program help the aged man of 65.

In the Revolutionary War period age 50 was considered old. In 1870, 65 was considered old. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who is now presiding in the chair, will agree with the junior Senator from Ohio, who has personally exceeded 65 by some years, that 65 is not so old any more. As a trial lawyer who over the years has tried many, many personal injury lawsuits involving damages claimed for deaths or permanent injuries, and who has introduced in evidence time and again the latest life insurance expectancy tables, I say that in our lifetime we have seen the life expectancy of Americans climb and climb, so that a man or woman in his or her fifties has a life expectancy far exceeding the life expectancy of some years past. As soon as medical science discovers controls and

cures for cancer and heart disease our life expectancy will shoot even further upward.

I am happy to say that there is every reason to believe that we are on the verge of making those discoveries.

Tom Paine, back in the Revolutionary period, proposed that there be established a national fund that would provide the sum of 15 pounds per annum. He wrote, "This is not charity but a right, not a bounty but justice." We can say that today of the social security system of our country. At that time Tom Paine, the pioneer, was advocating 15 pounds a year, which I estimate was a little over $5 per month.

Mr. President, I have digressed for a moment from what I had intended to say to point out that our American social security system was not obtained from Bismarck of Germany, but that it can be traced directly to an essay of Thomas Paine, written in 1795.

The concept of our social security system applies to all alike. The wealthy and the poor are equal before it.

All the millions of people who are covered are policyholders in the greatest insurance plan ever devised.

I recall distinctly that when we were attempting to liberalize and extend this act in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, short-sighted executives, the presidents of various life insurance companies, appeared before the committee and said that we were destroying private enterprise, and that we were resorting to state socialism.

Executives of insurance companies truly know now that the social security program, which was devised first by Franklin D. Roosevelt, enacted into law by the Congress of the United States in 1935, and signed on August 14, 1935, by President Roosevelt, has caused the individuals covered to be security minded, to give thought—which frankly I was not giving at that time—to an old age free from care and want. At that time I was living from day to day, happily. However, nowadays, due to the social mindedness and social security consciousness of young and old alike the business of the private insurance companies of the United States has increased tenfold. They have all prospered.

Some members of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, the reactionary group heading the association, still talk about socialized medicine and about state socialism when they refer to the social security law which we enacted in the Congress 25 years ago. It is noteworthy that some at that have sneeringly referred to this measure as a product of the New Deal and as New Deal legislation which should never have been enacted. When the Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, had a President and control of both branches of the Congress throughout 1953 and 1954 no attempt was made to repeal this or any other so-called New Deal law, and no candidate for the Presidency of the United States would even think of criticizing our social security system and urge its repeal. It is a part of the fundamental law of our Nation and it will endure forever for the welfare of all Americans.

It is not a mere pension system. Rather, it is a national insurance plan, an old-age and survivors and disability system, not in competition with, but complementary and supplementary to, private insurance plans. The benefits an individual receives from it are rightfully his, not by reason of charity, but by reason of his premiums paid during his economically productive years.

It is partly because of that, Mr. President, that I look with some degree of apprehension on the pending legislative proposal reported by the Committee on Finance. I do not like to have any individual in this country, whether 65 years of age or 68 years of age, when calamity comes into the home, when surgery or hospitalization is necessary, to be obliged to take a means test, or to sign an affidavit as to his need. The thing to do is to place this program under our social security system and to keep that system actuarily sound. It is reported by actuaries of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the system could be kept actuarily sound by increasing the premium by one-fourth of 1 percent each year for employer and employee, and by three-eighths of 1 percent being added to the premium of covered self-employed.

My view is that this is the philosophy which should apply to all medical care for the aged. It should be made an integral part of our social security system. Medical care should be the right of an elderly citizen for which he has paid and provided for in his earlier years. The Federal Government would be doing nothing more than providing the insurance system where private industry cannot do the job adequately. To do otherwise would be to scuttle our concept of social security.

Mr. President, the committee proposal, it seems to me, is fiscally unsound. While it offers little, in some instances no more than $12 a month, it provides no means for raising the revenue for the pitiful additional benefits it offers.

Incidentally, how much medical care will $12 a month bring?

In reality, the pending proposal, while it has many meritorious features, is not the kind of truly national plan I should like to have carry forward our social security system to greater heights, and at the same time continue it on an actuarily sound basis.

First, it relies on action being taken by the individual States before the Federal Government can participate. We would have 50 separate and distinct programs of medical care for the aged if and when all the States adopted some plan or other.

Secondly, the plans would vary from State to State. We are saying to our elderly citizens, who may desperately need surgical care and extended hospital treatment, "If you live in such and such a State, you will receive some help, small though it may be, but if you get sick in another State, then you may not receive any help."

For example, let us assume that the State of Hawaii adopted a program under this act. To a resident of Hawaii we would say, "Since you live in the State of Hawaii, you get such and such an amount." We would say to a person living in a State with a less adequate plan, "Since the general assembly of your State is not as liberal as the State of Hawaii or some of the other States, you will receive a lesser amount." It seems to me to be rather archaic in the space age to adopt this approach toward the health and welfare of our aged.

That part of the bill which provides medical care for the aged, as reported from the Committee on Finance, offers empty promises to some Americans. By innuendo, at least, it refutes the principles on which our social security system is based and detracts from the fundamental American concept of the dignity of the individual.

The distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has introduced an amendment supplementary to the committee proposal which is inestimably more suited to handle this problem. It would make medical care for those 68 and over presently covered by social security a part of our overall social security program. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico would provide increased benefits for hospitalization and for medical care and nursing. It would provide the basic needed benefits; namely, hospitalization up to 120 days, nursing home care up to 240 days, nursing and other health services at home up to 360 days, and outpatient diagnostic service.

These are the benefits which American people need and want. The proposal which comes to us from the Committee on Finance has many meritorious aspects, but I hope that on the floor of the Senate, as we proceed throughout this week, we shall by amendment to the committee bill further improve and expand the benefits which the aged men and women of our country are entitled to receive.

Of course, any proposal we enact, whether it be the committee proposal or the one offered by the Senator from New Mexico, will not be socialistic, despite statements made by a few reactionary members of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, who have wormed themselves into power over the physicians and surgeons of the country, and who maintain a powerful lobby in Washington. Americans enjoy, will continue to enjoy and have, the opportunity to be attended by the doctors of their choice.

Lest anyone think that I, a professional man myself, have any grievance against physicians and surgeons, which of course I do not, I wish always to have physicians and surgeons decide for themselves the right to accept or refuse to attend an individual. For example, if they choose not to go out at night, to be taken from their homes, and compelled to go a great distance to attend a sick person; that should be a matter for the physician or surgeon to decide for himself.

Those who oppose this plan as restrictive are blind to the fact that it helps provide for the future medical and

surgical needs far more in keeping with our American ideals than handouts from the Public Treasury. Private plans are inadequate and the costs are excessive.

Mr. President, there are salutary amendments to the Social Security Act contained in the legislative proposal before us, which I believe will help strengthen our social security system. Notable among them are three in which I have taken a special interest. While I shall hurry along in my remarks today, I may speak briefly on them a little later on, and may have something further to say on other meritorious aspects of the pending legislative proposal.

In the past we have dealt unrealistically and without imagination with the problem of disabled workers.

Disability is no less tragic at 30 than at 50, no less final in destroying the ability to work and earn a decent living. I am happy to see that the present bill eliminates this requirement and provides for benefits to disabled workers covered by social security regardless of age.

This is proper, of course, when a physician attends a worker who has paid his premium into the social security system, whether that worker is 30 years old, 35 years old, or whatever his age may be. If he has paid his premium in a sufficient number of periods to be covered by social security, and if doctors agree that he is permanently and totally disabled, and will never again be able to be gainfully employed, it is wrong to provide that such a disabled person may not receive any retirement benefit until he attains the age of 50, if he lives that long. I am happy that this problem has been taken care of in this proposal.

Then, also, increasing the earnings limitation from $1,200 a year to $1,800 a year is a step in the right direction. Personally, I hope that, perhaps, on the floor of the Senate we may compromise this matter further by increasing the amount from $1,800 to $2,400, at least, to enable many recipients of social security to enjoy greater dignity and comfort and a more decent standard of living. It is really a cruel punishment to deny those who wish to work and adequately supplement their incomes, the right to do so. It was their work and money which built this fund and which has helped to maintain it actuarially sound to this good hour. Of course, it is unrealistic to provide, as the present law does, that if they earn more than $1,200 a year, they cannot receive their retirement benefits.

Another provision would allow men to retire at the age of 62, if they chose to do so. I cannot understand why anyone would so choose. However, if a worker or a self-employed person chooses to retire at age 62, then it appears to me to be sound to permit him to do so and to reduce the benefits accordingly. This is actuarially sound, and is permitted for women today. Here is another forward-looking amendment to the present social security law. I hope it will be adopted.

Apart from medical care for the aged, there is one glaring deficiency, it seems to me, in the committee proposal. In the bill as it came from the House compulsory coverage under the act was extended to physicians and surgeons. The Committee on Finance deleted this provision on the ground that it could not ascertain definitely whether a majority of physicians wished to come under this provision.

It appears to me that there may have been a feeling among some of the members of the Committee on Finance, which I share to an extent—and I am sorry to say I am not a member of that committee, although I hope to be, because I enjoyed very much my service on the House Committee on Ways and Means—that so long as physicians and surgeons of the United States choose to be represented by that small, reactionary group at the top of the American Medical Association, then it serves them right not to be included in the beneficent provisions of the social security program. However, while I may have that thought, I conclude, more properly, that it is not right to punish the physicians and surgeons simply because they are misrepresented at the top. Wherever a referendum has been taken, doctors have expressed a desire to be included within the compulsory coverage of social security.

I am sorry I did not bring it to the Senate Chamber with me today, but I have in my office a large, bulging file containing telegrams and letters I have received from physicians and surgeons living in Ohio, urging me, their public servant in Washington, to try my humble best—and I shall try—to have the physicians and surgeons included within the Social Security Act. Those communications are surprising. The views of those physicians and surgeons are exactly contrary to the views of that little clique which is in charge of the American Medical Association; that little clique whose thinking dates back to pre-William McKinley times, and who are not properly representative of the views of the physicians and surgeons of the Nation.

Ten years ago, after I had been defeated for reelection as Representative at Large, I resumed the practice of law in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio. The Cuyahoga County Bar Association, comprised of some 1,800 members, some years later, honored me by electing me as its president. During that time, it was my privilege to come before the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate. I remember distinctly that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was present a part of the time when I was testifying. I remember also that the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is present in the Chamber today, was present throughout the time I gave testimony. He listened intently to my testimony, although I cannot say that I persuaded him. I believe it was mentioned at that time by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I was the very first president of any bar association in the United States to appear before a committee of Congress and to urge that self-employed lawyers be included under social security; and that had the lawyers of the Nation chosen to appear before the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance in previous years, self-employed lawyers might have been included in the act, together with other self-employed persons, before they actually were.

I do not claim that my effort had anything to do with the result, but the fact is that the view of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and other members of the committee prevailed, and lawyers were, a few months afterward, included under social security.

Because of the reactionary clique at the head of the organization claiming to represent the physicians and surgeons of the United States, it seems to me that physicians and surgeons are the only group of professional men who are not included in social security. It is my hope, that, perhaps, on the floor of the Senate during this week the law may be amended to include them. It would be a rebuke to the clique at the head of the American Medical Association. More than that, it would afford proper recognition of the fact that all self-employed men and women, in any profession or in any line of work, should be included; that our social security system should be made universal and apply to all self-employed persons, in addition to persons who are employees.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Ohio was most gracious in his reference to me.

Permit me to say that while the Senator from Ohio was serving as president of his bar association, he did an outstanding job in educating the lawyers of his State on the benefits available under social security and how the benefits compared to the price to the lawyer.

Prior to that time, most lawyers had not realized that, from an insurance point of view, there was available two, or perhaps four, times as much protection under social security as under private insurance plans. As the Senator from Ohio then pointed out to us on the committee, he saw to it that lawyers were appointed to study both sides, and to conduct a debate, and to show both sides of the argument. I believe the result was that at a meeting attended by a great number of lawyers in his State, the lawyers—including the two who had debated on the side against coverage—voted unanimously in favor of coverage. The Senator from Ohio knows as well as I do that those who had been assigned the duty of collecting the facts against coverage and presenting them and taking that side of the argument would be very likely to realize that the overwhelming argument favored coverage.

The junior Senator from Louisiana was one of those who told the doctors, on occasion, that he would not vote to have them placed under social security unless and until they were prepared to accept it. If and when the doctors of my State or the majority of the doctors of the Nation make it clear that they are

ready for coverage under the social security system, I am prepared to vote for such coverage for them.

But certainly in the past on the committee I have taken the attitude that I was not prepared to vote for coverage for the doctors until they indicated they favored it. I felt it would be better to leave things the way they were until the doctors became sufficiently educated about the matter to take a stand similar to that taken by the lawyers, who have desired coverage under social security—particularly after they better understand the cost as compared to the benefits. I believe that eventually that will be the case insofar as the doctors are concerned; but it will take a little time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Senator from Louisiana in making the statement he has just made.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana certainly manifests great intelligence and an excellent recollection. Attending, as he has, so many meetings of the Senate Finance Committee over the years, and being regarded as one of the hardest working members of that committee, it strikes me as unusual when he recalls the fact that the bar association of which I was president did, indeed, hold a referendum. We held a debate on the subject of whether lawyers should be included within the provisions of the social security system; and following that debate—where the usual arguments were made, such as "state socialism," and "socialized medicine," our association and the lawyers of Ohio did vote overwhelmingly in favor of being covered by the social security system. Approximately 70 or 80 percent of them were in favor of joining the social security system; and the Cuyahoga Bar Association, of which I was then president, voted unanimously to ask the Congress to include self-employed lawyers within the social security system. We were included.

Now, Mr. President, the physicians and surgeons of the country have likewise evidenced, whenever a poll has been taken, their wish to be included. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and I agree that they will be included, regardless of whether they are actually included this year.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, whom I hold in the highest admiration and respect, that I realize full well that he, likewise, wants our social security system to be applied universally—to all employed and all self-employed, regardless of their occupation or profession. I realize that he, too, is insistent that the system remain actuarially sound—as do all thoughtful citizens.

Mr. President, a moment ago I referred to the position now being taken by the American Medical Association in regard to having doctors and surgeons covered by the social security system. Mr. President, it is my belief that this antiquated and reactionary organization does not speak for the great majority of doctors who desire to be included under the act and who have publicly expressed this desire in polls and otherwise. In fact, it speaks only for a small group of willful doctors who have the time to devote to its activities, rather than to practicing medicine.

Mr. President, insofar as amendments to the Social Security Act are concerned, this bill, while not fully satisfactory, is at least an improvement upon existing legislation.

It is my fervent hope that we shall accept the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and thereby have a truly realistic program under a streamlined and up-to-date social security system.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I intended to take on this subject. At this point let me express, finally, my very fervent hope that the Senate, when it votes later in the week, will vote to accept the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is also my hope that we will adopt other amendments which will improve and expand this great system, of which all of us are so proud; and that, as the end result of our efforts during this session of Congress, we shall pass and shall send to the White House a truly realistic act which will provide an up-to-date social security program, actuarially sound. Such a bill will take care of the elderly men and women of the Nation, men and women who no longer are able to be gainfully employed. In particular it will take care of them when the calamity of unexpected, prolonged illness or of hospitalization and surgical care comes into their homes, because, Mr. President, we believe that colossal debt should not be the penalty that American men and women should have to pay when these tragedies occur.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

NEED OF LEGISLATION GIVING SECRETARY OF STATE POWER TO WITHHOLD PASSPORTS TO PERSONS ENGAGED IN COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the past several weeks we have heard quite a bit about the need for the passage of certain pieces of legislation which are deemed in some quarters to be urgent. Nowhere in such lists, however, have I seen any reference to a bill which is now on the Senate Calendar and which has actually been in the urgent category for the past 2 years.

I am referring to Calendar No. 1881, a bill—S. 2652—to strengthen the internal security of the United States. It is difficult to understand, particularly in view of the stepped up war of propaganda and subversion directed against this country by international communism, why there should continue to be any delay in enacting this or similar legislation.

The specific need for legislation of this nature is brought about by a decision of the Supreme Court on June 16, 1958. That decision held that State Department regulations denying passports to Communists or persons assisting the Communist movement were not valid because of the lack of specific legislative authority for them. The purpose of this legislation is to make that authority clear.

S. 2652, which was introduced nearly a year ago by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], contains a provision which I believe is particularly needed in these days of mounting pressures against the free world by the Communist conspiracy. That section would permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons connected with the Communist Party or persons who have engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. There should no longer be any doubt in the mind of anyone what the purpose of the Communist conspiracy is. We need look no farther than Cuba, the Congo, Berlin, and the propaganda trial of one of our citizens in Moscow right now, to see the varied workings of this international plot. This bill would serve as an effective means of reducing the ability of the Communists to carry out their conspiratorial missions, while at the same time it contains adequate safeguards to prevent the reckless administration of such power.

Last year the House of Representatives, for the second time since the 1958 Supreme Court decision, passed a bill (H.R. 9069) which is perhaps not as broad as the Senate bill. It does, however, accomplish essentially the same purpose in affirming the right of the Secretary of State to withhold passports from persons engaged in Communist activities. The House bill—passed in the House of Representatives on September 8, 1959—came over to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it remains. I sincerely regret that the committee, of which I am a member, has not seen fit to act on this most important piece of legislation.

As I mentioned earlier, however, we do have on the Senate Calendar the Keating-Dodd bill, which was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 30, 1960. It is a bill that should be promptly placed on this list of "must" legislation and brought before the Senate for action.

Last Monday the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] made an excellent presentation on this floor in favor of such legislation. At that time he inserted in the RECORD an analysis of the bill, a summary of congressional activity in this field since the 1958 Supreme Court decision regarding passport

powers of the Secretary of State, and a statement which outlines very clearly the urgent necessity for passage of S. 2652. These matters appear on pages 16414–16416 of the RECORD of August 15, 1960.

Mr. President, it seems completely inconceivable to me that we should allow to continue a situation wherein the most bitter enemies of this country and our democratic institutions are given this Government's blessing to conduct their dirty business under the protective shield of a U.S. passport. No one is naive enough to presume that the passage of this legislation will eliminate the Communist threat to our country. But it will make it more difficult for the Communists and their agents to go about their business of subversion, espionage, and spying.

If there is any legislation this Nation really needs from this session of Congress, it is this.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as has been stated, on June 16, 1958, the U.S. Supreme Court passed on the State Department regulations denying passports to Communists.

Only a few days later, on July 7, after the decision was printed and the matter researched, the President of the United States delivered a message to the Congress. His request was followed by the introduction on the ensuing day of a bill by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], then a Member of the House.

More than 2 years have elapsed. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we have not enacted this or similar legislation.

As the Senator from Delaware has said, Senate bill 2652, which was introduced nearly a year ago, contains a section which would permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons suspected of sympathizing with the Communist movement. I think all of us are agreed that there is now no question about the extent of Communist activity. Cuba, the Congo, and what is happening in the Berlin area are examples of the inroads which have been made.

The House last year passed for the second time a bill which empowers the Secretary to withhold passports from persons engaged in communistic operations. That bill, H.R. 9069, came to the Senate; but if my memory serves me correctly, the bill is still in the Foreign Relations Committee.

But the Keating-Dodd bill, S. 2652, was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee last June 30. In my opinion, this bill constitutes "must" legislation for this session of the Congress. Certainly we should do everything possible to hinder agents of the Soviet Government in the conduct of its subversive and espionage activities in this country.

That bill will go a long way toward doing it, and I am hopeful that the measure can be passed during this session of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on August 15, my distinguished senior colleague, Senator HRUSKA, spoke to the Senate with expert knowledge on the necessity for enacting, during the current session, S. 2652, a bill giving to the Department of State effective control over passports which are now being issued to known Communists and Communist supporters. His profound effort in this matter, as a very able member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, eminently qualifies him to serve notice on this body that we must act, that we must act now. Demands for the enactment of this bill are not partisan. They have been made by deeply concerned colleagues on both sides of the aisle. These Senators are keenly aware, as am I, that a gaping hole in our dike of defense needs to be plugged at once—failure to act finds us grievously derelict.

We know that, since 1958, repeated efforts have been made to correct this abasement of a great American privilege. Members of both parties have introduced legislation for correction and have diligently sought enactment. The President has repeatedly asked the Congress to take action. Excuses for inaction will not be palatable at home if we leave here and, by inaction, sign a death warrant to S. 2652.

Are we so naive to believe that travelers from behind the Iron Curtain have unlimited access to Soviet passports? Can we not accept the fact that Soviet administrators will let no one but the most hardened and seasoned Communists travel West? Have we not witnessed, repeatedly, accounts of tight surveillance over Soviet diplomatic personnel by secret police because of the psychotic fear of defection, of importing knowledge of Russian activities? Yet, blithely, we permit hundreds of Communists and their kindred spirits to trek to Moscow and report on matters most vital to our defense and our security. If any of us feel it necessary to offer an apology to Khrushchev for some American deed, is this not more logical than some which have been suggested?

Veterans of Nebraska—veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea have asked this Congress to tone down the politics of this session long enough to send S. 2652 to the President. I urge the leadership of this body to heed their call. Let us take this opportunity, at this session, to make a move which all Americans will applaud.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I certainly hope the majority leader will have time to schedule this bill for action and I join with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and others in urging its immediate approval.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12580, the social security amendments of 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is there pending any amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this bill has been fully debated. This is the second day it has been under consideration. If no Senator wishes to offer an amendment, I am wondering why we cannot proceed to the disposition of this bill by having the third reading.

We hear rumors that some Senators who had amendments printed may have decided not to offer those amendments. Some of these amendments that are at the desk have been submitted by Senators on both sides of the aisle; but if there is no disposition on the part of their sponsors to offer them I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Delaware has said. There is no other Democrat on the floor at present. I find myself in the somewhat embarrassing position of perhaps having to suggest the absence of a quorum, although it seems to me Senators who wish to offer amendments in the nature of a substitute ought to offer them, and if they are opposed to the bill, they ought to be on the floor to speak in opposition or to offer amendments.

After I suggest the absence of a quorum, I do hope we may insist that Senators who wish to offer substitutes either speak or discuss their substitutes or vote. I am ready to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hear rumors around the cloakroom that some Senators are thinking seriously of not offering these amendments that have been proposed. Perhaps they would rather vote for the bill as it was reported by the committee, which, frankly, I think should be done.

I feel very strongly that if Senators who have proposed these amendments are not interested enough to be on the floor, and present them they should not delay the Senate.

I renew my request to have the third reading of the bill and proceed to a vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I find myself very much in sympathy with the position the Senator from Delaware has taken, but I believe we should perhaps offer some opportunity to Senators who want to offer amendments or substitutes, or to oppose the bill, to be present. So 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 (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to H.R. 12580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] proposes an amendment identified as "8–17–60—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to have his amendment read in full or printed in the RECORD?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

MEDICAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

SEC. 604. (a) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after section 225 the following new section:

"MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

"Entitlement to benefits

"SEC. 226. (a) (1) Every individual who—

"(A) has attained the age of sixty-eight, and

"(B) is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under section 202,

shall be entitled to have payment made under this section on his behalf for inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, home health services, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services, furnished in the United States on or after whichever of the following days is the latest: (i) the first day of the month in which he attains the age of sixty-eight, (ii) the first day of the first month for which he becomes entitled to benefits under section 202, (iii) in the case of inpatient hospital services July 1, 1961, or (iv) in the case of all other services, January 1, 1962.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be deemed entitled to monthly benefits under section 202 for the month in which he died if he would have been entitled to such monthly benefits for such month had he not died in such month.

"Limitations on payment for services

"(b) (1) Payment for services furnished an individual may be made only in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) and only if—

"(A) written request is filed for such payment in such form, in such manner, within such time, and by such person as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, and

"(B) such services are furnished after referral by a physician who certifies in writing (and recertifies, where such services are furnished over a period of time, in such cases and with such frequency as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe) that such services (other than outpatient hospital diagnostic services) are or were required for his medical treatment or that in the case of outpatient hospital diagnostic services, such services are or were required for diagnostic study; except that such referral shall not be required for inpatient hospital services in case of an emergency which makes such referral impracticable.

"(C) with respect to inpatient hospital services for a continuous period in excess of thirty days, such services are furnished after the need for continued hospitalization has, in such cases and at such intervals as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, been reviewed by a hospital committee that includes two or more physicians.

"(2) Payment for inpatient hospital services furnished an individual during any benefit period shall be reduced (but not below zero) by a deduction equal to $75.

"(3) Payment under this section for services furnished an individual during a benefit period may not be made for any inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, or home health services after one hundred and eighty units of services have been furnished to him in any such period. For the purpose of this paragraph a unit of service shall be equal to each day on which inpatient hospital services are furnished to him, each two days on which skilled nursing home services are furnished to him, or each three visits during which home health services are furnished to him. Nor may payment under this section for services furnished any individual during a benefit period be made for—

"(A) inpatient hospital services furnished to him during such period after such services have been furnished him on one hundred and twenty days during such period;

"(B) skilled nursing home services furnished to him during such period after such services have been furnished him on two hundred and forty days after transfer from a hospital;

"(C) home health services furnished to him during such period after such services have been furnished to him during three hundred and sixty-five visits in such period.

"(4) For purposes of this section, a 'benefit period' with respect to an individual means a period—

"(A) beginning with the first day (not included in a previous benefit period) in which such individual both is furnished any of the following services: inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, home health services, or outpatient hospital diagnostic services and is entitled to have payment made under this section with respect thereto, and

"(B) ending with the three hundred and sixty-fourth day following such first day.

"Review of determinations

"(c) Any individual (other than a provider of services) dissatisfied with any determination made by the Secretary as to whether he is entitled to have payment made under this section for services furnished him, or as to the amount of such payment, shall be entitled to a hearing thereon by the Secretary to the same extent as is provided in section 205(b) with respect to decisions of the Secretary, and to judicial review of the Secretary's final decision after such hearing as is provided in section 205(g).

"Description of medical insurance benefits

"(d) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) The term 'inpatient hospital services' means the following items furnished to a hospital inpatient: bed and board in the hospital in semiprivate accommodations unless they are unavailable, or other accommodations are required for medical reasons, or other accommodations not more expensive than semiprivate are occupied at his request; and such nursing, and other services, such use of hospital facilities, and such drugs, supplies, and appliances, as are customarily furnished by the hospital for the care and treatment of inpatients while in the hospital; including ambulance services medically required, whether or not furnished by the hospital; and including laboratory, diagnostic X-ray, anesthesiology, physiotherapy, and other ancillary services which are customarily furnished to inpatients either by the hospital or by another person under agreement with the hospital; but excluding clinical medical and surgical services except those rendered in the course of an approved program of medical teaching;

"(2) The term 'skilled nursing home services' means the following items furnished to an inpatient by a skilled nursing facility after transfer from a hospital and which are certified by a physician as being required in connection with the condition or conditions for which he was hospitalized; (A) skilled nursing care provided by a registered professional nurse or a licensed practical nurse; (B) such medical and other services as are generally provided by skilled nursing home facilities; and (C) bed and board in connection with the furnishing of such skilled nursing care;

"(3) The term 'home health services' means (A) professional nursing care by a registered professional nurse or a licensed practical nurse in a place of residence maintained as an individual's home, prescribed by a physician and provided through a visiting nursing agency; and (B) part-time homemaker services physical and occupational therapy, medical social services, dietary counseling, ambulance service and similar allied services in an individual's home, prescribed by a physician and provided through a homemaker service agency.

"(4) The term 'outpatient hospital diagnostic services' means diagnostic X-ray and laboratory services, and such other services, drugs, and supplies as are generally provided by hospitals to outpatients for the purpose of diagnostic study;

"(5) The term 'hospital' means an institution which (A) is operated in accordance with the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is located pertaining to such facility and in accordance with standards established by the authorities responsible for such standards in such jurisdiction; (B) is primarily engaged in providing diagnostic and therapeutic facilities for surgical and medical diagnosis, treatment, and care of injured and sick persons by or under the supervision of physicians or surgeons; (C) maintains adequate medical records; and (D) continuously provides twenty-four-hour nursing service rendered or supervised by registered graduate nurses. The term 'hospital' shall not include a tuberculosis or mental hospital;

"(6) The term 'skilled nursing facility' means a facility which (A) is operated to provide skilled nursing services in accordance with the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is located pertaining to such facility and in accordance with standards established by the authorities responsible for such standards in such jurisdiction; (B) has beds for the care of patients who require continuing planned medical and nursing care; (C) is under the continuous supervision of a registered nurse or physician; (D) is operated in connection with a hospital or has medical policies established by one or more physicians (who are responsible for the execution of such policies) to govern the skilled nursing care and related medical care and other services which it provides; (E) maintains adequate medical records; and (F) continuously provides twenty-four-hour nursing service by registered graduate nurses or licensed practical nurses;

"(7) The term 'visiting nurse agency' means a public or other nonprofit agency operated in accordance with medical policies which are established by one or more physicians (who are responsible for supervising the execution of such policies) and which govern the visiting nurse services it provides;

"(8) The term 'homemaker service agency' means a public or other nonprofit agency that employs personnel to furnish home help services to convalescent, or acutely or chronically ill, aged persons; and

"(9) The term 'physician' means an individual (including a physician within the meaning of section 1101(a)(7)) licensed to practice surgery or medicine by the State in which he provides surgical or medical services.

"Agreements with providers of services

"(e) (1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, at the request of any hospital, skilled nursing facility, visiting nurse agency, or homemaker service agency (hereinafter and in subsection (c) referred to as a 'provider of services'), enter into an agreement with such hospital, facility, or

agency for payment for services furnished to individuals entitled to have such payment made under this section. Each such agreement shall contain such provisions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, as may be mutually agreed to by the Secretary and such provider of services.

"(2) Any agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide that—

"(A) the provider of services will not charge any individual (or any other person) for services for which such individual is entitled to have payment made under this section, and will make adequate provision for return of any moneys incorrectly collected from such individual or other person;

"(B) the Secretary will pay to any provider of services the reasonable cost of services specified in subparagraph (A) (less the deductions provided for in subsection (b)(2), but only if the provider of services furnishes such information at such time and in such form as the Secretary may by regulation require; the Secretary shall determine such reasonable costs and in making such determinations is authorized to use such method or methods of estimating as he may by regulation prescribe;

"(C) no payment will be made to any provider of services for any service which such provider is obligated by a law of, or a contract with, the United States to render at public expense;

"(D) where a provider of services furnishes to an individual at his request services which are described in subsection (d), and are in excess of or more expensive than that usually encompassed by the service so described, the Secretary shall pay to such provider of services only the equivalent of the reasonable cost of the service usually so encompassed and that the provider of services may charge such individual for any additional cost of the service furnished at such request; and

"(E) such agreement may be terminated by (i) the provider of services at such time and upon such notice to the Secretary and to the public as the Secretary may specify by regulations and (ii) the Secretary at such time and upon such notice to the provider of services as may be specified by regulations, but only after the Secretary has determined that such provider of services is not complying substantially with the provisions of such agreement or that such provider no longer substantially meets the provisions of subsection (d) and has notified such provider of such determination.

"(3) Nothing in this section shall—

"(A) preclude the Secretary from making payment for the reasonable cost of services furnished to an individual eligible to receive such services by any hospital which is not a party to an agreement under this subsection but only if (i) such services were emergency services and (ii) the Secretary would be authorized to pay for such services had the Secretary and such hospital entered into an agreement under this section;

"(B) preclude providers of services to be represented by an individual, association, or organization authorized by such provider of services to act on its behalf;

"(C) be construed to give the Secretary supervision or control over the practice of medicine, the manner in which medical services are provided, or over the administration or operation, the selection, tenure, or compensation of personnel of any hospital, skilled nursing home, visiting nurse agency, or homemaker service agency which has entered into an agreement under this section.

"(4) Where an agreement under this section between a provider of services and the Secretary has been terminated, the Secretary may, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, enter into another agreement under this section with such provider but only if such provider conforms to the standards set forth in subsection (c) and the Secretary determines that another agreement with such provider will effectuate the purposes of this section.

"(5) The Secretary shall from time to time determine the amount to be paid to each provider of services under an agreement with respect to the services furnished and shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, except that such amount may be reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that the amount paid to such provider of services for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment from the medical insurance account, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary, in accordance with such certification.

"FREE CHOICE BY PATIENT

"(f) Any individual entitled to have payment made under this section for services furnished him may obtain inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, home health services, or outpatient hospital diagnostic services from any provider of services which has entered into an agreement with the Secretary and which admits such individual or undertakes to provide him services.

"MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS ADVISORY COUNCIL

"(g) For the purpose of advising the Secretary in the formulation of policy and the promulgation of regulations in connection with the administration of this section, there is hereby created a Medical Insurance Benefits Advisory Council which shall consist of a chairman and twelve appointed members to be appointed by the Secretary, after February 1, 1961, and before April 1, 1961. The chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary. Not less than four of the appointed members shall be representatives of the general public, and the remainder of the appointed members shall be persons who are outstanding in the fields pertaining to hospitals and health activities. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as described by the Secretary at the time of appointment, three at the end of the first year, three at the end of the second year, three at the end of the third year, and three at the end of the fourth year after the date of appointment. An appointed member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served immediately preceding his reappointment. The advisory council is authorized to appoint such special advisory and technical committees as may be useful in carrying out its functions. Appointed members of the advisory council and members of its advisory or technical committees, while serving on business of the advisory council, shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and for subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The advisory council shall meet as frequently as the Secretary deems necessary. Upon request of four or more members, it shall be the duty of the Secretary to call a meeting of the advisory council.

"RULEMAKING POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

"(h) The Secretary shall have the power and authority to make rules and regulations and to establish procedures, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, which are necessary or appropriate to carry out such provisions, and shall adopt reasonable rules and regulations to regulate and provide for the nature and extent of the proofs and evidence and the method of taking and furnishing the same in order to establish the right of individuals to medical insurance benefits hereunder. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of appropriate public or private agencies in obtaining information to assist him in performing his functions under this section."

MEDICAL INSURANCE ACCOUNT

(b)(1) Section 201 of the Social Security Act is amended by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) as (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), and (j), respectively.

(2) Section 201 of such Act is further amended by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) There is hereby created in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund an account to be known as the medical insurance account. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of moneys appropriated to the trust fund pursuant to subsection (a), there shall be credited from time to time to the medical insurance account in such trust fund, amounts equal to the sum of—

"(1) the amounts determined by multiplying one-half of 1 per centum by the amounts of wages (as certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of paragraph (3) of subsection (a)) paid after December 31, 1960, and

"(2) the amounts determined by multiplying three-eights of 1 per centum by the amounts of self-employment income (as certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of paragraph (4) of subsection (a)) for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1960."

(3) Subsection (c) (redesignated as (d) by paragraph (1) of this subsection) of section 201 of such Act is amended by inserting after "Trust funds" in paragraph (2) the following: "(including the operation and status of the medical insurance account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund)"; by inserting "(including the amounts credited to the medical insurance account)" after "Trust funds" in paragraph (3) as amended by section 701(b) of this Act; by inserting "(including the amounts credited to and the charges made against the medical insurance account)" after "Trust funds" the first time it appears in the penultimate sentence of such subsection; by inserting "(including the future amounts to be credited to and the future charges to be made against the medical insurance account)" after "Trust funds" the second time it appears in such sentence; and by inserting "(including the medical insurance account)" after "Trust funds" the third time it appears in such sentence.

(4) Section 201 of such Act is further amended by adding after subsection (f) (redesignated as (g) by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) After the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the average of the amounts in the medical insurance account during such year for purposes of determining the amount of interest that should be credited to such account from the interest that was credited to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund during such fiscal year. There shall be credited to the account from the amounts appropriated to the Federal Old-age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund an amount for interest which is in the same ratio to the interest credited to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund for such fiscal year as the average of the amounts in the medical insurance account during such fiscal year is to the average of

the amounts in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund during such fiscal year.

"(2) The proper share of the proceeds from the sale or redemption of any obligations in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which are credited to such trust fund shall be credited to the medical insurance account."

(5) Subsection (g) (redesignated as (i) by paragraph (1) of this subsection) of section 201 of such Act is amended by striking out the last two sentences of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "After the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall analyze the costs of administration of this title incurred during such fiscal year in order to determine the portion of such costs which should be borne by each of the trust funds (including the cost which should be charged against the medical insurance account) and shall certify to the managing trustee the amount, if any, which should be transferred from one to the other of such trust funds (including the amount that should be charged in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund against the medical insurance account) in order to insure that each of the trust funds (including such account) has borne or has been charged with, as the case may be, its proper share of the costs of administration of this title incurred during such fiscal year. The managing trustee is authorized and directed to transfer any such amount from one to the other of such trust funds in accordance with any certification so made."

(6) Subsection (g) (redesignated as (i) by paragraph (1) of this subsection) of section 201 of such Act is further amended by inserting immediately preceding the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following: "; from the payment made from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund the Medical Insurance Account shall be charged with such amounts as the managing trustee determines as necessary for such account to bear a proper share of such payments."

(7) Subsection (h) (redesignated as (j) by paragraph (1) of this subsection) of section 201 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately preceding the period at the end thereof the following: "and in the case of payments required to be made under section 226, such payments shall be charged against the funds credited to the Medical Insurance Account."

AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954: CHANGES IN TAX SCHEDULES, SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME TAX

SEC. 605. (a) Section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1401. RATE OF TAX.

"In addition to other taxes, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax as follows—

"(1) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1959, and before January 1, 1961, the tax shall be equal to 4½ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1960, and before January 1, 1963, the tax shall be equal to 4⅞ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(3) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962, and before January 1, 1966, the tax shall be equal to 5⅝ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1965, and before January 1, 1969, the tax shall be equal to 6⅜ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year; and

"(5) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, the tax shall be equal to 7⅛ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

TAX ON EMPLOYEES

(b) Section 3101 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3101. RATE OF TAX.

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 312(a)) received by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))—

"(1) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1960, the rate shall be 3 percent;

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1961 and 1962, the rate shall be 3¼ percent;

"(3) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3¾ percent;

"(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1966 to 1968, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4¼ percent; and

"(5) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1968, the rate shall be 4¾ percent."

TAX ON EMPLOYERS

(c) Section 3111 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3111. RATE OF TAX.

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))—

"(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1960, the rate shall be 3 percent;

"(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1961 and 1962, the rate shall be 3¼ percent;

"(3) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3¾ percent;

"(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1966 to 1968, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4¼ percent; and

"(5) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1968, the rate shall be 4¾ percent."

STUDIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SEC. 606. (a) Section 702 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "702"; by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In connection with such study and recommendations, the Secretary shall institute and conduct appropriate demonstration programs relating to the health needs of such individuals and the manner and means by which such needs may be fulfilled. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the carrying on of such research studies pertaining to health care and the administration of such care as may be recommended by the advisory council designated pursuant to section 226(g). Such research studies may be carried on directly by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by others under contract negotiated for, or grants made by the Secretary, for such purpose."

(b) The Secretary shall carry on studies and develop recommendations to be submitted to the Congress not later than January 15, 1963, relating to (1) the adequacy of existing facilities for health care of the aged; (2) methods for encouraging the further development of efficient and economical forms of health care for the aged which are a constructive alternative to inpatient hospital care; (3) the feasibility of adding supplementary types of medical insurance benefits for the aged within the financial resources provided by this Act; and (4) the effects of the initial deductible of $75 upon beneficiaries, hospitals, and the financing of the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the amendment is the one which I discussed at some length on Saturday afternoon. Very few Senators were present at that time. I do not intend to repeat at any great length what I said then, but I again wish to remark that the amendment is offered as an addition to the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee. It is not a substitute for any of the amendments presented by the Senate Finance Committee or any of the provisions contained in the bill, but instead it establishes a fully financed social insurance program on a contributory basis.

I listed in the RECORD of Saturday the numbers of people who might be involved in this plan in the various States, showing that in New York State, for example, more than 1 million people would be covered under the amendment, that in Illinois approximately 550,000 people would be covered, and that in other States there would be correspondingly large numbers.

I was happy to point out that it involves some very essential services. It would reduce the number of hospital days permitted by the original amendment from 365 to 120. It proposes to cut out the second $75 contribution in a year, and that change would make possible the addition of some other services. In-hospital services are made available. Skilled nursing home services would be available up to 240 days in 1 benefit year. Home health services, which would involve nursing and other home nursing services, would be permitted up to 360 visits within the benefit year.

Finally, as a fourth provision, outpatient, diagnostic hospital services would be provided.

One of the points which I had hoped Senators would remember is that we had the problem with reference to disability. We had a report from an advisory committee suggesting that we adopt disability on a pay-as-you-go basis with contributions.

Congress decided that was not the wise course and adopted another program in 1950. But by the year 1956 Congress saw that was not the wise course, and it put disability on a pay-as-you-go basis for the establishment of a fund. The very same principle which motivated the Senate Finance Committee to take that action in 1956 should have moved the Senate Finance Committee to take a comparable action with reference to medical care in 1960. I wish that the same voices might have been raised in support of the program now as were raised in 1956. It is true that we do not easily adopt measures of this type. It is true that in 1956 we had to have long,

long conferences of the majority members of the Senate Finance Committee, and those conferences were held.

I referred on Saturday afternoon to the fact that a caucus was held in the office of the Secretary of the Senate in which the principle embodied in the amendment was considered for a long time, and it was finally agreed that the committee would bring forth a bill containing a provision for contributions.

That same wise procedure, it seems to me, might have been followed in this regard and it might not require the intervening, intermediate steps of trying to take the required money out of the Federal Treasury first, and then some years later come back and do the same thing we did with respect to disability, namely, to put the program on a pay-as-you-go basis.

If we were to follow the principle we learned on the subject of disability, we would have that type of bill from the Finance Committee at this time, I am sure.

It is true that the proposed program will cost some money. There are no bargain days or bargain basements or special discount stores in this field of health. We cannot get a satisfactory program for $130 million. It will cost at least $700 million the first year, and eventually $1 billion.

That is why we have tried to say we might as well face the problem now instead of waiting several years and then saying the program is too much of a burden on the Treasury, and that we must put it on a pay-as-you-go basis. The amendment which has been introduced on behalf of the Senators stated will provide for payment of one-quarter percent by both employer and employee. These payments will provide a surplus the first year of 1961 of perhaps $300 million, and start off a separate fund, as was so wisely done in 1956 on the previous program relating to injuries.

I hope that the Senate will spend some time on the amendment. I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], when he arrives, will have a substitute for the amendment which he desires to present. I hope we may have some discussion of it throughout the day.

I also hope that we may reach a prompt vote. But I do know that the program which was laid down relies upon the social security program as a first line of defense, and public assistance as a first line of defense, and public assistance as a second line of defense. If the amendment is not adopted, we have in the bill before us only a second line of defense, and we shall have omitted the first line of defense that we think should be included.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been discussing the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, and the question arose as to whether, if the holder of a social security card was earning, we will say, $10,000 or $12,000 a year, but was otherwise qualified for benefits under the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, he would be disqualified because of his earnings. Could he still earn any amount and qualify for benefits, or is there a limitation on earnings involved in the amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a limitation on earnings involved in the tax, but there is no provision in the bill which requires that if a man earns $1,000, another $2,000, and another $3,000, and still a fourth man earns $10,000, the man earning $10,000 must be separated from the others. A man who earns $500,000 as head of a great corporation is covered for social security benefits now, even though he may be drawing that large salary.

Mr. AIKEN. Up to the amount of $4,800.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Payments are deducted from his earnings on the basis of $4,800. He is not protected beyond $4,800. The tax is on only $4,800 of his pay.

Mr. AIKEN. If he had a social security card, but even after the age of 68 he was earning $10,000, $15,000, or $20,000 a year, would he still qualify for the health benefits under the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely.

Mr. AIKEN. Then earnings under the amendment make no difference.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no means test involved in the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no means test. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no means test, because we learned very quickly in the disability program that the means test was not a satisfactory test, and we did not put the program on the basis of means. As I tried to point out the other day, we have learned by long experience how some of the past programs have worked. I remarked on Saturday that I had been administrator under the FERA, SERA, CWA, and the WPA, and under the National Youth Administration. We learned in those early 1930's that a program started as a public assistance program is thereafter proposed on a pay-as-you-go basis. We adopted a social security program. We can still have various types of assistance which will constitute a second line of defense, but the primary line that must be depended upon is the payroll tax.

We have followed that principle consistently in every step we have taken. Even when we wavered from it, as we did in connection with disability, we soon came back to it. In other words, we can dodge around it for awhile, but we have to come back to it eventually. It is the identical experience we had with aid to children and aid to the blind, and so forth.

Mr. AIKEN. If a man earns $10,000 or $15,000 a year, and is 68 years of age, and not entitled to social security benefits, is it true that he would not qualify under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. He would be barred, unless he is entitled to social security benefits. He may be entitled to benefits and still not receive cash payments because of the earnings limitation. But he is still covered under my amendment.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I can use $10,000 as an example, or I can use $4,000, if that suits the situation better. If a man has never had social security, would he qualify under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. He would not qualify if he has not gained entitlement to social security benefits.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. To qualify for benefits under the Senator's amendment it would be necessary to be entitled to benefits under section 202, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Section 202 benefits are not payable if the person has an income of $1,200 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. A person may earn up to $1,200 a year under present law without suffering any reduction in retirement benefits. If H.R. 12580 is passed that limitation will be $1,800. Benefits are not stopped, but only proportionately reduced.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes. So that a person getting over $1,800 a year, under the amendment, or over $1,200, as now, would not receive any benefits.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; that is not correct. The important point I was trying to bring out is that we do not single out individuals. We put them in the social security system. If they are entitled to benefits under social security they will be covered regardless of the income limitation with reference to retirement payments.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. We are trying to clarify what the bill does.

Mr. AIKEN. I was trying to find out what it does.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I would be happy if the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Vermont would give me their attention, because I should like to ask some questions along the line of their inquiries of the Senator from New Mexico. When would the Senator's amendment become effective?

Mr. ANDERSON. On January 1, 1961.

Mr. KERR. I thought there was a date in the amendment of July 1, 1961, and another date of January 1, 1962.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, we did some revising, but I do not believe we changed those dates.

The tax becomes effective on January 1, 1961.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will examine his amendment, I am sure he will find that the tax becomes effective January 1, 1961, but I do not believe the benefits become effective until July 1, 1961, or January 1, 1962.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am looking at section 604:

> The first day of the month in which he attains the age of sixty-eight; the first day of the first month for which he becomes entitled to benefits under section 202; in the case of inpatient hospital services July 1, 1961, or in the case of all other services, January 1, 1962.

Mr. KERR. That is, insofar as hospital services are concerned, benefits would become effective July 1, 1961, and all other services not until January 1, 1962.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. KERR. With reference to the application of the law, no one not under social security would benefit by the Senator's amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. I believe the provisions of the House bill as amended by the Senate committee would take care of the other people.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but I am talking about the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KERR. With reference to those who are eligible, that is, if they are on social security and 68 years of age, they would be eligible for the benefits of the Senator's amendment whether their income was $1,500 a year, $900 a year, or $100,000 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what I said to the Senator from Vermont, and I believe that is a correct statement. There is no limitation in the amendment dependent on a man's earnings.

Mr. KERR. That is correct, and that is as I understand the Senator's amendment. I am not criticizing it; I am trying to get into the RECORD what it would do. It would make anyone on social security, over 68 years of age, eligible for its benefits, regardless of how much the person earned; but no one not on social security would be eligible for the benefits, regardless of how little he earned.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right, because they have made no contribution to the fund. This is a separate fund we are speaking about for social security individuals.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that anyone who had social security credit would be eligible for benefit, even if he had an income of $100,000, but if he were actually earning over $1,800 would he not be disqualified?

Mr. KERR. He would not be eligible for cash benefits, but would be for hospital benefits, provided he were over age 68.

Mr. AIKEN. He would get the benefits regardless of income, but there would be some limitation based on earnings.

Mr. KERR. The limitation that applies is with reference to cash payments, but not with reference to benefits for hospital and doctor care, as I understand the amendment. The Senator from New Mexico said that the amendment was similar to the program we put into effect for the disabled.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KERR. To whom were the benefits available under the disability amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Oklahoma ought to know about it. He had a great deal to do with the writing of it.

Mr. KERR. Yes; I had a great deal to do with it. If the Senator will permit me to refresh his memory, I will ask him if it is not a fact that under the disability amendment the benefits were available only to those who made themselves eligible with a certain amount of personal contribution to the fund.

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to me we started with one type of fund, in 1950, and there was some money available in it.

Mr. KERR. When did we adopt the disability amendment which would make benefits available to a worker 50 years of age or older who may become disabled?

Mr. ANDERSON. In 1956.

Mr. KERR. That is my recollection.

Mr. ANDERSON. We had enacted a provision previously, in 1950.

Mr. KERR. I thought the Senator's remarks were addressed to the provision we adopted in 1956.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right. We started with a program in 1950. Then subsequently we changed it in 1956, by adding a payroll tax. We put it on a payroll tax basis.

Mr. KERR. With limited benefits to those who qualified as workers, and who had made a contribution to the social security fund themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON. Because we had a previous fund with money in it.

Mr. KERR. The 1956 amendment, which the Senator said was similar in principle, did not make provision for anyone disabled who did not qualify for the benefits by having a certain number of quarters of contribution to the OASI fund.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall not argue that question. I simply say that when we reached the item of disability, we recognized that the same pay-as-you-go principle had to be adopted which we are trying to adopt here.

Mr. KERR. We adopted a pay-as-you-go principle, and we adopted a program for the disabled, but we did not make the benefits available to millions of people who had made no contribution to the social security fund.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this case, we will take care of a few people who are past the age of 68 and who are making no contributions today. All the people under 68 will be making a contribution. I believe the number who will have made no contribution is less than 500,000.

Mr. KERR. All under 68 will make a contribution, or all under 65?

Mr. ANDERSON. All under 65.

Mr. KERR. In other words, as of now, or as of the effective date of the Senator's amendment, the benefits which would be provided beyond the effective date, which would be July 1, 1961, with reference to hospital benefits, and January 1, 1962, with reference to all other benefits, apply not simply to those making contributions to the fund, but among the people who would be eligible on the effective dates of the Senator's amendment would be those who had made no contribution to the medical care fund.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think some persons who will benefit under the Senator's amendment, which is already in the bill, will have made no contribution.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to discuss that point. I am trying to identify the provisions of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely because they were below 65. If we are to take care of the aged, we have to take care of the aged on an even basis.

Mr. KERR. That is what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks; and that is the reason he offered his amendment.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I had intended to yield the floor, but I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The bill which the committee reported provides only for those in States which provide matching funds, and who later go to the welfare office and successfully claim they are poverty stricken.

Mr. ANDERSON. Who say that they are medically indigent.

Mr. GORE. What does "medically indigent" mean?

Mr. ANDERSON. It means a man can pay his board; that he can have money for the movies; but that he cannot pay the hospital. I say that is a brand-new type of indigency in this country, one which I think will become completely unsatisfactory to the people. It puts a means test on people who have means. It puts a property test on people who have property. They may have property, but they can go to the welfare office and say, "But I can't go to a hospital. I can't pay my hospital bills. I can't have nursing home care later on. Therefore, I am a pauper medically. But I am not a pauper from the standpoint of income."

I do not understand how one would feel who said, "I am medically indigent, but I am perfectly able to pay all the rest of my bills."

Mr. GORE. Did I hear the amendment which the able Senator from New Mexico has offered, and of which I am a cosponsor, criticized because it would provide benefits to those who have paid into the social security fund, but who have not paid a tax which has not been levied, on the ground that somebody was getting something for nothing? Was the Senator's amendment criticized on that basis?

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely. That, of course, is the situation that obtained with all the rest of the bill, in the amendment of the Committee on Finance, which has been adopted. It is right to do it if it is done in the committee's bill; it is wrong if we do it in this amendment.

Mr. GORE. There is a big difference, though. In the case of the Senator's amendment, a person who has paid into the social security fund would become eligible for this additional category of benefits which would be added to the social security program. That benefit would be by right, and an old person would not be subject to humiliation, if he asserted his poverty.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator. I only say—and it is true—that for a short period of time a few persons who have not contributed will be getting money from the fund. But that happened in the beginning of the Social Security Act. People drew unemployment compensation when they had made very trifling payments into the fund.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from New Mexico say that when the Social

Security Act was made effective, it was available to no one who had not earned at least six quarters' compensation?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I say that people who had made trifling contributions to the fund nevertheless received unemployment compensation. I stand on that statement. Does the Senator from Oklahoma contradict it?

Mr. KERR. No; but that is the point which the Senator from Oklahoma makes. Under the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, millions of people would be entitled to draw from the social security medical program who had made no contributions to the social security medical care fund.

Mr. GORE. But they will have made contributions to the fund, and the amendment would add an additional category of benefits to which they would be entitled.

Mr. ANDERSON. They have made a contribution previously. They have met the qualifications. The fund now has over $20 billion in it. This proposal might take $1 million or $2 million out of it. At least, it would not go broke.

If the system for paying interest were changed from the one we have, it would be possible to pick up a good many million dollars. Money is credited to the social security fund on the 1st and 15th of each month. Interest is lost all the rest of the time.

I received a figure the other day in the amount of $25 million. That is probably all the money which may be taken in the first year of this proposal. It is perfectly all right to chisel the fund of $20 million for one particular purpose, but it is awful to take a few million dollars to pay persons who had reached the age of 68, and who, as a matter of fact, wanted and needed some medical care.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one further time? Then I shall desist.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. This amendment provides social insurance. It is security based on the mass contribution of the people. It is security based upon actuarial soundness. I ask the Senator: Does not the amendment meet the test, based on the contributions and the benefits, of actuarial soundness?

Mr. ANDERSON. Completely. It will take a half percent to do this. The first year it will probably take only $700 million, and the fund will collect $1 billion. It will get a little cushion, a nest egg, which will take care of such people as we are talking about. Thereafter, year after year, the money will be collected by a payroll tax. This proposal is actuarially sound. No one has disputed that fact.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe we have quite clarified the meaning of the wording in the Senator's amendment. I asked the division whether earnings had anything to do with qualifying a person over age 68 for benefits from the proposed legislation. On page 2 of the Senator's bill, under the heading "Medical Insurance Benefits," and subheading "Entitlement to Benefits," I read from section 226(a)(1):

> Every individual who—
> (A) has attained the age of sixty-eight, and
> (B) is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under section 202.

Under section 202, as I understand, anyone earning more than $1,800 a year could not qualify for benefits. I think that ought to be clarified, because from my inquiries from official sources, we find it is also a question as to what it means already as to whether a man earning $40,000 a year could still qualify or not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Earnings do not have any reflection on entitlement. Does the Senator think they have? A person may be entitled to benefits under section 202, but due to the earnings limitation he may not receive cash payments.

Mr. AIKEN. Entitlement to social security benefits regardless of earnings?

Mr. ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The law today provides that a person cannot earn more than $1,200. The bill, as I understand, provides that he cannot earn more than $1,800. If I had my way, I would take off that limitation completely; but I do not have my way.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point is that a man who earns more than $1,800 a year, or $1,200 now, is entitled to Social Security benefits, but he is not receiving them because of some other earnings he has, and the entitlement he has, which qualifies him in that respect, entitles him to medical benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. On earned income.

Mr. ANDERSON. On earned income.

Mr. AIKEN. I know personally some judges in my State—I could name them, but I shall not do so—who have retired—perhaps have retired under Social Security—who go to work for 18 months, or whatever number of quarters is required, for someone else, in order to qualify for Social Security. However, that qualifies them after they have reached a certain age. I simply wanted to make certain that anyone earning more than $1,800 would not be disqualified, even though he might be entitled to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I tried to say, two or three times, that I am sure that the person who is entitled to it draws it, under this provision. I do not believe any provision to the contrary is included in this measure. I realize that it is necessary for us to make use of the drafting service; but if this measure contains a provision about which I do not know, I shall be very much surprised.

But certainly this measure does not include any provision to the effect that reduced medical care benefits shall be received by one who is making a salary of $15,000 or $20,000 a year.

Mr. AIKEN. Then do I correctly understand that a social security cardholder who has been earning $4,800 a year and has been paying the tax on it during the time this law has been on the books would receive the same amount as that received by a social security card holder who has been earning $2,500 a year and has been paying the tax on it over a 15-year period during the time the law has been on the books?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, that is clear.

Mr. AIKEN. It is clear, is it?

Mr. ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the other may become a little cleared as the debate proceeds.

Mr. CHURCH. It is my understanding that under the committee bill, the medical benefits would not be confined to those who are on public assistance, but would include others—those who are medically indigent. Is it the understanding of the Senator that, under the committee's bill, the declaration of medical indigence which would qualify these additional persons is something like the declaration that a veteran must make when he seeks to obtain hospitalization in a veterans' hospital for a non-service-connected disability? That problem has caused endless difficulty in the administration of the veterans' hospital program.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the same general principle applies to both. It is rather hard to establish what a medically indigent person is; but it is difficult to establish what an indigent person is; but it is difficult when the law includes a new category which would result in the American people being told, "You may have plenty of money, and you may own a $20,000 home, and you may have a good annual income; but now you say to us that if you were suddenly asked to pay a $2,000 medical bill, you might have to mortgage your house. Therefore, you are medically indigent."

Of course that person might be able to reduce his television payments, or something else, and then not be medically indigent.

As I tried to point out the other day, one of the problems in which we became involved when we were discussing the provision of relief, one time, was whether relief included a home; and I think someone raised the question of whether a proper home included lace curtains. The Administrator ruled that lace curtains should not be included. But there was much opposition, and finally we included lace curtains.

So the application of the definition of the term "medically indigent" to needy people will very likely vary from State to State.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator, and I think this particular provision is open to very serious abuse.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Democratic Convention adopted, as part of its platform, the following plank:

> We shall provide medical care benefits for the aged as part of the time-tested social security insurance system. We reject any proposal which would require such citizens to submit to the indignity of a means test—a "pauper's oath."

The Senator's amendment complies with that plank in our platform, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it does; and I wish to tell the able Senator from Pennsylvania about the situation when that particular part of the platform was under consideration. I speak now as a member of the committee which held the first hearings; and then we had a drafting committee, of which I was a member, which worked for several days, in a closed room, on the platform; and then I was part of the speakers' group which handled the platform at that point; and, so far as I know, not one Democrat in any part of the hall rose and objected to that provision. When the platform was brought before the full Democratic Convention, there was objection to certain parts of the platform; but some of our friends very eloquently pleaded for this part of it, and no one objected to this part of the platform.

Mr. CLARK. That is my recollection, too.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, it is remarkable to note what some persons will do when such matters face them later on.

Since it is obvious that this way is the way in which this matter will ultimately have to be handled, I think it better to proceed in this way now.

Mr. CLARK. The committee bill does not conform to the Democratic platform, does it?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. However, of course, one has a right to say that the platform perhaps will commit subsequent Members of Congress, but not necessarily the present Members of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. The Javits proposal does not conform to the platform, does it?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not yet before us.

Mr. CLARK. But it is clear that it does not conform to the platform, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think it clear that there should not be a means test. But what concerns me about the Senator's amendment is that it does not state how the "medically indigent" requirement would be applied.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that the term "medically indigent" is not included in this proposed legislation.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. But we understand it is an expression that is used in connection with the bill.

Mr. KERR. But it is not accurate to say the term is to be found in the bill; and I hope that both the proponents and the opponents of the bill will be mindful of the fact that the term is not used in this bill, and no provision of the bill would justify the use of that term.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I accept the comment the Senator from Oklahoma has made.

Mr. KERR. It was the purpose of the framers of the amendment to eliminate entirely the possibility that that term might be determinative in the minds of Senators.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I understand that; but I also find——

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say that while we were discussing it in the committee, the term "medically indigent" was used time after time after time, as I am sure the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who were there will recall.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. My question is why the Senator from New Mexico puts his proposal on top of the other one, instead of substituting his proposal and also a provision to take care of the objection being made to the committee bill, rather than to proceed in the other way.

Mr. ANDERSON. On Saturday, I spent nearly 2 hours, here on the floor, trying to explain why that is so. Let me put the matter in this way: In the first place, although we do not criticize the committee amendment, it may involve some delay, and perhaps may never be accepted.

Many States do not provide for any medical care. Fifteen or more States make only a trivial provision as regards medical care. Other States, such as Louisiana have fine hospital benefits; but not every State does.

Therefore, some of us felt that in all the States of the Union, those who qualify under social security and who reach age 68 would be better served by this provision, without the requirement that the States dig up some more money.

I point out to the Senator from New Jersey, who is a stanch friend of social security legislation, that 30 of the Governors who recently attended the Governors' conference spoke out specifically against the provision of the committee report, and asked that this provision for health care for the aged be made on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I understand that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand the Senator's point of view. I only state that the Governors had this problem before them.

I have to concede that the provision of the bill is very liberal, and the formula worked out by the Senator from Oklahoma should be an inducement to the States to put up the necessary money. But regardless of whether such an inducement is created, some of the States are "up against the gun" as regards raising more money; and today 15 or more of the States still have very low payments of this sort.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate the Senator's explanation. However, severe criticism has been made of the committee bill by students of this subject. They criticize the committee bill on the ground that it would introduce a new concept—whether it be called medically indigent or something else. They are opposed to that, because, in their judgment, not only would it be socially bad, but it might be almost impossible of administration.

I am thinking immediately of the people in my own State who administer the old-age and survivors program. It has been very well administered and has, I think, worked extremely well. Their concern with the committee bill is very great indeed. What troubles me, and what I press on the Senator from New Mexico is, Why keep it? Why not revise it at the same time we are doing it for those who are now on old-age and survivors insurance, a program which, in my judgment, is much better?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a fair question, and I think I should answer it. I think the principal reason, in my own mind, for doing that was that the committee bill, particularly the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Delaware, and other Senators, provided some Federal matching money for those States which were trying to match under public assistance cases. It is true an additional number might come in. I believe the estimate was there might be 10 million who might come in, and maybe 500,000, or perhaps 1 million, would ask for assistance. Personally, I think when those individuals ask for assistance, the States are going to be reluctant to allow persons who are fairly well fixed financially to plead poverty in order to get medical care. The States might turn them down, or establish standards sufficiently high to keep them out. I thought it better to take the Senate language we now have than to toss it out and write a new provision in it.

This matter will go to conference. If there is any overlapping that has to be adjusted, if these other amendments should go into the bill, then the conferees can deal with it. But the amendment was adopted by the Senate committee, and was adopted in 5 seconds, without a vote or discussion of any kind. Therefore, it is in the bill, and I would rather go to conference with it than without it.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey appreciates the courtesy of the Senator and the time he has taken to give this explanation of it. It is a troublesome matter, and I would like to see it worked out in a different way, if it could be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. I still recognize it is a troublesome matter. We spent quite a bit of time discussing how it might be handled. Many Senators felt there might be conflicts, as the Senator from New Jersey feels. Whatever the Senate does, the final decision goes to the conference with the House, and all these amendments will be in conference with the House. We may find some better solution than now proposed, but for the present I feel the bill is better with the Kerr-Frear amendments in it than without them.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that, as one of the cosponsors of the Anderson amendment, I earnestly hope that the social insurance principle of providing medical care and hospitalization for our aged citizens, with this beginning, will be broadened and extended until many of the people who will be eligible for old-age assistance or public

assistance under the committee bill will no longer be required to take a means test.

Perhaps we can never reach the period when some of our citizens will not need public charity, but I surely hope that the beginning which the Anderson amendment would provide for the principle of social insurance with medical care and hospitalization can be broadened until those dependent upon public charity will be reduced to a much smaller number than will be covered under the committee amendments.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a comment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Tennessee. I have very strong feeling on this subject. I think, however, we ought to do that now, and not "mess up" the operation of the public assistance programs nationallly. In many States, particularly in New Jersey, it is going to get us off on the wrong track, and delay, rather than expedite, putting into effect this health program for our older people on an insurance basis across the board.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from New Jersey, for whom I have tremendous respect. It bothers him because it bothered me, and it bothered the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As a matter of fact, in committee I offered an amendment as a substitute for what was finally approved by the committee to do that which the Senator from New Jersey suggests. But we must start from where we are, and not from where we wish we were.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can say to the Senator from New Jersey that I, as well, offered an amendment, very similar to the one before us, as a substitute for the one which is proposed. But we have to operate by a majority on these matters, and there were 12 votes one way and 5 votes the other way.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for this very great effort to extend the coverage contained in the committee amendment that will grant some type of medical care to some of our elderly people as a matter of right, and not as a matter of charity. I think such aid should be granted to our citizens as a matter of right, and we should not force an individual to endeavor to get medical care on the basis of charity, which is detrimental to the character of an individual and to the higher instincts of man.

My question to the Senator is directed more to the committee amendment than his amendment, because it goes back to the earnings that a social security recipient may be allowed before his social security payments are cut off.

Under the law as it now stands, as I understand it, if a person on social security earns more than $1,200 a year, his social security payments are reduced, and are reduced on a ratio of a certain amount for each $80. A recipient is cut out of 1 month's pay for each $80 that his annual earnings exceeds the sum of $1,200. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. From letters I have received and from what I have heard on visits in my State and other parts of the country, the greatest complaint, not only from the social security recipients, but from civic organizations that are interested in the problems of the aged, is the law against retired persons earning money.

Is it not a fact that if a person getting social security payments has an income of $30,000 a year solely from investments, the social security payments would not be cut 1 red cent?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The committee has endeavored to improve this condition by raising the annual earnings allowed to $1,800 a year without reducing social security benefits to retired persons. I have a bill pending raising that amount to $2,400. I contemplate offering it as an amendment.

I ask the Senator if it would not be beneficial to raise the amount that a person who is drawing social security payments may earn to $2,400 rather than have the limitation become $1,800.

Mr. ANDERSON. We tried every kind of scale we could imagine, inside the committee. I had a proposal which called for $2,000. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] had the figure of $3,600, and had others all the way down to about $1,800. The able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] pointed out that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] had a figure of $1,800. We had figures all over the landscape.

We did what legislators sometimes have to do. We tried to find some compromise figure which we could use as a first step. We hit upon $1,800, because that represented a 50-percent increase. We thought that was pretty good.

Personally, I would have liked to go to the $2,000 figure which I suggested but a majority of the committee felt that we should settle upon the figure of $1,800. This is partly a recognition of the increase in the cost of living, and it is partly a move in the direction the Senator is now mentioning; namely, a desire to free the people so that they can make some additional money.

This will be tested. It will be watched carefully by the social security people. I believe the Senator will find that the $1,800 move is a good move, and it may lead to a bigger move, which the Senator himself contemplates.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Actually, since the $100 per month limitation on earnings was established, has not the cost of living increased so much that the increase to $1,800 would virtually be taken up by the increase in the cost of living since the $100 per month limitation was put into effect many years ago?

Mr. ANDERSON. The figures which I saw indicate, I think, not all of it would be used up for the cost-of-living increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is my recollection.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is some freedom, but not much.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his work in bringing the figure up to $1,800. The Senator mentioned the different figures offered, from $1,800 to $3,600. I regret that the compromise was on the basis of the lowest figure suggested. I wish it had been a little higher, at least $2,400.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to have the Senator from Texas give me credit for this. I am sure that every member of the Committee on Finance is in favor of increasing the amount. It is simply a question of how far we ought to go.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In the committee report there is the statement:

> Under the committee's bill a beneficiary would lose 1 month's benefits for every $80 (or fraction thereof) by which his annual earnings exceed $1,800. There would be no change in the provision of existing law which guarantees that no benefits will be lost for any month in which a beneficiary earns $100 or less and does not render substantial services in self-employment.

Why was not the monthly limitation raised from $100 a month to $150 a month, as the annual limitation was raised from $1,200 to $1,800?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the best answer is that the amendment simply did not do it, I am sorry to say. We might as well be frank about it. The members of the Committee on Finance are not absolutely perfect. It may be more logical to do this as the Senator from Texas has suggested, but we did not do so. Therefore, it is presented on this basis.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In order to give protection, if the matter involved 1 month only instead of the whole year, if a person worked 1 month for $150 but did not earn $1,800 for the year, for that month he would receive a deduction, under the language of the report; is that not correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am afraid the Senator from Texas is not correct, but I simply say this was a point which did not occur to us. We were in a hurry. There was pressure to get the bill reported. We spent our time talking about the level and not about all of the refinements afterward.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is a minor detail, which we can cure by amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. One of the great problems, when one starts to amend one section of a bill, is that one does not always recognize all of the sections which ought to be amended.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am not being critical. I hope that can be cured.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has brought up a good point.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the fact that the Senator has brought to our attention the increase in the earnings limitation from $1,200 to

$1,800. If the Senator from Texas will give me his attention, I think it has been well stated that every member of the Senate Committee on Finance wished to do something in this field. There was no question on that. The question related to the amount, as the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned.

One thing which I trust the distinguished Senator from Texas will keep in mind, if he desires to suggest that we increase the amount to $2,400, is that we learned the increase from $1,200 to $1,800 will cost the social security fund $400 million a year. If we should increase the amount to $2,400, if I remember the figure correctly, the cost will be $1.1 billion.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is very close.

Mr. CARLSON. That also enters into the picture.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his contribution.

It seems to me there is a grave inequity involved, when a person reaches the age of 65, if he retires under social security. His payments, we will say, are $12.50 a month. People cannot live on that. People may subsist, and may not starve, but they cannot live on a normal standard of living of people who have homes and who have to pay taxes at the present rate of school district taxes in America. The Federal Government is doing nothing with regard to supporting schools. School taxes are very high in most districts in America. These people have to pay high taxes if they live in their own homes. They cannot live on such an amount unless they are willing to give up, to move into an old person's home. They have extremely difficult times living on $111 or $112 a month. Most of those who are able try to supplement their earnings. Some have saved some money or have other income. If they have saved enough money or if they have enough other income, they can draw as much as $20,000 a month from dividends—stock dividends, bond interest, coupons, and so on—and not have their social security payments cut one red cent. However, if these people should earn $110 a month, then the social security payments are cut because they are earning too much money.

This puts a premium upon not working, to stop people who wish to help pay their own way from working, in the American spirit. It is said, "If you go out to earn some money we will dock your social security payment." That is unjust.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think perhaps I gave the Senator from Texas the wrong impression awhile ago. If a person should earn $112 in a single month he would not be docked for that, unless he should earn more than $1,800 in the year. A person can earn $200 in a month, or $250, or $300. The $100 a month provision does not apply to it, so long as the person does not earn $1,800 per year. Or even after he reaches this amount, if in any one month he earns less than $100 he would be entitled to a check for that month.

Mr. GORE. Neither applies to the medical care and hospitalization aid contained in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield. I am trying to yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think section 211, which would increase the earned income limitation from $1,200 to $1,800 is one of the least publicized but one of the most important features in the bill as reported. I say that with conviction, because in both the 85th Congress and the 86th Congress, in January, as soon as possible after the Congress convened, I introduced bills to accomplish this very thing.

The language which is used in at least the first paragraph of section 211 in the amendment is identical, I believe, with the language of S. 699, which I introduced in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, on January 17, 1957, a part of the legislative day of January 3, the first day of the session. I also introduced S. 638 on January 23, 1959, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the present Congress.

I am certainly in favor of increasing the earned income limitation, and I think the merits of it have been well covered by the Senator from Texas. Later in the day, as soon as I can be recognized, I desire to speak further on this subject.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator for yielding.

THE HONORABLE USHER L. BURDICK

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on Friday, August 19, North Dakota lost one of its most notable public servants, the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, father of our distinguished colleague, QUENTIN N. BURDICK.

Usher L. Burdick served North Dakota in the House of Representatives for 20 years. Before his service in the Congress, he had been elected to the State legislature in 1906. During his second term as a member of the State house of representatives, he was elected speaker. In 1910 he was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Dakota. The large majority vote which he always received is indicative of the high esteem in which he was held by the people of North Dakota.

Usher Burdick was among the last of the old, hardy, resourceful pioneers who settled our State. His family lineage, of which he was very proud, dates back to the days of the pilgrims. Usher Burdick grew to manhood in North Dakota close to the Fort Totten Indian Reservation. His childhood experience, like most other North Dakotans, had a deep impact upon his life and personality. It instilled in him a friendship and understanding for other people upon whom fortune did not always smile, and had much to do with his lifelong desire to help others, and especially the farmers of this Nation.

Among his many fine qualities was his great wit and keen sense of humor, which gained for him innumerable friends both in and out of Congress. These and other qualities made him a most able extemporaneous speaker. He was never at a loss for words when called upon to speak. Usher Burdick was an avid reader with a tremendous desire to absorb all the knowledge he could. He maintained a large private library which he read extensively until the very last. In his own right he was a poet too and the author of many interesting and authentic books on the early history of North Dakota and the Old West.

North Dakota and the Nation have lost an able, talented, and outstanding citizen in the death of Usher L. Burdick. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to all of his family, especially his daughter, Eileen, wife of Representative Robert Levering; his son, Judge Eugene A. Burdick; and our distinguished colleague, Quentin N. Burdick.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As one who served in the House of Representatives with Usher Burdick for a great many years, I wish to join in paying tribute to his career of service and worthwhile work. Coming from South Dakota and having in the district I represented five large Indian reservations, one of which is the Standing Rock Reservation, which extends across the State line into North Dakota, I found that the interests of North Dakota, which Usher Burdick so well served, were often the interests of South Dakota, and the problems of North Dakota were often the problems of South Dakota. Consequently, starting with the 75th Congress when I first entered the House of Representatives, I had a great deal in common with Usher Burdick. I came to know him and to respect his unique ability. He was not a party regular. He was an independent thinker. But he could always be counted upon to do what was good for the people who sent him to Congress. In that sense he was a Representative of unusual value and distinction. He had the literary ability and the love of the old West to which my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota has alluded. He was outstanding in any group in which he was found. His sense of humor, his wit, and his ability to penetrate fallacious arguments by dry and salty comment was well known.

I regretted, to be sure, his retirement from the Congress, but I wish to join in the tribute with all who had an opportunity to work with him and know of his work. I pay tribute to the effective representation he gave to the causes, to the problems, and to the spirit of the Dakotas.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I had the honor of being elected to Congress and coming to the House of Representatives the same year that Usher Burdick came to Congress; namely, the opening of the 74th Congress. We became very close friends, and during all the intervening years we had many pleasant associations together.

I was pleased the other day, that he was able to be present when his son was sworn in as a Member of this body. I congratulated him on the occasion. I was delighted that he was permitted to live long enough to cherish one of his life's ambitions; namely, that his son would be elected to the Senate as he had been a successor to Usher in the House.

Usher Burdick was truly a westerner. He was a great friend of agriculture. He was, as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has stated, witty in his remarks, and his views were highly regarded by his colleagues in the House. His presence was called to the attention of the House whenever he took the floor to speak on any subject.

The day before he died I received a handwritten note from him, written with a red pencil, which stated, "FRANK, I think you should have this," and it was signed "Usher." With the note was an autographed copy of speeches by former Representative U. S. Guyer, of Kansas, dated 1925. I cherish those speeches very much. I appreciated receiving them. So I, too, wish to share our regret in the loss of this great citizen and former Member of Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the junior Senator from Kansas. I am sure the Burdick family will appreciate those comments.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I served with Usher Burdick in the House of Representatives. He came from a completely different background than my own and from a very different part of the country. I was literally at the other end of the pole from Usher. I was born in the slums of New York; he was a farmer from the tips of his toes to the top of his hat, which he nearly always wore. I think it was one of his great regrets that he could not wear his hat in the House of Representatives.

Usher was one of the most admirable, saltiest and wisest characters I have ever met. I shall never forget the impression Usher left on one. He not only had wit, which he showed on the floor of the House of Representatives to the great edification of the House, which respected him highly, but also he had the wisdom that went with wit; and whether I agreed with Usher Burdick or not, it was always a joy to hear him. He occasionally poked fun at me. Perhaps the acid test of friendship is that the fun was always delightful to receive, even though it may have hurt on occasion in terms of policies we were discussing.

I join with my colleagues in the gratification that has been expressed, not with respect to party, but in a personal sense, that his son is with us in the Senate.

I wish also to join in paying my tribute to Usher. I shall always remember him as a smiling, witty, vigorous man, expressing almost in every fiber of his being as well as in the sound of this voice the good earth of our country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from New York for his very fine comments.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I deeply regretted to learn of the death of my old friend and former colleague in the House, Usher Burdick. He was a great Representative. I agree with his son, who now sits with us in the Senate, when he said, "A great man died when my father died."

I think the colorful characteristics of Usher Burdick which have been mentioned here, and which have been mentioned in the press, obscured the fact that Usher Burdick was a very fine and excellent student. He was a great student of history. Most people did not realize that he probably had one of the finest libraries of any Member of Congress. He was a great student of Indian history. He had one of the finest libraries on Indian history in the whole country. Unhappily, when he undertook to get rid of some of those books, I did not get some of them that I would very much like to have. But Usher Burdick was a great friend of mine. He had a brilliant mind.

Sometimes I went to him with problems I had in the House of Representatives in connection with the House Committee on Claims. He was always fair. He had the capability of analyzing legislation in connection with claims in the way that a good lawyer would analyze them.

In paying tribute to Usher Burdick I would only add to the things that have been said with regard to Usher Burdick being a colorful man and a distinguished figure in Congress, that aside from these characteristics, emphasis should be laid on the fact that Usher Burdick was a serious student of history and a brilliant man who covered with a fine sense of humor a wonderful appreciation of what the democratic processes of this country are all about, and who served his State and his people and the Nation with great distinction in a colorful and vigorous way.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding to me, because I am happy to pay this final tribute to a man whom I regard as one of the finest friends I had in my life.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for the tributes to the late Representative Usher Burdick. I did not know him personally, but I rise to pay tribute to his knowledge and his contribution to American history. He was a true student of American history. He was not only a student of American history, but he was also a writer and publisher of American history. He published his own writings. He published numerous monographs on American history, mainly histories dealing with the western migration of our people, and the conflict between the advancing settlers and the Indians. He also published monographs on broader phases of American history.

I have in my library a book of recollections on Abraham Lincoln, published a few years ago by Usher Burdick, based on conversations he had with men who had lived in Lincoln's time and who had known Lincoln personally. His range of interest of American history was broad. His range of interest is demonstrated by monographs. They are all broad in range. One cannot read his writings without realizing that here was a real scholar of history. Congress has lost one of its ablest Members in his passing. I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from North Dakota for their fine tributes.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580) the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 12580, and ask that it be printed.

The purpose of this amendment is to add Texas to the list of States which are permitted to divide State and local retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

The State and local employees covered by a retirement system are generally excluded from coverage under social security except where the members of a retirement system by a majority vote elect to take social security coverage for the entire group. This is the present situation in Texas. Many States, by specific listing in the Social Security Act, are, however, allowed to divide their State and local retirement systems into the two groups of those desiring and those not desiring the additional coverage provided by social security.

The inclusion of Texas among these States so listed would permit complete freedom of choice for every Texas State and local employee now covered by a retirement system, who would not otherwise be eligible for social security coverage.

In other words, if Texas is included, it would give to employees in Texas privileges which are already enjoyed by employees in many other States, with each employee being able to elect whether or not he wishes to come under the Federal system.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee, as well as a majority of the committee, is in agreement with the Senator's amendment, and that there will be no serious resistance to it. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator that there is no need of printing it. If he will permit it to lie at the desk, then at such

time as he is in a position to call it up, he will be able to do so, and I am sure it will be agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana, and I request that the amendment be not printed. I have spoken to the chairman of the committee about it.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Many Texas public employees, particularly schoolteachers, are very desirous of this amendment as it is their only practical way now of obtaining social security coverage. So far as can be determined, all interested groups in Texas favor the passage of the amendment.

The amendment would not affect the existing exclusion of policemen and firemen from social security coverage.

EZRA TAFT BENSON—SCAPEGOAT FOR CONGRESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this year will bring to an end the Cabinet service of a great American who has served his country well. When Ezra Taft Benson accepted the Office of Secretary of Agriculture in January of 1953, he inherited a colossal mess. His four immediate predecessors had been under continuous fire from Congress and from farmers. It was regarded as the toughest political assignment in the Cabinet.

World War II legislation designed to stimulate agricultural production to the maximum was still law even though wartime demands had ceased. Government warehouses were bursting with surplus agricultural commodities. It is no wonder then that the voters in 1952 completely repudiated the "Brannan plan" and the Truman agricultural policies then in effect.

Based upon the advice of respected experts and upon his own great experience in agriculture, Secretary Benson developed a forward looking, sound program to bring sanity to the Department of Agriculture. This program was presented to Congress for its approval, but it was summarily rejected, not once but many times.

BENSON PROGRAM—CONVICTED WITHOUT TRIAL

The Benson program has been convicted without a trial by a stacked jury in Congress. Secretary Benson has been attacked and maligned in the Democratic controlled Congress for 6 years. Although the Democrats now control Congress by a two-to-one majority, most of them still refuse to face up the farm mess which they created, preferring to cling to the outmoded, discredited, wasteful, and unworkable wartime program of high price supports.

The Democrats created this farm Frankenstein, but now they wish to disavow their monster child and call it Ezra Benson. They wish to make the Secretary of Agriculture the scapegoat for the sins of Congress. First, Congress put the Secretary in a straitjacket and then in effect told him to chin himself. It is like handing a scalpel and forcepts to Venus de Milo and telling her to "operate."

It is to the everlasting discredit of his attackers that their 8-year campaign has succeeded in persuading many gullible farmers that Secretary Benson, who must administer programs created by Democrats, is responsible for the failure of those programs. They have made him a symbol of their own farm failures. Psychiatrists, political scientists, and students of propaganda techniques can have a field day in analyzing the success of this sorry episode in our Nation's history.

NOT ALL HAVE BEEN FOOLED

Fortunately, not all have been fooled by the misleading attacks on Secretary Benson. Some of the great newspapers of the land have refused to be taken in by the efforts of many Democrats in Congress to make Mr. Benson their scapegoat. I ask unanimous consent that editorial excerpts from nine of these publications be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

"It is, however, timely to remember that Mr. Benson did not create the problem that he has been unable to resolve and that Congress, under Democratic control through most of the post-World War II period, has been likewise unable, or unwilling, to solve it" (Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 13, 1960).

"We have upheld his policies right along, and are not persuaded that anyone else could have handled more rationally a farm program which, by the will of Congress, not Mr. Benson, still rests altogether too much on irrational bases" (San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 5, 1960).

"No matter what may be said about him by demagogic politicians in the campaign, he will be remembered as the man who tried to steer American agriculture back to a sound course.

"In this he was thwarted in part by Congressmen, who wanted to keep subsidies at wartime highs to buy votes, and in part by farmers themselves, who voted for controls to obtain subsidy checks.

"Some day, unless our Government is to go bankrupt, Congress must come to its senses and adopt a sound farm plan, one that will restore to the farmer his lost independence and will quit pouring tax money into subsidies that create surpluses. In that day, Ezra T. Benson will be recognized as a prophet crying in the wilderness" (Dallas News, Dallas, Tex., July 17, 1960).

"It is characteristic of the Utahan that even while the political fireworks exploded over his program, he was quietly going about his efforts of trying to improve the market for farm products.

"Despite Mr. Benson's efforts the old rigid program of the depression and World War II years remains on the books for a few crops, with only slight changes. The program fails to meet the challenges of rapid changes in agriculture.

"It may be that, as some observers have said, some phases of the farm program, notably wheat, defy solution at present. Considering that $42.1 billion has been budgeted for agriculture in the last decade, roughly four-fifths of it for price and income support, a continuance of high, rigid supports seems the height of insanity, regardless of the political considerations.

"Mr. Benson will be remembered among other things as an honest public servant with unusual courage" (Salt Lake Tribune, Aug. 14, 1960).

"But these statements do not mean much unless it is asked why matters have turned out so disastrously. The principal reason is the continuation of the high price-support policies designed to spur maximum production as a World War II emergency measure. Secretary Benson has succeeded in getting through Congress some modifications of this, but Congress has balked at significant changes. So it is not the Republican administration but the Democratic Congresses that stand indicted for the farm chaos" (Wall Street Journal, Aug. 5, 1960).

"The real trouble with Mr. Benson's policies is that he has not been allowed to put them into practice. The Democrats attempt to fix on him the responsibility for declining farm income and accumulating surpluses. Yet it is the policy of Democratic Congresses, which he is obliged to administer, that is really to blame. If Mr. NIXON wins the election, he, too, will find that the farm politicians are his biggest obstacle" (New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 3, 1960).

"Trouble was Mr. Benson could never get to the root of the whole problem. He could try to sneak up from behind the barn, so to speak, but Congress was always there like the embattled farmer of literature, pitchfork at the ready. Nothing Mr. Benson tried to do worked well for the simple reason that all his efforts were circumscribed by congressional insistence on a farm program of high price supports and controls.

"Mr. Benson knows now that he has made mistakes, but the greatest of all was to take such a job and try to make sense out of it when an unwilling Congress has the last say" (Wall Street Journal, Aug. 3, 1960).

"Heir to a farm mess, Secretary Benson was thwarted by the Congress in every maneuver to reduce subsidies enough to discourage surplus production. As a result, the mess has grown messier; surpluses have mounted. Taxpayers have tended to look at the increasing surpluses, now valued at more than $10 billion, and wring their hands. Farmers have tended to look at the flexible supports and acreage controls, pour in a little more fertilizer, add a stream of tobacco juice and curse Ezra Benson" (Lynchburg, Va., News, Aug. 4, 1960).

"Democrats have attacked him almost since he took office 7½ years ago. They stand for just the opposite of what the Secretary believes. His only usefulness to the Democrats is what they claim is his unpopularity" (Rochester Times-Union, Aug. 4, 1960).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, these same newspapers in addition to approving the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies also have high regard for Ezra Taft Benson, the man. I ask unanimous consent that several typical editorial excerpts be included at this point in my remarks.

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

"Ezra Taft Benson has commanded our respect for 8 long years of ever-abnormal granaries. He has taken his lumps in the ceaseless struggle to cut them down to marketable size. He has clung to the principle that the farm economy will prosper best as it is freed from its dependence upon government supports and controls. This is indeed the aim of the influential American Farm Bureau Federation, which says:

" 'With less interference from government, the marketing system will be freer to operate effectively and efficiently.'

"Secretary Benson has estranged politicians who talk about 'guaranteeing' the farmer 'full parity in the marketplace'—a phrase which is semantically pleasing but which would be as bankrupting in its effect on the Treasury as it is bankrupt of economic reality.

"Anyone who works for reduced price supports, and thereby a reduced tax subsidy for agriculture, is unlikely to endear himself to the farm politicians, especially at election time. Mr. Benson is philosophically rediscovering this fact" (San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 5, 1960).

"The farm problem, not politics, is Mr. Benson's chief concern 24 hours a day, 52 weeks a year. Thus, while the echoes of the political battle over him were dying out, Mr. Benson was in Europe until yesterday where he was as usual working for the continued expansion of world trade in farm commodities. Specifically he warned against high internal support prices and 'the insulation of the domestic market from outside competition'" (the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1960).

"Pelted with rotten eggs, splattered with insults, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has steadfastly advocated a program of flexible farm subsidies, which 'enables the Government to provide proper incentives for agriculture to adjust output of specific commodities to demand.'

"For almost alone among the men who inhabit Washington's proliferating bureaucracy, Mr. Benson was an advocate of less government, not more government, of freedom, not regulation. Ezra Taft Benson, soldier for governmental sanity, speaker of the hard truth, defender of free enterprise, fades from the political scene, an election-year casualty.

"And it is depressing" (Lynchburg, Va., News, Aug. 4, 1960).

"So hard-working, sincere Ezra Taft Benson becomes a political albatross. Expediency demands the end of his attempt to restore sanity to American agricultural policy.

"But political repudiation doesn't make Benson less right in what he tried to do. That knowledge may give him comfort in these last months of his great public service to American farmers and all the American people" (Rochester Times-Union, Aug. 4, 1960).

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. How many administrations did the Senator go back?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah went back four. Was the Senator a part of the four?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was one of the four. Will the Senator start naming some of the things which I did as Secretary of Agriculture he does not approve?

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to finish my statement first. However, I will digress at this point to say that my subsequent experiences with the Senator from New Mexico have convinced me that he may have been as much a victim of the situation as the present Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was it awful that I made $225 million for the country out of the sale of surplus cotton to countries like Japan, China, Germany, and Austria?

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the Senator will permit me to finish my statement. I do not wish to debate the services of the Senator from New Mexico. I am sure he made an excellent record.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

PRESIDENT SUPPORTS BENSON

Mr. BENNETT. President Eisenhower also recognizes the essential rightness of the Benson policies. Only recently he said at a press conference:

Ezra Benson has, in my mind, been very honest and forthright and courageous in trying to get enacted into legislation plans and programs that I think are correct. Therefore, for me to regret that he has been working would be almost a betrayal of my own views in this matter. I think we must find ways to give greater freedom to the farmer and make his whole business more responsive to market, rather than just to political considerations.

WHEAT—CLASSIC ILLUSTRATION

The present wheat situation is not only a national disgrace, but it is also a classic illustration of the impossible situation which has confronted Secretary Benson during his tenure in office.

The Democrats' wheat legislation is still on the books, largely unchanged, after 8 years. This program consists of high price supports and production controls alternatively too rigid and too loose. One of the foremost loopholes is the 15-acre provision under which a farmer can grow 15 acres of wheat free of any penalty without being required to obtain a marketing quota. In all, 690,000 farms took advantage of this gimmick in 1959, up 152,000 in 3 years.

The Democratic wheat program is doing a disservice to the farmers and costing the taxpayers a fortune. It has so stimulated unneeded production that we have 1.3 billion bushels of wheat in storage. This is enough wheat to provide 450 loaves of bread for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is enough wheat to satisfy our domestic needs for over 2 years. Under the stimulus of Democratic price fixing, we are now harvesting a record wheat crop this year of 1.3 billion bushels, 300 million bushels of which we do not need either to satisfy our domestic or foreign markets in the coming year.

The Government now has $3.2 billion of taxpayers' money tied up in surplus wheat. Millions more will be required to buy the 300-million-bushel surplus now being harvested. It presently costs the taxpayers $1¼ million per day just to store the wheat glut. The Democratic wheat price stabilization program costs from $500 to $700 million each year.

KENNEDY AND DEMOCRATS DEFAULT

While the Senate did pass a wheat bill this session which would have made some modest improvements, the House couldn't even pass a bill. Thus the Democratic Congress has again refused to heed the pleas of Secretary Benson, who for 8 years has tried to bring sanity to our farm programs. With the wheat program a national scandal, the failure of Congress to face up to its responsibility is a national disgrace. No wonder in their frustration many Democrats seek a scapegoat in Secretary Benson.

The Democratic candidate for President, Senator KENNEDY, held out the promise while he was wooing delegates in the Midwest before the Democratic Convention that he would get an emergency farm bill through Congress this year. He has defaulted on that promise, and there will be no meaningful farm bill in spite of the fact that President Eisenhower has again urged Congress to act.

The Democratic platform for 1960 proposes even more massive doses of the same old discredited political high-price-support medicine to cure farm ills. Apparently 15 years of Democratic farm failure have been to no avail. The farmer is to be regimented and the taxpayer bled.

EZRA BENSON—PROPHET IN A CONGRESSIONAL WILDERNESS

Congress is rapidly erecting a memorial to its own failure, a tower of Babel constructed of wheat. The confusion of tongues in the Democratic Congress is so pronounced that the American people have some cause to lose faith in their government.

Ezra Benson has been a prophet crying in a congressional wilderness. He has sought to bring freedom to the farmer while protecting him from disaster. Four-fifths of agriculture is free and doing fairly well. He has not been doctrinaire in his approach. He has not claimed infallibility. But he has fought with courage and dedication to achieve a sound, workable farm program. History will deal harshly with his critics and with the political paralysis in Congress. History will vindicate his essential rightness.

Ezra Taft Benson has fought the good fight. He will return to private life having won the respect and admiration of millions both in America and abroad. The Nation is the better for his service.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of agricultural accomplishments from 1953 to 1960 be printed following my remarks, together with a speech by the Honorable Don Paarlberg, special assistant to the President, in support of the administration's farm policy.

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

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS 1953–60

The food-for-peace program was set in motion by President Eisenhower and is enabling the United States and other food exporting nations to better share their abundance with people in the free world. It is helping develop farm markets.

Total agricultural assets are at an alltime high of $208.2 billion as of January 1, 1960.

Owner equities on January 1, 1960, were $33 billion above January 1, 1953, and hit a new peak of $184.2 billion.

Farm ownership is at a record high, and there is a smaller proportion of tenants than ever before.

Farm foreclosures are near an alltime record low.

Total financial assets of farmers, including farmer cooperatives, have risen from $19 billion in January of 1959 to $19.4 billion, January 1, 1960.

Farm debt amounts to only 11½ percent of the value of farm assets.

The standard of living on farms is the highest in history, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles and other conveniences owned by farm families.

The special school milk program was inaugurated in 1954. The program was operated last year in 81,500 schools where nearly 2.2 billion half pints of milk helped improve diets of our children.

The school lunch program absorbs large quantities of plentiful foods and improves children's diets. Last year's purchases totaled $510 million. Complete meals in 1959 were increased 1 billion over the 1 billion served in 1951, or doubled in number.

About 70 million people in 91 foreign countries have been receiving food and fiber donated by the United States. Nearly 5 million American family units have shared in our abundance through donations of surplus foods.

Important new facilities were established to insure future agricultural progress and livestock health. Among these is the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory in Long Island Sound where diseases foreign to our country are being studied for control purposes. Native diseases will be studied at the new Ames, Iowa, laboratory.

Victories have been registered in the battle against two serious livestock diseases—screwworm infestation in cattle in the southeastern United States and vesicular exanthema in hogs.

Success was achieved in the campaign to help wipe out an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, which, had it spread, would have meant incalculable losses for U.S. stockmen.

A new milestone was reached by the Forest Service in 1959 when for the first time 2 billion trees were planted, double the 1958 record.

Timber cut in national forests is at the rate of 8.3 billion board feet, the highest on record. The income from these sales largely offsets the cost of running the national forests.

Progress has been made in reducing forest fire losses and in 1957 were reduced to an alltime low.

The importance of water to farm and city people has been stressed by this administration. The first Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Committee was established and meets regularly to plan for the future.

The internal revenue law was amended to permit farmers and ranchers to deduct from their taxes expenditures made for installing certain soil and water conservation practices.

The rural development program is raising living standards of those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder through the cooperation of the Federal Government and local authorities, and private leadership. Work is progressing in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

The Great Plains conservation program is operating in 422 counties. The long-range purpose is to minimize drought, flood, and wind erosion damage in the Western States once embraced in the Dust Bowl.

The agricultural credit system was made more responsive to farmers' needs. The Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency.

The number of soil conservation districts assisted in 1959 totaled 2,865 compared to 2,493 in 1952. The land of 20 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands is covered by soil conservation districts.

Exports grew from $2.8 billion in 1953 to an alltime high of $4.7 billion in fiscal 1957 and for the past 3 years has averaged about $4 billion per year. It is expected that fiscal 1960 will be the second highest on record.

More than $17 billion worth of food and fiber was moved out of storage and into use at home and abroad in 6 years through aggressive disposal efforts.

In periods of oversupply, 665 million pounds of meat products, poultry, and eggs worth $295 million were bought for the school lunch program, welfare institutions, and needy people. Cattle, hog, poultry, and egg prices were thus bolstered without the Government getting into the meat business.

Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 117 percent since 1953. Much of this has gone into successful research to find new uses for our farm abundance, and to develop new crops for current needs.

Repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery saves farmers $60 million a year.

Farmers in 1954 were benefited by the largest tax reduction in history.

Per capita farm income rose from $838 in 1950 to $960 in 1959.

Twenty-eight million acres of farmland have been taken out of production by the conservation reserve program of the soil bank. These acres would have otherwise added to our surpluses. In addition, participating farmers—while adding to their income—are making unprecedented strides in the conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife resources.

Family type farms received loans totaling $188.5 million in 1959 as compared to $130 million in 1953. Farm ownership loans totaled $64.7 million compared to $29.7 million in 1953.

The Rural Electrification Administration has met the continuous and growing demand for power and telephones, including the growing needs of expanding rural industry. About one-third of all of REA loans have been made since 1953. Over the past 6 years, 800,000 consumers have been added. Electric loans last year were at the level of $177 million; telephone loans at the level of $100 milion.

In recognition of the Nation's mounting need for water conservation, this Department has stressed protection of watersheds. As of November 1, 1959, 210 local watershed projects in 45 States were receiving assistance. Authorizations for planning assistance had been extended to 508 projects in 45 States.

Operation Outdoors was set up to expand family recreational facilities in the national forests. In 1953, 35,403,058 people visited the national forests; in 1959 the number was 81,521,000.

Well administered emergency livestock feed programs have helped farmers and ranchers overcome effects of drought, floods, and other natural disasters.

Approximately $600 million a year has been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953. Such aid enabled families to stay on the land.

The Water Facilities Act was amended to provide for direct and insured loans for certain soil and water conservation activities in all States. Prior to this amendment, the act had applied to the westernmost States only.

In 1959, the Federal Extension Service had 2,253,999 boys and girls enrolled in 92,932 4–H clubs; 11 million families received FES consumer information; 7,475,000 families participated in home demonstration activities, and 7,946,600 families were given advice on agricultural practices—new records being set in all four categories of service.

Farmers Home Administration in 1959 extended $7.5 million in soil and water loans compared to $6.0 million in 1953. It extended $60.7 million in housing loans compared to $19.0 million in 1953.

In 1958, FHA loans in rural development counties increased $3 million over those made in the previous year. In 1959 arrangements were made to more fully meet the needs of part-time farmers.

Producers of dairy products, one of the mainstays of agriculture, received estimated cash receipts of $4,654 million in 1959, an alltime high.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DON PAARLBERG, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, ON THE OCCASION OF THE WINTER PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN FARM ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION—JOINT SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION MEETING

IN SUPPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM POLICY

In this address I wish to make four points:

1. The farm price-support and production-control legislation now on the statute books does not represent the administration's farm policy.

2. The farm policies which this administration does support include many activities other than price support and production control.

3. On the controversial price-support and production-control issue, the needed modifications lie, as embodied in the administration's farm proposals, in the direction of greater opportunity for individual persons to exercise their judgment as to what should be produced and at what price it should be sold.

4. The alternatives to the administration's farm policy are generally lacking in promise.

I now shall take up these points individually.

I

First, let me trace the origin of the farm price-support and production-control legislation we now have, legislation which is generally considered to be unsatisfactory.

In making the flat statement that this legislation is considered unsatisfactory, I wish to acknowledge the good record of the Congress as regards price support and production policy for the majority of our farm products; that is, for commodities other than the so-called basic crops. I want to make clear my view that legislation providing for marketing agreements and orders has generally been helpful, as has legislation authorizing the purchase of surplus farm products and their diversion to the school lunch program and to needy persons. What I am speaking of as unsatisfactory is the mandatory system which requires price support for a few favored commodities at artifically high prices, and couples that support with a halfhearted and ineffective control effort. This is the system which has failed.

I have come to harbor misgivings both with respect to those economists who think they can analyze farm problems without reference to politics, and those politicians who think they can solve farm problems without reference to economics.

The basic legislation with respect to farm price supports and production control was enacted in 1933. This was done in an effort to meet the grave problems of a worldwide depression.

This legislation was clarified and modified in 1938. The major intent of the 1938 act was to give continuing status to the emergency legislation of 1933.

In 1941 and 1942 the Steagall amendment and other legislation were passed. Price supports were raised to a high level during the war emergency and their continuation was assured for 2 years after the war.

In 1948, Congress provided for an adjustment from the wartime level of price supports, but this law was not allowed to go into effect. The next Congress rewrote this law and delayed the date at which it was to become operative, thereby continuing the wartime level of price supports.

In 1954, Congress allowed the 1952 extension to expire, thereby permitting the functioning of legislation previously enacted.

For the 5 years since the congressional elections of 1954, the Congress has been controlled by one party and the executive branch by another. During this period some helpful modifications of the price-support and production-control legislation were enacted, but legislation for most of the so-called basic commodities remains generally similar to the pattern of earlier years.

During 22 of the 26 years encompassed by this legislative history, the Congress was controlled by the party now in the majority. The party now in the minority held congressional responsibility during 1947–48 and again during 1953–54. During the first of these two periods, farm legislation was enacted which a succeeding Congress kept from becoming effective; during the second period legislation was passed which allowed a law enacted by a previous Congress to become operative.

Thus practically all present farm legislation regarding price supports and production controls were written by the party now in the majority. Continued existence of this legislation is tolerated and condoned by the majority party, which has the power to change it.

It is sometimes said that the present Congress cannot enact farm legislation because of the threat of veto exercised by the executive branch. However, no truly remedial legislation has been vetoed, or is likely to be.

It is frequently said that farm policy has been bipartisan. But the effort to place responsibility upon this administration for the shortcomings of farm legislation is certainly a partisan effort, and an unwarranted one.

With respect to farm legislation, the executive branch has two responsibilities. One of these is to administer laws enacted by the Congress. This the present administration has done, and done faithfully. The other responsibility is to recommend legislative changes for the Congress to consider. This the present administration has also done. For 7 years now the administration has been invited by the Congress to make recommendations for improving our farm legislation, and has complied faithfully with these requests.

Some of the administration's recommendations have been heeded. Public Law 480, the basic authority for surplus disposal, was enacted much as recommended. The same is true of the rural development program.

Others of the administration's recommendations were accepted in part, though considerably modified. This was true of the soil bank and the present corn program.

Most of the administration's recommendations have been resisted by the Congress, particularly those having to do with price support levels and production-control policies.

The administration cannot possibly be responsible for legislation which antedated its period of service and emanated from another party.

Existing difficulties with the farm program, and they are many, cannot possibly be the result of legislation which the administration has recommended if such legislation has not been enacted.

Congress cannot divest itself of legislative responsibility. Nor can the executive branch divest itself of its administrative responsibility. Surely the Congress will not accept responsibility for errors of the executive branch in administering our farm laws; nor can the Congress expect the executive branch to accept responsibility for legislative shortcomings.

Almost nobody defends the farm legislation now on the books. The pertinent point is that this legislation was put there by the Congress. If it is to be changed, it must be changed by the Congress.

Present farm legislation does not represent the policies of this administration, as I have endeavored to show. On the contrary, it must represent the farm policies of the majority party, since that party put it on the books and left it there despite having the power to change it.

There is a studied effort to create the illusion that the failure of agricultural adjustment policies is an administrative failure while in reality it is clearly a legislative failure.

If there is a failure to administer our farm laws as enacted by the Congress, this is a matter properly to be laid at the door of the administration, but I do not know of any serious charge of this kind. If there is a failure of the laws themselves, which is the fact, this is a responsibility of the Congress.

There exists a great confusion in the public mind as to the separate responsibilities of the executive and legislative branches of Government. Some Members of the Congress have heightened and exploited this confusion, rather than address themselves to their proper tasks, which is the writing of needed legislation.

II

Having attempted to make clear the fact that present legislation does not represent the administration's farm program, I shall now indicate what actually constitutes the administration's farm program. There is support for activities in eight different areas; there are recommended changes in one.

First, there are the historic services that concern the development of human resources, among them education, research, and the supplying of needed information.

Second, I name the rural development program, by means of which we endeavor to open wider the doors of opportunity for the 1½ million rural families with very low incomes.

Third, I would name the development of natural resources and their intelligent use, including the conservation reserve, various land-use programs, the activities of the Forest Service and related matters.

Fourth, is market building, which relates to consumer education at home, market development abroad, and research to discover new uses.

Fifth, I shall list surplus disposal, those activities which move into use, through special programs, our heavy Government stocks of farm products.

Sixth, are the credit programs, intended to meet a variety of needs, written for varying periods of time.

Seventh, there are regulatory activities to insure the wholesomeness of the food supply, the proper functioning of the commodity exchanges and similar activities.

Eighth, there are the marketing orders and agreements, the purchase and diversion of surplus products to the school lunch program, and the authority to support prices of the great majority of farm products at levels discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Ninth, for the problem crops, particularly wheat, legislative changes are proposed which move in the direction of greater freedom to plant and less interference with market forces.

Some of these activities were launched by this administration. Others originated earlier. All have administration support. It is clear that the administration's farm program is a broad one, encompassing many areas of service rather than one.

There is general agreement on the appropriateness of the first eight of the services I have listed. Despite occasional friction regarding one or another, they have been the cause of relatively little cleavage between the executive and the legislative branches, or between the two political parties.

Greatest interest has centered on the last of my listed categories, the one having to do with price support programs for the so-called basic crops. The six crops designated by legislative fiat as basic bring in only about 20 percent of the farm income. But they account for 85 percent of the Federal inventory of price supported commodities and for about 95 percent of the controversy. The remaining income, surplus stocks and controversy are distributed among some 250 farm products which have not been designated as basic.

In its recommendations regarding price and production policies, the administration has not been doctrinaire, though it has often been charged with being so. Alternative recommendations have been made. The administration has indicated that it viewed with favor the relation of price support levels to appropriate parity standards, if the Congress should so prefer. Or, if desired, supports could be linked to market prices of the immediately preceding years. Or, should the Congress wish, the Secretary of Agriculture has indicated that he would himself bear responsibility for establishing support levels in accordance with general criteria.

With respect to production controls, the administration has likewise avoided a doctrinaire position. A willingness has been expressed to support action by the Congress which would liberalize acreage allotments, eliminate them altogether, or to have the farmers choose between alternative programs. There has been an expressed willingness to administer a program of tightened allotments if the Congress should insist on keeping price supports at a high incentive level.

Throughout there has been this one important and consistent recommendation: That price support objectives be reasonably related to production policy. If price supports for wheat are to be held at a high level, Secretary Benson said a year ago, then strict production controls must be imposed. If price incentives are reduced, then a less restrictive production policy can be followed. The administration indicated its clear favor for the liberal as compared with the restrictive route.

The one thing the administration has consistently resisted is high price supports coupled with flimsy production controls—running the vehicle with the throttle wide open and without brakes.

III

Much of the controversy regarding farm policy springs from failure to distinguish between equity and workability. Both of these are important. No farm policy can succeed unless it takes account of both.

Let me state some appropriate considerations of equity:

1. Farmers, who are exposed to unusual economic and natural hazards, are entitled to the help of Government as a cushion against unfortunate events which they cannot well avert through individual or organized action.

2. The cause of equity is not served by programs which aggravate the disparity of income within agriculture while endeavoring to reduce the disparity of income as between farmers and other occupational groups.

3. A man's role as a citizen takes priority over his role as a member of an occupational group. It is not equitable to do violence to his rights as a citizen, or to the rights of other citizens, in an effort to improve the position of his group.

4. Equity does not lie in the equal treatment of unequals.

Within the stated conditions of equity, there are workable farm programs. There is a substantial area within which equity and workability overlap. The administration's farm policies are within this area.

Equity, like workability, is a necessary but not a sufficient criterion for success. Some programs are advocated as equitable, but are not workable and are of no service to agriculture. Other programs may appear to be workable in a harsh and callous sense, but do not meet the standards of equity which prevail in the mid-20th century; they will not be tolerated.

I wish to discuss the workability of farm programs, a matter which is the primary province of agricultural economists.

Here we run head on into the fundamentals of demand, supply, and price. I shall state what seems to me to be the present state of professional knowledge on these points. If this seems elementary to you, I ask only that you note the grave difficulties that farm programs have come to by overlooking the fundamentals.

The law of demand is that, other things equal, an increase in price will result in a reduction in the quantity demanded; a decrease in price will result in an increase in the quantity demanded. I know of no exceptions to this law in the agricultural field.

Statistical evidence is very strong that for most farm products, in the short run, and with other things equal, a given increase in price is accompanied by less than a proportional reduction in the amount demanded. Thus, in the short run, a short supply will usually bring in a larger-than-average gross income.

The unchallenged statistical demonstration of this fact is the vision which has led to the production-control and price-support legislation now on the statute books.

But this vision, so clear in the short run, is proving in the long run to have been a mirage.

In the long run—and the long-run effect has been subjected to much less study—the relationship of price and quantity is far different from what it is in the short run. Over time and for many farm commodities, a given boost in price results in more than an equivalent reduction in the quantity demanded. Thus, in the long run and for many farm commodities, other things equal, a high price means a lower gross income to the seller.

The difference between the short-run and the long-run effect of a price increase is that over a period of time the buyer can find or develop substitute products or sources of supply. In the case of cotton, a price supported continuously and substantially above market levels has greatly stimulated the use of manmade fibers, and greatly stimulated the production of cotton abroad. During a quarter century of price support, the share of our farm income earned by cotton fell from 12 percent to 7 percent.

During the 5 years prior to the inauguration of price support and production control, the 6 basic crops brought in 21 percent of our farm income. After 25 years of controls and supports, after expenditures of many billions of dollars and the utterance of many millions of contentious words, these same basic crops still brought in only 21 percent of farm income, and a goodly share of this 21 percent was from sales to the Government.

It might be argued that in a free country, if a group of people wish to sacrifice the future to the present, that should be their prerogative. But at least they should know the result of what they are doing. And economists, who by their professional competence have this knowledge, should tell them.

Confusion with respect to the law of demand has made grave trouble for farm programs. But confusion with respect to the law of supply has led us even more deeply into trouble.

The law of supply is that if price is increased, other things being equal, a greater quantity will be offered. And if price is reduced, other things being equal, a smaller quantity will be offered.

This law is challenged by many persons. The statement is made that if price is reduced, farmers will increase production in order to offset the decline in income.

There undoubtedly are some individual farmers, with very limited alternatives, who react to some extent in this manner. But this is not true of farmers as a group.

I have studied all the research on this subject which I have been able to find. This includes the work of Bean, Black, Kohls, Moore, Nerlove, Pearson, Pubols, Warren, Wells, and others. Thus far I have not been able to discover any competent piece of work which shows the perverse relationship so often alleged to exist.

Some Members of the Congress say that a price decline results in an increase in production. Yet when these gentlemen decided that fewer potatoes were needed, they properly allowed the price to decline. When they wanted an increase in production, as during the war, they properly raised prices. As recently as 1958 they extended the National Wool Act, the stated purpose of which is to stimulate production; the means by which this is to be accomplished is through offering increased prices. By their deeds Members of the Congress recognized the economic facts of life as related to the law of supply.

Recently there has been some loose economic thinking with respect to changes in corn acreage. The statement is made that price supports were dropped and farmers increased their acreage in order to maintain their incomes. The truth is that price supports were dropped for about 14 percent of the corn farmers, those few who had previously complied with their corn allotments. Supports were increased for the other 86 percent of the farmers. Farmers reacted in a perfectly normal and predictable manner. With price supports raised, with the corn acreage reserve program and corn acreage allotments abandoned, and with price supports for alternative feed grains reduced, a jump in corn acreage was practically certain. Farmers reacted in conformity with the law of supply.

Those who claim that farmers as a group increase production when price declines postulate a perverse and irrational situation. If farmers actually behave in this manner, crop acreage and livestock production are incapable of reaching or approaching equilibrium, and must, therefore, be subjected to strict Government control or catastrophe will occur. Those who deny the validity of the law of supply are left without any explanation for the generally rational behavior of farmers who produce the unregulated crops and livestock products. Nor do they have an explanation for the generally rational behavior of farmers who produced wheat and corn and cotton during the centuries which preceded acreage control.

The fundamental laws of economics are these: Other things being equal, as price rises, the quantity which will be produced increases and the quantity which will be purchased decreases. The Congress has not been able, in 25 years of effort, to set aside these laws.

I said these laws operate with "other things equal." But other things have not been equal. The special factor which has modified the operation of these laws has been the technological revolution in agriculture; this revolution has caused artificially supported prices to generate even greater surpluses than would otherwise have been the case.

The longrun consequences of artificially supported prices have set in. Supply has been increased, buyers have turned to alternative sources, markets have been lost, and farm incomes have been reduced.

If there is to be a better balance within agriculture, inducements for excess production must be diminished and pricing policy must allow farmers to regain markets.

Some people say that the solution lies in the direction of stiff controls. For 25 years the Nation has been building up a history of experience with controls. The evidence is that the Congress will not enact, the executive branch cannot enforce and the farmers will not accept the kind of production controls which would be necessary to balance production and consumption at the price objectives customarily cited by those who advocate the strict controls.

If, with supplies as heavy and costs as great as they have been in recent years, stiff production controls could not be enacted, how likely is it that tough controls will ever be invoked?

Until someone develops evidence of a substantial change from the pattern of the last quarter century in political behavior and in American mores, this history must stand as an insurmountable refutation to those who advocate stiff production controls as a way out.

As we said before, we are in the midst of a technological revolution in agriculture. The need is to reap for society whatever gains this revolution may bestow, and to cushion its impact when it deals harshly with individuals and groups. Farm legislation has concentrated more on the problems of this technological revolution than on its opportunities. As a nation we have been problem prone rather than opportunity oriented.

Our rapid scientific advance has lightened the toil, lifted the level of living, and broadened the horizon for our farm people, and holds hope for a hungry world. This is good, not bad. To extract the most good from this revolution, and to be in a position to ward off its sharpest blows, individual persons should themselves have a substantial role in price-determination and in resource allocation. The rapid changes which are under way call for a greater adjustment capability than is present under parity formula or a historically based acreage allotment.

The heart of the administration's farm policy is faith that individual farmers, with appropriate services provided for them by private and public agencies, will be able to make wise allocation of their resources—decisions that are advantageous to them personally and are in the public interest.

A technological revolution calls for the use of all the intelligence that is available. In the practical experience of 4½ million farmers there is a great reservoir of intelligence and sound judgment. A major purpose of the administration's farm policy is to tap this reservoir.

The services I mentioned earlier are of great help in improving the caliber of individual decisions. Public programs can serve the national interest better by helping to improve the caliber of individual decisions than by substituting Government edicts for private judgment.

At the bottom of the income scale are 1½ million rural families who receive, from all sources, less than $1,000 a year. In terms of genuine need, this is the real problem. These people have been almost untouched by price-support and production-control programs. The technological revolution has largely passed them by. They do not contribute as much as they should or as much as they would like to the national production of goods and services. The administration's rural development program is addressed to this problem. It needs greater understanding, wider support, and more funds.

The administration's food-for-peace program is an effort to use our abundant capacity for food production in support of the foreign policy of the United States. This is done chiefly through Public Law 480, the chief legislative authority for surplus disposal. During this past fiscal year, well over a billion dollars worth of American farm products moved abroad under our special export programs. Some of these programs are new, unique and unorthodox. They are not described in the standard texts on international trade. They have grown up out of necessity because our stocks were heavy and because dollars weren't available in the countries which needed our products. This program serves the needs of our friends abroad and relieves our heavy supply position. It is my feeling that Public Law 480, which has been considered by some as a province for idealists and temporizers, might better be considered as subject matter for hardheaded realists.

This then, restated in summary form, is the farm policy of this administration:

For the farmers who produce the bulk of our food and fiber: a liberal production policy coupled with modest price objectives.

For rural people in areas of low income: services which will open wider the doors of opportunity both within agriculture and for off-farm employment.

For all farm people: services to improve the caliber of individual decisions.

For this generation and the next: land-use programs intended for wiser use of our national resources.

In the broad public interest: wide dissemination of the fruits of the technological revolution, to our own citizens and in the service of American foreign policy.

IV

What are the alternatives to the adoption of some such policy as I have outlined?

Continuation of the present program? Clearly the public patience will not tolerate indefinitely the heavy cost and the growing stocks which result from the laws we now have.

Stand by and allow the present program to collapse of its own weight? This would be a sadistic remedy. If the present program should collapse, with the mountainous stocks now on hand, prices of wheat and corn and cotton would be carried to disastrous levels. After having been insulated for 25 years from the rough and tumble of the marketplace, these crops can hardly quickly be tossed, unprotected, to the not-so-tender mercy of a completely competitive climate. We cannot regain overnight markets which we have been losing for a quarter of a century. Government has piled up the present stocks and is responsible for some of the present dislocations. Government cannot walk off and expect farm people to pick up the pieces.

Shall we apply marketing orders or some similar technique to additional crops and livestock products? Programs which have worked tolerably well for specialty crops in concentrated areas of production, marketed through a limited number of well-defined channels, cannot easily be extended to crops grown generally in diversified areas, moving to market in many forms and through many agencies. The so-called self-help plans thus far offered involve substantial Government financing and responsibility. And it is not clear that Government, while retaining responsibility for the domestic and foreign consequences of these plans, can legitimately delegate price and production authority to commodity groups. Nor can commodity groups avert the laws of demand and of supply which have brought Government price-support production-control programs to their present difficult state.

Should we enact two-price plans or domestic parity plans? If we do we institutionalize a wedge between the domestic and the foreign price, we set up Government machinery for the transfer of added special moneys from the eaters of food to the producers of food, and we set one faction of agriculture against another.

Shall we adopt production payments, or deficiency payments, or compensatory payments? Let us remember that the sole use to which this device has thus far been put has been the role of stimulating production, a consequence we do not want. Consider the likelihood that the Congress would dependably and consistently provide an annual appropriation running into many billions of dollars, to be paid directly and visibly to a vocational group which numbers only 10 percent of the voting population. And let us think of what might happen to the market price, and hence to public cost, if an unsupported market is asked to move not only the abundant production of our present farm plant but also the added amount induced by a Government payment.

There is, as I said earlier, a substantial area within which the separate disciplines of equity and workability overlap. Within this area the administration's farm policies will be found. These policies will not satisfy those with their own special definitions of equity, or those who ignore the practical problem of workability. Nor will they satisfy those who see an opportunity to make "workable" some program which violates individual rights.

Whether the administration's farm policies will satisfy a sufficient number of persons to permit corrective early legislation remains to be seen. Whatever time schedule the fates may hold, the day is gradually drawing nearer when farm legislation will be rewritten. It would be better to do this before the public patience is exhausted; it would be better to write new farm legislation in a climate of reason than with the attitude of resentment which further postponement would bring about.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580), the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is the pending business.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it be in order for me to offer a perfecting amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may do so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I offer an amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that an amendment to the Anderson amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; it is to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then it would not be in order unless it were to the pending Anderson amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is not the Anderson amendment a substitute for the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that case, I shall withhold the amendment temporarily, but I should like to be recognized to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to what I regard as one of the most important and least publicized sections of the bill, namely, section 211, which is entitled "Increase in the Earned Income Limitation," and which appears at page 100 of the bill reported by the committee. This paragraph would permit persons between the ages of 65 and 72 to increase the amount of their earnings from $1,200 to $1,800 without forfeiting their entitlement to social security benefits.

I have long advocated amending the Social Security Act to this effect. In fact, I first introduced such a proposal on January 7, 1957, the bill being known as S. 699. While several other bills were also introduced during that session to increase the annual test of earnings, my bill appears to have been the first to propose an increase to the $1,800 figure which is included in the committee bill.

I again introduced such a bill at the beginning of this Congress, and it is known as S. 638. Therefore, I take some small pride in having had a role in initiating this particular amendment, even though I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the portion of the committee bill which appears at page 100 of the present committee bill, and is entitled "Increase in the Earned Income Limitation," being lines 14 through 24 of section 211.

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

INCREASE IN THE EARNED INCOME LIMITATION

SEC. 211. (a)(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection 203(e) of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800", and (2) such paragraphs and paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of such section are each amended by striking out "$100 times" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$150 times".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after 1960.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of S. 699, of the first session of the 85th Congress, which I introduced on January 17, 1957, being the legislative day of January 3, 1957.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (e) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800", and (2) such paragraphs and paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of such section are amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after the month in which this Act is enacted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of S. 638, which I introduced on January 23, 1959, during the first session of the present—the 86th—Congress.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (e)

of section 203 of the Social Security Act are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800", and (2) such paragraphs and paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of such section are amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after the month in which this Act is enacted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it will be evident that the text of the two bills which I introduced in the opening days of both the 85th Congress and 86th Congress is identical with the substitute provisions of section 211 of the bill now reported by the committee.

It has been said that some 600,000 persons over the age of 65 will be affected by the proposed change. The impact of the bill upon my own State of South Dakota can only be estimated in terms of the overall figures. However, based upon the fact that South Dakota has a somewhat larger percentage of its total population in the age group of 65 and over than has the Nation as a whole, it seems to me probable that there should be approximately 22,500 persons in South Dakota who would profit by this increase in earnings which is permitted.

When the Social Security Act was passed in 1935, Congress, upon the advice of the Economic Security Council, included a provision excluding from benefits persons who were gainfully employed. Just how this was to be defined was not specified, but a major purpose of the provision was clear: it was to encourage older persons to get out of the labor market and make way for young workers.

Today we no longer have that purpose. On the contrary, the Federal Government is now spending millions of dollars each year trying to help those older persons who are able and willing to continue as active, working contributors to our country's welfare.

In this situation the present, absurdly low $1,200 limitation on earnings under social security is an anomaly. Little wonder that our aging citizens tend to develop bad cases of cynicism long before they reach senility. They hear the Government saying to them in one voice: "Please work if you can, we need your skills, your talents, your experience, and wisdom." But in a slightly louder voice—the voice of the law—they hear: "Certainly, you can work. But don't work much, or earn much, or you won't receive a penny of those social security benefits you have been counting on."

Mr. President, the limitation on earnings was set at $1,200 in 1954. Many persons thought it was too low then; and, as I have previously set forth, I introduced bills, in January of 1957, and again in January of 1959, to do exactly what section 211 of this bill now proposes to do. In view of the wage and the price levels which exist in this country today, the $1,200 limitation on earnings is certainly too low now; and there should be general support for the provision to increase the limitation to $1,800, as included in the bill reported by the Finance Committee.

This increase will not eliminate the inequities of the retirement test; but it will alleviate them. In general, under present law, a worker begins to lose benefits when he earns more than $1,200 annually. When he earns as much as $2,080, he is subject to the loss of all of them. Under the proposed amendment, social security beneficiaries will be able to earn a more respectable $2,680 a year before losing all benefits. There will then unquestionably be more incentive for persons to keep on working after they reach retirement age.

Mr. President, recently, when I was at home during the recess of Congress, I had this hardship of the present law brought very forcefully to my attention when I visited an old friend, a No. 1 carpenter; in fact, he is a cabinetmaker. He was called on to do some work for a person in my home town of Custer. My cabinetmaker friend found that by the time he had gotten the rough part of the work well under way, he had reached the earnings limitation provided by the law. But at that point he was reaching the part of the work where his skill as a cabinetmaker was definitely called for. As a result, at that intricate point in the work, my cabinetmaker friend either had to turn the job over to another worker or had to abandon the work for the time being; and in the latter case, the man who was having the work done would have had to wait until the next calendar year began. Certainly, it seems ridiculous that a skilled cabinetmaker would have to do that. I told him that we had pending legislation to correct such a situation; and he certainly hoped it would be enacted. And I hope it will be, too.

All of us are aware of how expensive it is simply to provide for necessities, these days. It seems incredible, therefore, that we tell an older worker that when he earns $2,080 a year, we will cut off all his benefits, because theoretically he is not retired and does not need them.

Let us use this $2,080 amount and build up a hypothetical example. Let us say that both the worker and his wife are over age 65, and that this income is subject to no income taxes, either Federal or State, but is, however, subject to the 3-percent social security tax on earnings. They start out with $173.33 a month, from which is deducted $5.20 for social security. We allow them $60 a month for housing, another $60 for food—a very modest amount, I may say—$11 each for medical and dental care, and $10 each for clothing and personal needs. I am not saying these amounts are really adequate; but with care and luck, and perhaps with a garden, they might be enough to get along on.

But where is our couple now? They have already accounted for $162 for bare necessities. They have left, only $6.13, which they must divide among costs for transportation, church contributions, postage stamps, light bulbs, reading matter, and the like. I think that balancing this budget might be a job which even our Bureau of the Budget would be loath to tackle.

When Congress assumed the responsibility of establishing an earnings limitation, I believe it also assumed the responsibility of gearing it, and keeping it geared, to our economy as a whole. Since the $1,200 earnings limitation was set, however, wages have increased by about 20 percent. Personal income in the United States increased a total of 6 percent, in the 1 year between 1958 and 1959. We do not, I am sure, begrudge these increases, and the improvement in well-being that they entail, to our people. But we are by law begrudging our social security beneficiaries similar improvements in their well-being, by neglecting to increase a wage limitation that is wholly out of keeping with economic realities.

In other words, in effect we are saying to the social security beneficiaries, "You cannot increase your earnings in keeping with the increased earnings of the economy as a whole."

For the older worker concerned, the low-retirement-test provision can entail some very unpleasant alternatives. He may feel forced to restrict his work activities. Worse, he may offer his services for substandard wages; or he may seek a floor-sweeping job, rather than the office job he is capable of performing, simply to keep his earnings low. Any of these alternatives means frustration for the individual, and waste for society as it does in the specific case of the cabinetmaker-carpenter to whom I previously referred.

Earlier I referred to the fact that an estimated 600,000 workers would benefit immediately from the $600 increase in the retirement test provided in the committee bill. This could be argument enough for adopting the proposal. But this proposal is one of national benefit, not only individual benefit.

Our national strength is directly tied to the strength of our people. Our country's productivity is dependent upon the productivity of each of our workers. If a person can work more, produce more, earn more, he should be encouraged to do so, and not simply be told that he must "go on the shelf."

There is, I am happy to observe, strong congressional and public support for changing the present retirement test. In the neighborhood of 100 bills which would affect the existing provision have been introduced in the House and in the Senate. Some of these bills would eliminate the retirement test altogether. Most of them, taking into recognition the very high cost of such a step, provide only for an increase.

Not long ago, a cross section of American adults of all ages were questioned by Gallup poll reporters on the subject of the retirement test. Sixty-seven percent said they thought the law should be changed. Only 23 percent were in favor of keeping it in its present form.

Every Member of Congress must have received, as I have, hundreds of letters, urging us to do something to correct a law which most of our older people regard as unjust, ridiculous, and unsound in principle.

Public opinion is strongly behind the proposed action; and, as a noted American author of the 19th century observed:

Public opinion is stronger than the legislature, and nearly as strong as the Ten Commandments.

No one, I suggest, knows this better than do the Members of Congress.

Our actions should, and must, be guided by the great American public. The needs of our people must not be violated by law.

The Social Security Act was enacted to meet obvious need. In the 25 years of its existence, Congress has seen fit to amend it in many ways, to meet the new and changing demands of a dynamic society.

Now, as in 1939, 1950, 1952, and 1954, it is necessary to bring the retirement test provisions up to date to meet the needs of our older people who are eager for an opportunity to help themselves, their families, and their country. I sincerely hope that, whatever other changes may be made in the pending bill, the proposal of the Finance Committee to let people in ages between 65 and 72 help themselves will survive.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his active interest in an amendment, which was adopted unanimously by the Finance Committee, which would permit an increase in earnings from $1,200 to $1,800 a year as the exempt wages of those who are on social security payments. I think there was a general feeling in committee that this was not only a timely amendment, but that it was needed.

There was considerable discussion of increasing the amount from $1,200 to $1,800. The committee also voted on removing any limitation on the amount a person could earn. After voting on varying amounts, the committee unanimously agreed that $1,800 was the point where we ought to stop.

I had the pleasure and privilege of offering that provision, which was adopted, which increased the exemption from $1,200 to $1,800. I think the Senate should be very careful about increasing the amount. As a matter of fact, I am hopeful we can hold it in conference, because this proposal is going to cost the fund $400 million. The figure of $2,400 a year was suggested. If my memory serves me correctly, that exemption would cost $1 billion. It is very important that we keep the fund actuarially strong, or as strong as possible. Therefore, we cannot accept a higher figure without giving consideration to an increase in the rates to be contributed.

As a matter of fact, in considering the proposals, thought was given to the possibility of an additional increase in the tax both on the employer and employee. So it is one of the considerations we must keep in mind in dealing with this question.

I commend the Senator from South Dakota, because he has had a very active interest in this question for many years. It is an amendment we are happy about and hope to see become law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate very much the kind remarks of the Senator from Kansas. I am interested in his report that this particular proposed change in the law was supported unanimously by the Committee on Finance. I also find a little personal gratification, I suppose, in the fact that the figure which was proposed in the motion made by the Senator from Kansas, namely, $1,800, happens to be identical with the figure which I proposed in a bill which I introduced in January 1957, and again in January 1959.

I recognize that this bill, like most proposed legislation, and particularly measures dealing with figures like these, has the complication, which the Senator from Kansas has mentioned, of the impact on the Treasury, and, in turn, the impact on other related taxes, income taxes, and so forth. It evidences how complicated legislation is, particularly in the field of revenue.

However, to have the figure of $1,800 be the magic figure, so to speak, and to win the unanimous vote of the Committee on Finance, gives me a little comfort, because that was the figure I used in the two bills which I introduced, as I said, in January, at the opening of the 85th Congress, in 1957, and again in 1959, at the opening of this Congress.

I merely wish to add that I have thought possibly some of the estimates of the Treasury were a little bit on the pessimistic side as to the effect of any change on the Treasury. Actually, especially when it is proposed to enter the field of medical aid, it seems to me it is entirely possible that there will be some savings to the Treasury by reason of the fact that if people between the ages of 65 and 72 are able to increase their own earnings, their call upon the medical aid program which may be established will be lessened thereby.

I am sure most people between the ages of 65 and 72 who are able to earn the money necessary to meet their medical costs would rather provide for it themselves than call upon a cooperative plan of the Federal and State treasuries to supply that aid as a grant, or something of that kind.

So from every standpoint, Mr. President, it seems to me this particular change in the present law, namely, to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the amount of earnings permitted as the retirement test, is justified; and I hope that section 211 as proposed in the bill will survive both action on the floor of the Senate and the conference between the Senate and the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11666), making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BOW, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 7263. An act for the relief of Edward Ketchum; and

H.R. 8860. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes.

POLITICAL PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am concerned with the significance which a considerable number of people attach to political polls. It is because so many people think they are important that they have become an unduly significant factor in our national politics.

This undue influence, as I see it, is the only really important fact about political public opinion polls. But this is important. It is important because our democratic processes are involved, and to some extent prejudiced.

Insofar as accuracy in depiction or prediction of the way the mass of our people will vote in a national election is concerned, I consider most of the political polls, including the Gallup poll, as almost meaningless and in many instances misleading. This conclusion is the result of considerable observation and study over a period of 6 months.

Yet I found some Republicans quite gleeful and some Democrats virtually wringing their hands when the Gallup poll published August 17, 1960, showed Senator KENNEDY trailing Vice President NIXON 50 percent to 44 percent. I think such an influence is entirely unjustified, and to the extent that it affects or may affect the judgment of the people or the attitudes of our leaders, it is a disservice to our elective process to attach such importance—indeed, any measurable importance—to such a political poll.

The public statements of Senator KENNEDY's press secretary, Mr. Pierre Salinger, tend to give the poll some credence. He is quoted as saying:

Polls are not an absolute science; they are an indication.

With respect to Senator KENNEDY, Mr. Salinger added, "He's been behind before."

Now, whether Senator KENNEDY is behind or out in front cannot be proven by the meager Gallup sample.

I say meager because, in a letter to me on January 3, 1960, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dr. Gallup wrote:

Our national sampling unit is made up of 1,500 adults.

Now, this amounts to less than two hundredths of 1 percent of the adult citizens of the United States, and, for example, about 1 person, man or woman, well- or ill-informed, in every third county in Tennessee.

It is interesting that Mr. Gallup would find only 6 percent of the people undecided this far from election day. This is particularly interesting in view of the fact that on November 3, 1952—one day before election day—Dr. Gallup showed 13 percent of the people undecided. Now, I have no national poll to prove how many people are now undecided as to how they will ultimately vote in November, but I venture the suggestion that 16 percent or even 26 percent would be more realistic than 6 percent at this date. Indeed, I am reliably informed that another recent poll taken since the two political conventions with a considerably larger sample than Dr. Gallup's meager 1,500, showed 24 percent undecided.

I read a column written by Mr. Joseph Alsop, published in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, in which it was reported that the number of people polled who were tabulated in Dr. Gallup's poll was actually nearer 1,300 than 1,500.

Incidentally, Dr. Gallup has a remarkable record of inaccurate prediction. As an example, I should like to read the first four paragraphs of a column written by George Gallup appearing on the front page of the Washington Post on November 3, 1952. The headline is "Nip-and-Tuck Race Tuesday Indicated in Final Survey":

PRINCETON, N.J., November 2.—Final poll results, based upon interviewing through Thursday, show Dwight D. Eisenhower and Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson coming down the homestretch in a tight race for the popular vote majority.

That is quite a prediction, is it not, Mr. President? In his letter to me Dr. Gallup claimed he predicted the Eisenhower victory in 1952. Let us see what he said. He said:

They were: * * * coming down the homestretch in a tight race for the popular vote majority.

Latest figures show the race has narrowed since the last report. Continuation or acceleration of the trend to Stevenson, reported in earlier surveys, would give him a majority of the popular vote on election day.

This is his prediction of the Eisenhower victory. I continue to read:

The electoral vote, which will decide the winner, depends upon four key States—New York, Illinois, Ohio, and California—where latest figures show the candidates running virtually even.

His latest figures, according to the column, indicated the candidates were running virtually even in New York, in Illinois, in Ohio, and in California. When the real poll was taken the next day General Eisenhower received 59½ percent of the total of Eisenhower and Stevenson votes in New York and Governor Stevenson received 40½ percent. In Illinois General Eisenhower received 55 percent and Stevenson 45 percent. In Ohio Eisenhower received 56.8 percent and Stevenson received 43.2 percent. In California Eisenhower received 56.9 percent and Stevenson 43.1 percent. This was the real poll.

I have read from the column and the poll by which Dr. Gallup claims he predicted the Eisenhower victory. If Senators can find such a prediction in it, I shall be pleased for one of them to point it out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I correctly understand the Senator's point, he is saying that not only was the Gallup poll incorrect in 1948, but also in 1952, only 4 years later, after the pollsters had undertaken to correct the mistakes which were apparent in 1948. Dr. Gallup predicted a nip-and-tuck race, pinpointing the four major States, and insofar as the general experience in those States was concerned the victory was a landslide victory on that occasion for President Eisenhower.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Four years previous the poll had predicted a landslide for Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Truman was elected?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. Despite this, many people continue to attach great importance to the Gallup poll. I think it is wholly unjustified. It is virtually meaningless.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps the significance of what the Senator has said about the Gallup poll in regard to 6 percent of the people being undecided, may be missed. I have known of many polls taken in the State of Louisiana, which had a larger sampling in the State than the Gallup poll has nationwide. In other words, I have seen polls taken in regard to elections with some 1,000 or 1,500 people sampled in the State of Louisiana alone. The coverage would be 50 times as close as Dr. Gallup was able to arrange.

Mr. GORE. It would be 50 times as great.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I refer to a State which has less than 2 percent of the national population. Almost as many people were polled as Dr. Gallup has polled over the entire Nation. Therefore, the population was covered 50 times as closely, we might say, as the Gallup poll covers the United States, by simply polling 1,500 people nationwide.

About 3 or 4 months previous to an election it is rather typical to find an undecided factor of about 26 percent. That is somewhat normal. My guess is that if Dr. Gallup had been in a position to poll more closely and had placed in doubt those who were really in doubt, he would have come up at this stage with a showing of around 20 to 30 percent of the persons undecided as to how they will vote. It is ridiculous to say that only 6 percent of the people at this time are "undecided." I can assure anyone that such a result would be ridiculous in Louisiana at this time.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator that it is ridiculous. In my opinion, if any further evidence were needed to discredit the validity or importance of the poll, this should be it. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this column entitled "Nip-and-Tuck Race Tuesday Indicated in Final Survey," may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Republican chances rest primarily on Eisenhower's personal popularity and on the fact that he runs ahead of his party nationally, as shown by the vote on the institute's two barometers of political sentiment.

1. The final result on the candidate barometer question, before taking account of the probable behavior of undecided voters, is:

"If the presidential election were being held today, which candidate would you vote for—Stevenson, the Democratic candidate, or Eisenhower, the Republican candidate?"

	Percent
Eisenhower	47
Stevenson	40
Undecided	13

The group of voters who are undecided or unwilling to state their preference contains more Democrats than Republicans this year, as in earlier presidential races.

Postelection analysis of the 1944 dates shows that this group divided 68 percent Democratic, 32 percent Republican, or a ratio of about 2 to 1. In 1948, the undecided group divided about 75 percent Democratic, 25 percent Republican, or a ratio of 3 to 1.

Assuming a 2-to-1 Democratic split this year in the undecided vote, the results become:

	Percent
Eisenhower	51
Stevenson	49

Assuming a 3-to-1 Democratic split, the figures become:

	Percent
Eisenhower	50
Stevenson	50

2. Traditionally, polls have always been taken by asking voters their preference between the candidates. This year, because Eisenhower was much better known than Stevenson at the start, the institute in August adopted a second barometer. This second question was designed to take basic party loyalties into greater account. The expectation was that the vote on the two barometer questions would be identical by election day, but this has not occurred. The party barometer question and the final vote before taking the undecided into account follow:

"If the presidential election were being held today, which political party would you like to see win—the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?"

	Percent
Republican Party	45
Democratic Party	44
Undecided	11

Assuming that the undecided and noncommittal voters divide on a 2-to-1 basis, the figures become:

	Percent
Democratic	51
Republican	49

Assuming that the undecided and noncommittal voters divide on a 3-to-1 basis, the figures become:

	Percent
Democratic	52
Republican	48

Up to October 12 the Republicans were ahead on both barometer questions. Then the Democratic Party took the lead on the party barometer question after the undecided were allocated, while Ike continued to run ahead on the candidate question, though by a steadily declining margin.

Weighing the results shown in the three tables on each barometer question, the evidence points to the following conclusions:

Eisenhower has the advantage with voters who have made up their minds on how they will vote. He runs two points ahead of his party. Republican hopes rest primarily on his personal popularity as shown in the candidate barometer results.

Stevenson's chances depend on winning at least a 3-to-1 ratio of the undecided or noncommittal votes, as Truman was able to do in the closing days of the 1948 campaign.

In order to win, Eisenhower must halt or reverse the present Stevenson trend and maintain his narrow margin in the crucial States.

As compared with 1948, Republican gains will be smallest in the big industrial States. Eisenhower's gains over 1948 will be greatest in the South, in the farm States of the Middle West, and in the Mountain States.

Estimators of electoral votes never overlook the fact that a modest majority in popular votes can produce a commanding electoral lead. For example, in 1948 Truman carried Ohio, Illinois, and California, with 78 electoral votes, with a plurality of only 70,000 votes in all 3 States combined.

Estimates of how sentiment was dividing on the major parties in 10 key pivotal States up to last week follow:

[In percent]

	Eisenhower	Stevenson
Massachusetts	48	52
New York	50	50
California	51	49
Pennsylvania	52	48
Illinois	51	49
Michigan	52	48
Missouri	47	53
Ohio	51	49
New Jersey	54	46
Indiana	53	47

All figures reported above are subject to a normal margin of error. This has averaged 3 to 4 percentage points in past elections. All figures apply to the popular vote only, not to the electoral vote. They also reflect civilian opinion, not soldier opinion. Minor parties poll approximately 1 percent.

[Final Gallup Poll estimates in the 1948 election divided the popular vote as follows: Dewey 49.5 percent, Truman 44.5 percent, Thurmond 2 percent and Wallace 4 percent. Percentages in the actual vote were: Dewey 45.1, Truman 49.5, Thurmond 2.4 and Wallace 2.4.—Editor's note.]

FINAL POLL FIGURES AT GLANCE

Question: "If the presidential election were being held today, which candidate would you vote for—Stevenson, the Democratic candidate, or Eisenhower, the Republican candidate?"

Candidate preference:	Percent
Eisenhower	47
Stevenson	40
Undecided	13
	100

Allocating undecided 2-to-1 Democratic:	
Eisenhower	51
Stevenson	49
	100

Allocating undecided 3-to-1 Democratic:	
Eisenhower	50
Stevenson	50
	100

Question: "If the presidential election were being held today, which political party would you like to see win—the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?"

Party preference:	Percent
Republican	45
Democratic	44
Undecided	11
	100

Allocating undecided 2-to-1 Democratic:	
Democratic	51
Republican	49
	100

Allocating undecided 3-to-1 Democratic:	
Democratic	52
Republican	48
	100

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to engage in a little more colloquy with him?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My experience in public affairs has been that even in connection with a well-taken poll, in which a relatively high percentage of people are polled, such as the polls to which I have referred that have a coverage of 50 to 100 times as thorough as Dr. Gallup undertakes to achieve, I would nevertheless insist that there must be a margin of error to be expected. A somewhat standard margin would appear to be about 10 percent. With such margin, if the poll predicted that one would get 50 percent of the votes, he might get as high as 55 percent or he might get as low as 45 percent.

Mr. GORE. Which would mean the difference between a landslide victory and an ignominious defeat.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It could very well be.

Mr. GORE. Then, there is 1948, when all the polls elected the wrong man. Dr. Gallup predicted that President Truman would receive only 44.5 percent of the popular vote. He missed it by 12 percent—5.4 divided by 44.5. Yet in his booklet entitled "The Story Behind the Gallup Poll," Dr. Gallup claims to have missed it by only 5.4 percent. This is twisted arithmetic. By the same calculation, he claimed that he missed the vote for Henry Wallace by only 1.6 percent. He predicted that Mr. Wallace would receive 4 percent of the popular vote. Actually he received only 2.4 percent. Now, this is a 40 percent error. But by the Gallup computation method of "percentage points" this margin of error is reduced from 40 percent to 1.6 percent.

We recall that in 1956 T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, was a candidate for President with a third party nomination. Dr. Gallup predicted that he would receive 1 percent of the vote, or more than 600,000 votes. Actually Mr. Andrews received only 134,000 votes. Yet by the Gallup computation of margin of error he missed the T. Coleman Andrews vote by less than seven-tenths of 1 percent. What a convenient method of calculating one's error. My banker will not let me get by with it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the margin of error were computed in the manner in which I or any layman would compute it, Dr. Gallup missed his prediction by a margin of 4 to 1. He missed it as 1 is to 4. While he predicted that a candidate would receive 600,000 votes, the candidate received only 134,000—one vote for every four that Mr. Gallop predicted. If Mr. Andrews had been paying for this service and the poll taker predicted he would get four times the number of votes which he actually received, he would not hire that group to take any more polls for him, even though the poll taker might think he was within his margin of error.

Mr. GORE. According to Dr. Gallup's computation, if T. Coleman Andrews had received twice the number of votes that Dr. Gallup predicted, Dr. Gallup's percentage of error would have been only 1 percent. If he had received no votes at all he would have been only 1 percent wrong, which is remarkably twisted arithmetic.

This is a publicity guessing game. In addition to its prejudice of our elective process, I am concerned that so many publishers of great newspapers, at a time when world tension and national and international affairs compete for space on the printed pages to inform our people, large areas of printed space on the front pages of our daily newspapers are devoted to this worthlessness.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe one reason why the poll information could not be an accurate reflection of what the people are thinking is depicted in this example. Suppose we should try to find how many persons should be polled in a city the size of New Orleans in order to determine how an election would go. In a city of that size, about 600,000 people, a number of 1,000 would be an appropriate number to sample to see how the election was likely to go.

As the Senator from Tennessee well knows, this is a Nation of 180 million people. As the Senator has so well

pointed out, the same principle would be applied if one were to go into his State of Tennessee and ask a single person how that person expected to vote, and then proposed by that person's vote to guess how the people of three counties would vote on the basis of a single expression of opinion. Obviously the sample is much too thin.

Mr. GORE. That person whose opinion was sought might not even vote. He might never have been a voter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The number sampled in that case is so very scant, as the Senator said, that it puts one in the position of participating in a guessing game.

In my hometown of Baton Rouge, La., I might very well sample perhaps 300 or 400 people and come up with a fairly accurate guess as to how the city or the parish would go, especially if a scientific sampling principle were used. But if I were to sample only a single person or two or three in that entire city, the chances are very slim that I would come up with an accurate guess.

Mr. GORE. The fact that political polls are accurate or inaccurate is not the important element to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. It is not their accuracy or inaccuracy that urges me to take the time of the Senate to speak upon this subject. They have become political phenomena. The Gallup Poll has become a political event, largely, I believe, because so many newspapers give the poll such wide publicity.

Such polls interfere with our elective processes. Not only do they exercise an influence upon the voters, but we observe events such as occurred recently in connection with Governor Rockefeller of New York. I remember that a story was written after the Governors' conference in Puerto Rico, to the effect that Governor Rockefeller would determine whether he would enter the race for President upon the basis of his standings in the political polls.

When it comes to pass that the Governor of the largest State in our Union can base a major political decision as to whether he will seek the Presidency of the United States upon political polls, then I think it is time for the Senate and the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to take a look at political polls.

The danger is that they will be used to influence public opinion, rather than to reflect it. No pollster is held to task for any poll except his last one before election day, and some of them tend, as Dr. Gallup clearly did before the 1952 election, to crowd the middle. What of the interesting polls that are taken 3 months, 2 months, and 1 month before election day? There are many ways that they can be used, to which I will refer later.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course, the Senator well knows that the important thing in public affairs is not what the people think before they have heard the arguments; the important thing is what they think after they have heard the arguments. It may very well be that when the public has not considered the issue they may think entirely different from the way they may feel after the issue has been discussed. People may have all sorts of misunderstanding about an issue, but when a candidate goes to the people and explains the issue, the people may agree with him, even though they may have been in disagreement with him on the issue before that.

Mr. GORE. I would rather risk the opinion of the junior Senator from Louisiana about the political attitude of the people of Louisiana than rely on a poll of 25 or 30 people, well or ill informed, selected at random, in the State of Louisiana. That is only a preface to saying that in all of my talks with my Democratic colleagues—and I have not talked to every one of them, but many of them—only one Democratic Senator has expressed in my hearing the view, either before the national conventions or since, that Vice President NIXON would run as strong a race in his State as Governor Rockefeller would run as the Republican nominee. That opinion is not reflected in the polls. If a real poll were taken, the story might be different.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps those Democratic Senators were speaking in terms of how the people thought they would vote after the issues had been presented, which no poll can show at this point.

Mr. GORE. Dr. Gallup is by no means the only pollster whose polls have been proven almost meaningless. Indeed, there have been many others. Just recently The Chattanooga News-Free Press in my State, conducted a statewide poll in the Democratic senatorial primary contest between my colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, and Judge Andrew Taylor. The final tabulation was 1,913 for Taylor and 1,687 for KEFAUVER, a 53 percent win by Taylor. But when the real poll was taken, Senator KEFAUVER won by 65 percent of the vote. I cite, too, the polls in the West Virginia presidential primary. Also the polls on the British election last year.

But despite all this evidence, the political poll and political pollsters are now to have their Rose Bowl game in the presidential election of 1960. Will their forecast be on the nose or will they again elect the wrong man? This is interesting speculation. But if the standing of a candidate in the public opinion polls has a psychological and political effect upon the voters or the candidates, as I regret may be the case, then it is a matter of importance which requires public attention. This is why I speak on the subject today.

Ever so often President Eisenhower says something with which I agree wholeheartedly. Such an instance occurred last Wednesday when someone asked the President about the most recent political poll. The President is reported to have said:

> No one should be pessimistic or discouraged by some straw in the wind and certainly he should not be complacent with another straw that seems to point favorably in his direction.

Although the popularity of the political poll has reached a high mark only in relatively recent years, formal political polling is by no means a product of the 20th century. Recognized as the first published American political poll was one conducted in 1824 by the Harrisburg Pennsylvanian at Wilmington, Del. In that poll, Andrew Jackson received almost twice as many votes as the ultimate presidential winner, John Quincy Adams.

The history of election polling can roughly be divided into three distinct periods. The era prior to 1936 has been well described as the "catch-as-catch-can" period and that subsequent to 1936 to about 1950 can be considered as the "quota" period. Since about 1950, we have had the "probability" period. Undoubtedly at any given time during any of these periods it has been thought that the methods employed at that particular time were the ultimate in polling technique. However, the occurrences of mispredictions have convinced the almost unconceivable pollsters that polling perfection was a long way off.

In the "catch-as-catch-can" period, responses were solicited haphazardly by mail, by clip-out ballots appearing in newspapers and magazines, some by personal interview, and by almost any other rapid manner which would add to the total number polled. Emphasis was on quantity. The period ended abruptly with the collapse of the Literary Digest poll. Earlier successes had given the Digest poll tremendous prestige as its predictions in three previous presidential campaigns had been successful. Of all the polls conducted in 1936, the one by the Literary Digest was easily the most widely known; now it is the most widely remembered. The Digest, we may recall, predicted a landslide victory for Alf Landon. Well, there was a landslide all right, only it was in the opposite direction than had been predicted. Franklin D. Roosevelt in that election received all but 8 of the 531 electoral votes. With this demonstration of polling inaccuracy, "finis" was written to the Literary Digest and the "catch-as-catch-can" period and to the political career of Mr. Landon.

The so-called quota sample, which gives the second period its title, was in wide use until a few years ago. A cross section of the adult population was laid out—so many college graduates, so many men under 30, so many women over 50, so many in high income brackets, and so forth.

Once the sample was drawn up, the interviewers would have the task of finding the required number of people in each category for interview. This method placed much discretion in the hands of the interviewers and it relied on uncertain predetermined population categories. The biggest reversal in the quota period was the victory of President Truman in 1948, when the Gallup poll and others predicted firmly that the next President of the United States would be Thomas E. Dewey. A letter which I received from Dr. Gallup and which I inserted earlier in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, stated:

> A whole book was written on the 1948 election, based upon the post mortem conducted by the Social Research Council. Chiefly the error was due to the failure to poll up to the end of the election.

Dr. Gallup says further that his final election survey in 1948 was completed on October 15, only about 3 weeks before the election. He indicates that the lesson he and others learned from the 1948 election was the importance of taking polls right up to the time of the election. Presuming Dr. Gallup's chief reason for the failure of the 1948 polls is fully justified, this leads me to inquire:

Following this line of reasoning, how can Dr. Gallup claim any accurate predictive value in presidential popularity polls taken months before an election, if Dr. Gallup dismisses as unreliable a poll which is completed just 3 weeks before an election?

In recent years, especially since the Truman victory, pollsters have turned from the quota method to the so-called probability sample or a modified version thereof and we are now in the "probability period." The probability sample reportedly is obtained by a technical and complex method whose announced objective is to give every adult in the United States an equal chance to be polled. If for example, one resides in the second house from the corner facing north, there is a slim possibility that one would be included in some sampling unit.

Today, then, political polling is in the "probability period." Twelve years ago, in 1948, a gross misguess by most so-called scientific guessers led to the end of the quota period. Twelve years earlier, in 1936, the "catch-as-catch-can" period ended abruptly with a major polling setback. Whether or not this 12-year progression will continue in 1960 remains to be seen.

I doubt that it would, because some pollsters have learned one lesson. They crowd the center near election day and use fuzzy language to avoid being stuck with gross *mis*predictions.

From a small beginning in 1824, political polling has expanded, as I have said, until today more than 30 firms are engaged in the public-opinion business. In addition to the type of polling done by Dr. Gallup, Mr. Elmo Roper, and a few others, today much of the polling is private opinion-taking done under contract for individuals. An outstanding feature of the private poll, as opposed to a newspaper survey, is that the candidate who contracts for it is free to make public any favorable finding and, at the same time, suppress any unfavorable findings.

Now I should like to discusss some of the salient points respecting polls and polling technique.

SIZE OF SAMPLE

Dr. Gallup has a sample poll of 1,500. Mr. Elmo Roper has a sample of 3,000. Other pollsters have more, some less. Dr. Gallup and other pollsters contend that the size of the sample is far less important in achieving reliable and valid results than several other factors. I concede there may be some truth in this statement, particularly since I have considerable misgivings about some of the other factors connected with political polling, to which I shall later refer. Still I feel the size of the sample merits close scrutiny. As a layman, I would question that a straw poll of less than 1 percent of the people could under any reasonable circumstances be regarded as a fair and meaningful cross section test. This would be something more than 500 times as large a sample as Dr. Gallup takes.

In 1944 a committee of the House of Representatives, headed by the then Representative and now the junior Senator from New Mexico, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, conducted a study of political polls. The committee appointed a technical committee to examine the data and statements submitted by Dr. Gallup. The committee was composed of representatives from the Bureau of the Budget, the Bureau of the Census, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which, of course, engage in considerable statistical analyses. Upon examination of Dr. Gallup's testimony and statistics, the technical committee stated in its report:

> The size of the samples used for many of the States was not large enough, even if properly drawn, to insure reliable individual State estimates based solely on polls of the voting population. The use of a size of sample adequate to insure reliable results for individual States might have involved more expense than the Gallup organization could afford.

Mr. President, this was in 1944. I recognize that, especially because of the historic 1948 miscalculation, polling organizations have made some alterations in their polling methods. I believe, though, that the committee very properly questioned the adequacy of the sample size in 1944. I would still question it today.

SAMPLE SELECTION

Tied in closely with sample size is the selection of the sample itself. I referred to the composition of the sampling unit earlier in tracing the history of political polling. There is widespread agreement that no accuracy whatsoever can be claimed if, from the very beginning, the subjects polled are not truly representative of the entire area polled. Are the middle-aged South Georgia farmer, the young Oklahoma oilman, the New York career woman, and myriad other such groups and classes adequately represented in such a small sampling unit? They should be if the sample selected is to be an accurate mirror of the area polled. Is this usually the case? It deserves looking into.

MAKEUP OF POLLING BALLOT

It is apparent that polling organizations exercise their own judgment in determining who should be considered a political candidate. We are told, in addition to announced candidates, names are suggested by political writers and county political chairmen. Mr. Kenneth Fink, director of the Princeton Research Service, has written me:

> I, too, have been disturbed by the fact that the United States has no real national presidential primaries. As a result, the polls, including our own—willy nilly—are in the position of practically determining who the presidential candidates for the two major political parties are to be.

At times the exercise of judgment by the pollster in the selection of names for his polling card may be extremely poor. On occasion the name of a person who in no way expects to be, and cannot logically be, a candidate appears on the polling card. Any votes such a person receives, merely out of familiarity with the name, would detract from the totals of other actual or truly potential candidates, and the results would thus be distorted.

It is generally recognized that the positioning of a key question or a series of questions in itself can make an important difference. Although political polling does not deal primarily with a key question or a series of questions, the positioning of names on the polling ballot is deserving of close study. Is there an advantage given to the name listed first or last? Marketing authorities advise that the first glance in merchandising is of the utmost importance. Does the same hold true for political polling?

FAMILIARITY WITH POPULAR NAME

In response to my question whether political polling is a reflection of familiarity with a name or names, Mr. Roper replied:

> It is certainly much more a reflection of a familiarity with names than anything else—until after the campaign itself has started.

In an experimental poll recently conducted in Washington by members of my staff, we exercised the same privilege which pollsters do. We picked our own candidates and placed them on the ballot card in the order we desired. In addition to the names of more likely candidates, we included two possible but certainly not probable candidates with popular family names, John D. Eisenhower and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. As I reported to the Senate in an earlier address, the attraction of these two well-known names drew either first- or second-place support from 25 percent of the Washingtonians indicating Democratic leanings, on the Democratic ticket.

INTERVIEWERS

Most organized political polling is now done by personal contact. Unrepresentative balloting by mail was held to have been partially responsible for the gross error in the Literary Digest poll in 1936. When a system of interviewers is utilized, there exists the question of objectivity. There is always the possibility that the actions or comments of the interviewers, however slight or unintended they may be, or however intentional they may be, will have an influential effect upon the person being interviewed. Some polling organizations claim to have highly trained and skilled interviewers, and this I do not question.

Referring once more to the investigation of the 1944 political polls, the House technical committee, referring to the 1944 Gallup poll, reported:

> Partly as a result of manpower shortages and to maintain low costs, the 1944 election poll was conducted by relatively untrained enumerators with relatively little supervision in the field. Better training and closer field supervision would undoubtedly improve the reliability of the results obtained and would be important factors in assuring that sampling instructions are scrupulously followed, that a representative cross section of voters is interviewed, and that errors in response are minimized.

Perhaps the Gallup organization has improved. Dr. Gallup, however, recognizes that this is as a legitimate criticism.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTENT OF VOTING

Another pitfall is the fact that the pollster may be able to find out how the voter says he will vote, but cannot determine accurately whether he is really going to vote. A national poll theoretically samples the opinion of the entire qualified adult populace, but not everyone bothers to vote. Many times a series of questions is used in an effort to determine just who is going to vote. But according to Mr. Roper:

Many more people claim they are going to vote than actually do vote. In fact, this is one of the chief problems we face, and we have a rather elaborate battery of questions out of which we hope to gain a fairly accurate impression of who is likely to vote and who is likely not to vote, even though they contend vigorously they will.

In addition to the problem of establishing the intent of voting, the qualification for voting must also be considered. The inclusion of those not qualified or those having no intention of voting would, of course, increase the possibility of error.

HANDLING THE UNDECIDED VOTE

There undoubtedly has never been a time when every person polled had his mind made up as to who his favorite candidate is. We had such an experience in the experimental poll conducted in Washington. It is the undecided vote and how to handle it in the tabulations that poses a major problem for all pollsters. Once more the element of judgment on the part of the pollster enters in deciding how to handle the undecided responses. It is the view of many that the silent vote swung last year's British elections, in which most polls failed to predict the decisiveness of the sweeping Conservative victory. A normal method is to split the undecided vote according to the percentages of the decided vote in the poll. This method, however, has been seriously questioned on the ground that the undecided people are in many ways unique and their mental processes differ from those with strong party or candidate affiliation. There is, therefore, no reason to assume that they will make up their minds and split their votes in the same way as do the "decided" voters. A few percentage points off either way in the tabulation could make a substantial difference in the predicted outcome, as Mr. Joseph Alsop reported in his article which was published this morning in the Washington Post.

Mr. President, I have referred specifically to seven problem areas confronting the pollster, problems which make precise predictions impracticable and render political polling scarcely more than an informed guessing game. There are other related problems, which I shall not take time now to discuss, which, when coupled with one or several of these seven, or even occurring alone, have the potential to throw an otherwise valid poll off considerably.

Even if the pollsters could come up with a valid poll, we cannot escape the possibility that political polls may be subject to manipulation and misuse. Mr. Roper, in speaking of the political poll, has told me:

I feel the tool with which we're working is a potentially very valuable one, but like many other thoughtful people, I have misgivings about its possible misuse.

I certainly concur in that statement.

I go back once more to the 1944 investigation. Dr. Gallup has said that—

From the Gallup Poll started in 1935, we have always regarded ourselves as fact-finders—or, in a sense, as score keepers.

In spite of this statement, however, it appears that upon occasion Dr. Gallup, and possibly other pollsters, has exceeded the "factfinders" limit in reporting the poll results. At one point during the 1944 presidential campaign, Dr. Gallup subtracted 2 percentage points from the Democratic Party total for what he said was an anticipated low turnout. On this point, I refer again to the report of the House Technical Committee:

The manner of handling the adjustment of anticipated low election turn-out, which resulted in a 2-percentage-point subtraction from the estimated Democratic vote as reported in the actual canvass of the voting population for the three polls published prior to October 27, is subject to criticism. While it is at least debatable whether or not such subtraction was justified in the publication of the early polls, the publication of the estimates, without specific mention of the character and magnitude of the subtraction, may be questioned. This is particularly true, inasmuch as turn-out adjustment had such an important effect in the early Gallup predictions for the 1944 election. Moreover, the adjustments were made on a rough appraisal basis rather than on any basis of precise quantitative measurement, and the same percentage was applied uniformly to the States without regard to local variations.

Mr. President, such unpublicized weighting of averages and the taking into consideration of geographical and other factors was referred to by Mr. Joseph Alsop, in his article which was published today in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is my hope that some curiosity—and, indeed, some concern—has been aroused about political polling procedure, and especially about some of the pitfalls and some of the dangers to our democratic system that I have mentioned. I submit, however, that concern is of no significance unless the published results of political polls have an influential effect in our election processes or upon our leaders. From my study, I have concluded that polls do, in fact, have an influence which is entirely unjustified.

Most pollsters firmly maintain that there is little evidence that published results of their polls even weeks or months before an election have a "bandwagon" effect, pulling voters to the candidate which polls show is in the lead. They point to the miscalculated 1948 campaign, and state that if the desire to be with the winner had operated, Dewey would have won by the greatest majority of the century. Reasoning, however, does not permit dropping from our consideration the "band wagon" possibility. The operation of the "bandwagon" effect does not necessarily have to lead to an out-and-out victory for the candidate whom polls erroneously predict is in the lead.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Tennessee has clarified a point I was going to make. He stressed the fact that the polls might influence the voters. But certainly that was not proven to be the case in the 1948 election.

Mr. GORE. It was not proven that the polls were decisive in their effect, Mr. President. Nevertheless, I would not want to dismiss as inconsequential the influence of the polls.

It is true that, despite the fact that all the polls showed that Governor Dewey would be elected, Mr. Truman won. But it does not necessarily follow that the polls had no influence.

Polls may have a very great influence months ahead of a political campaign. They may discourage campaign contributors. They may affect morale of campaign workers. They may influence local political leaders who wish to be with the winner to make an alinement, which they may maintain through the campaign.

The influence of polls in the early stages of the campaign may be more effective than very near the end of the campaign, when some pollsters crowd the middle line in order to protect themselves, as I have said.

There is reason to believe that, especially in the case of early polls, when the minds of many voters have not been made up, published results of polls do exert an influence. Even if such an influence amounts to only 1 percent, the damage to our election processes has been done. That might be the margin between victory and defeat of a good man.

The danger is that polls will be used to influence public opinion rather than reflect it. To the extent that the public considers the polls seriously meaningful, this danger is magnified.

Samuel Grafton, in a recent article in the New York Times magazine, writes:

The poll itself becomes a political event, interfering with the thing observed. It may set up a bandwagon effect, by giving one candidate an overwhelming early lead; no bandwagon effects are set up for upholstery. Or a negative bandwagon effect may be created, by frightening off other potential candidates, leaving them without the will, perhaps without the funds, to fight. Or a useful debate may be blocked, in the course of which the voter's thoughts might have become clarified, and the shape of his political longing might have become manifest to himself.

With respect to the reverse bandwagon situation, I again quote Mr. Roper:

We have conducted no polls during 1959, and this is a matter of principle with us. I have always felt that the publishing of the

fact that some really good man was far down on the list in the public's esteem might have nipped some very promising candidacies in the bud, and the one thing I don't want this measuring rod to do is to influence the thing it is intended to measure.

Mr. President, I have raised a number of questions today about political polling. I have studied this subject carefully and have arrived at certain conclusions. I hasten to concede, though, that I do not have all the answers, but I do know that our important election processes are involved and there is reason to be concerned. I am in full agreement with Dr. Gallup, who in his book, "The Pulse of Democracy," wrote:

> The public is entitled to know all the facts about the polls of public opinion. The people should be informed of the nature of the sponsorship of various polls, and should know where the money for the polls comes from. They are entitled to know the methods used, the number of people in the sample, the method of collecting the ballots, and the margins of error within which the published figures are interpreted.

And, I add: "the influence which polls have upon voters."

Mr. President, the role played by the political poll is large and is ever increasing. Its influence is not to be desired in our democratic election processes. The matter of political polling procedures and influence is, I believe, one for the attention of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. As chairman of that subcommittee in 1956, an extensive study of political financing brought to the attention of the American public the influence that the dollar has in elections. Partly as a result of this investigation, the Senate earlier this session passed a "clean elections bill" which should do much, if enacted, to deter vested interests from wielding too much influence with the pocketbooks in elections.

Now we are faced, I believe, with another election influence—the published results of the premature political polls and the possibility of manipulated polls. I am not sure what the proper course of action should be, but I submit that this is an appropriate area for the attention and study of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee is present on the floor. He has done me the honor of following carefully my address. The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is now chairman of the subcommittee. I hope he will give attention to this subject. I hope also that the study of political campaign contributions and campaign expenditures which the subcommittee, under my chairmanship, made 4 years ago will be continued this year.

We have heard some charges about money in the campaign. Let the public know. The public is entitled to know. Let the subcommittee of the U.S. Senate which has the legal and constitutional jurisdiction require that candidates and their supporters "lay it on the line" in black and white. Let us know where the money came from, and who gave it, who got it, and what they did with it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I am sure those of our colleagues who have been here during the address which we have just heard are greatly interested. Anyone who is interested in the outcome of an election must be interested in how elections are to be conducted in the future and how to benefit, if we can, by errors which have been shown to exist in the past.

I had hoped that the very interesting paper which we have just been listening to might end with a proposed solution of the problem which has been so well stated. I am sorry to say that resolution remains to be found, if it is capable of a finding.

I can assure my colleague that the subcommittee to which he has referred, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, will give consideration to this matter, especially as it is proposed by a former chairman of that committee.

I myself feel left up in the air, as I think my colleague, who gave this interesting address on the subject, has apparently been left in the air, as to what solution can be found for the evil which we agree is a growing one. But that does not mean a solution should not be undertaken, and I can assure him this matter will be brought to the attention of the committee and an earnest effort will be made to find a solution.

In the meantime I trust any Member of this august body who is interested in this subject—and I think every one of them is probably interested, if not from public motives, from selfish motives—will help us find a solution nationally, if possible.

At any rate, the subject has been presented in very clear form, and I am sure will have the attention of all our colleagues, whether or not they are members of the subcommittee which has this matter in charge.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am most grateful for the generous comments, the response, and the promise of consideration given by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Rhode Island. I hope the subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished Senator will also consider an inquiry into campaign contributions and expenditures.

The report of the subcommittee of 4 years ago is out of print, but it is in great demand. Almost daily now teachers, reporters, students—many people—call my office and call the office of the committee headed by the able Senator desiring copies of that report. The report is now 4 years old.

I hope the subcommittee will undertake a similar study of campaign contributions, expenditures, and finances, including how much money is spent on radio, television, billboards, newspaper ads, and the various categories. We cataloged expenditures of $33 million 4 years ago. We did not claim to have cataloged all of it.

If I may say so, I think this study was a significant study. I urge the able Senator to consider such an activity on the part of his committee at this time.

Mr. GREEN. I assure my distinguished colleague I shall bring this matter to the attention of the committee. I know the committee members will be very grateful to think they have been given something to do in these last days of the session. Whether we can reach a solution which will really solve the problem is another question. It is a matter which should be gone into, I agree entirely with my colleague. I shall do my best to see it is gone into to the extent the limited time available to us before the campaign permits.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1960]

WHAT GALLUP LEFT OUT

(By Joseph Alsop)

In the newspaper trade, it is usually considered bad form for one wretched scribbler to make remarks about the work of another. Yet an exception seems to be justified in the case of the inquiring Dr. George Gallup's important first poll after the national conventions. What is left out needs to be put back in.

The political community was both excited and amazed by this poll, showing 50 percent of the "decided" pollees choosing Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, 44 percent of the "decided" choosing Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, and 6 percent of the pollees undecided. NIXON's lead caused the excitement. The almost incredibly low percentage of undecided voters caused the amazement.

But the voters so positively described as "decided" by Dr. Gallup were by no means unanimously decided in the true sense of that word. In the total sample, 6 percent of the pollees specifically stated they were undecided about their votes, but later admitted or indicated that they were leaning to one candidate or another. These "leaners"—a familiar phenomenon to every doorbell ringer—were somewhat oddly lumped in with the truly "decided" in the published poll.

According to Paul Perry, chief statistician of the Gallup organization, this undisclosed disposition of the "leaners" benefited the Democrats. He said that the Kennedy-Johnson ticket got "approximately 54 percent of all the leaners."

The Democrats rather conspicuously failed to benefit, however, by two other unseen dispositions made by Dr. Gallup and his staff. The first and most remarkable was the simple cancellation of about 20 percent of all the ballots collected by Dr. Gallup's field workers.

Apparently this winnowing of goats from sheep is standard Gallup practice. Suspected nonvoters are spotted by such indicators as failure to vote last time, failure to register thus far, and so on. The suspects' ballots are then thrown out of the sample—which is the other half of the secret of Dr. Gallup's amazingly low percentage of undecided voters.

Statistician Perry stated that he "did not have" the actual split of the suspects thrown out of the recently published poll; but he added that the discarded ballots were "regularly more Democratic." In addition, important numbers of Democratic votes were apparently lightweighted by Dr. Gallup's special system of synthesizing his national percentage figures.

Like the throwout of suspected nonvoters, this synthetic character of Dr. Gallup's published national percentages may well be known to sociologists and other students. Statistician Perry made no bones about it, when questioned. But it is certainly unknown in the political community, where the Gallup results are therefore misunderstood.

Briefly, then, every Gallup poll is divided into four regions: eastern, midwestern, southern, and western. Voting habits in the regions differ. The aim is to forecast, not the victor in the election, but the popular vote. Thus the polling samples from each region are given a weight, proportional to that region's contribution to the popular vote in 1956. The national averages are then synthesized from the weighted samples.

The region that suffers from this system is the South, where the popular vote is always low in national elections. The 13 States in Dr. Gallup's southern region have just under a quarter of the population of the United States. More important, they have 27.2 percent of the electoral college votes, which decide the presidential choice. But in Dr. Gallup's percentage synthesis, the 1956 yardstick gave the South a weight of only 16.6 percent. Thus every southerner in Dr. Gallup's recent sample got only about three-fifths of a vote in the final count.

Although Dr. Gallup frequently publishes regional breakdowns, he is not doing so this time. Hence statistician Perry refused to disclose the split of the latest southern sample. Rather hesitantly, he merely said that the Republicans were doing better in the South than they have done in the past, "except in 1928, 1952 and 1956"—which were the only years when the Republicans got to first base in the South.

It seems likely, therefore, that the Gallup sample from the southern region showed a small but significant Democratic majority, which was then downgraded by the "weighting" system. Add the probable Democratic majority among the thrownout ballots of suspected nonvoters. It then seems a fair bet that the Democrats actually had a modest overall majority in Dr. Gallup's unprocessed ballots.

A handful of votes would produce such a majority, because of the narrow base of Dr. Gallup's famous percentages. In the last poll, the nationwide sample was about 1,600 ballots. About 20 percent were thrown out, and the final sample was under 1,300 ballots. A single Gallup percentage point would, therefore, represent not more than 13 votes. And the mere transfer of 39 votes either way would have altered Dr. Gallup's nationwide percentages, to show KENNEDY running dead-even with NIXON, or to show NIXON leading KENNEDY 53 to 41.

All this is not intended to suggest that Dr. Gallup has been cooking his poll. He has not been doing anything of the sort. Yet the facts have to be faced that this poll has become a fairly major, extralegal institution of American politics. For this reason such things as unannounced transformations of "leaners" into "decideds" do not serve the public interest.

Dr. Gallup's industrial and commercial clients may be best served by facts carefully processed and homogenized in the undoubtedly expert Gallup manner, but the public interest demands something more when Dr. Gallup puts on his political-institutional hat. In this role, Dr. Gallup ought also to provide all the unprocessed facts. Indeed, he might start this time.

Mr. JAVITS. 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.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise to speak for a few minutes on a nongermane subject, which does not happen to be connected with my proposed rule for germaneness, but does have to do with a further amendment of the Senate rules. I return to the question of the ways in which the present session of the Senate has indicated the need for changes and amendments of the Senate rules, and I shall discuss briefly the session of Wednesday, August 17, 1960.

During that day the Senate convened at 10 a.m., and recessed at 8:29 p.m., a session of about 10½ hours. During that period, exclusive of quorum calls, votes, and so forth, the Senate devoted, determined in accordance with the method which I described when I first began to discuss the subject of Senate business, 543 minutes of total spoken time, slightly less than 10 hours—about 9½ hours. Of that time 5 hours were spent on germane business, that is, on the Fair Labor Standards Act; so during that day the Senate devoted only 55 percent of its time to the pending business.

However, before the Senate adjourned a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, and as a result, on the following day, Thursday, the Fair Labor Standards Act and all amendments were disposed of expeditiously.

That action illustrates again the position that I have stated several times previously, to the effect that the only way the Senate is really able to legislate effectively is under unanimous-consent agreements. When we do not get such unanimous-consent agreements, we do not often legislate. Any one Senator can prevent a unanimous-consent agreement from coming into effect. I point out again that next January it may be very difficult indeed to get a unanimous-consent agreement, and I suggest, therefore, that the Senate rules should be changed to make it possible for the conduct of business to move forward expeditiously.

On Friday the Senate had a similar experience. We relaxed a little, and had a morning hour for a change, but for various reasons, with which Senators are familiar, there was no 3-minute rule, and quite a long time was spent on the morning hour.

Then the lead and zinc bill was called up and it became very clear early in the day that if we were to pass that bill, we would require a unanimous-consent agreement. Again we got one, and passed the bill expeditiously.

Then we discussed a variety of other matters, and finally the majority leader and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee were able to get two additional informal unanimous-consent agreements, and we proceeded, with very little debate indeed, to pass very important legislation dealing with the subject of loans to Latin America, and additional authority to the President in connection with additional possible loans to the Congo. In these instances agreement to limit debate was implied; not expressed by formal agreement.

On Saturday there was a desultory discussion of what is now the pending business. An announcement was made that there would not be any votes. Therefore, Saturday is hardly a very good example of whether or not we need a change in the Senate rules, because it is important from time to time to set some time aside for Senators to talk about anything they wish to speak about. I certainly have no objection to that procedure. It is always difficult to get a quorum to vote on any question on Saturday. In fact, the RECORD of last Saturday makes it clear that a quorum was not present. Word went out that there would be no votes, and a quorum call had to be suspended; otherwise the Senate would have had to adjourn, because a quorum could not be obtained.

Therefore I conclude on this subject with the suggestion that last week is a pretty good indication again that we need pretty drastic changes in the Senate rules if we are to legislate effectively in the Senate next year.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES RELATING TO DEBATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate referral a resolution embodying another suggested change in the Senate rules, and ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table until the close of business on Wednesday for additional sponsors, if any of my colleagues desire to join me in this effort.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator to repeat his request.

Mr. CLARK. I submit a resolution to change the Senate rules so as to make it possible for any Senator to have printed in the RECORD in full type a speech, whether he delivers it or not, which I think would save the Senate countless hours of wasted time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I could not agree with the Senator more that that would be a desirable change in the rules. I thank him for his effort.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution (S. Res. 367) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph No. 1 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Upon the request of any Senator who has been recognized, his remarks upon any subject may be delivered in writing, and if so delivered shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the same manner as if those remarks had been delivered orally."

SEC. 2. Senate Resolution 121, 80th Congress, 1st session, agreed to July 23, 1947, is repealed.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that a rule which requires Senators to read each

and every word of his speech to sometimes nearly an empty Chamber in order to have his remarks appear in normal size print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wastes an inordinate amount of time.

The adoption of a rule that speeches may be printed in the RECORD whether delivered in full or not, will make it possible for Senators to get their remarks to the press and in the RECORD without taking the time of the Senate to read them—valuable time which could be devoted more profitably to many other purposes.

It is interesting to note that many a Senator, including this one, has taken advantage of an informal custom by which a long speech is placed in its entirety in the RECORD in normal type although only the first and last lines are read. Some Senators are not willing to engage in this harmless subterfuge. Would it not be better to adopt the suggested rule and avoid this hypocrisy? Surely no one can seriously contend that the reading of a long speech to an empty Chamber is an appropriate part of either the legislative process or of valid senatorial debate.

Without any invidious suggestion with respect to any one of my colleagues, those present in the Senate Chamber will remember an occasion last Friday afternoon when one of our colleagues read a very long speech for quite a long while, which resulted in delay in the passage of the mutual security authorization bill. He was entirely within his rights. I do not blame him at all. But I suggest that if the proposed rule were in effect, that kind of practice would be unnecessary.

I believe all Senators, and many others who perhaps will later read these words, will recall that in theory, if a Senator does not make his speech in full, the part that he has not actually spoken in the Senate Chamber appears in small print. Of course, no Senator wishes to see his deathless prose appear in any smaller print than is absolutely necessary under any circumstances.

The House does this in a little different way, under permission to extend remarks. Then the remarks of the Member are printed in such big type that even those who, like myself, must wear bifocal glasses, can nonetheless read what is printed. If we were to adopt the rules of the House in that regard we would undoubtedly save a great deal of time in the Senate.

This is the third suggested change in the rules which I believe would be desirable to adopt come next January. The other two which I have already suggested had to do with germane debate and with permission for Senate committees to sit without the necessity of obtaining unanimous consent for that purpose while the Senate is in session. I will have more changes in rules to propose during the rest of the week.

Mr. President, I obtained the floor because it is my understanding that no one is anxious to vote on the Anderson amendment, which is the pending amendment. Therefore it is desirable to mark time for a while. I had a little deathless prose to contribute on the pending business, but if anyone else wishes to take the floor, I will yield now, and regain the floor later.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the Senator should qualify his statement about nobody being ready to vote. I believe a great many of us are ready to vote. Maybe a majority of the Senate is not ready to vote. I am ready.

Mr. CLARK. I will have to interrupt the Senator to say that I accept the amendment of my friend from Washington. He is quite right. He is ready to vote. I am ready to vote. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is ready to vote. I am sure the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] also are ready to vote. If the bells were to ring, I am sure a great many other Senators would say they were ready to vote.

Mr. CARLSON. I am ready to vote, too.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Kansas is also ready to vote, as I am sure is also the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am quite interested in the observations the Senator has made. I have always felt that the absence of a rule of germaneness in the rules of the Senate is one of the reasons for a great deal of delay on the floor of the Senate.

The Senate committees transact their business with fair dispatch, but the situation on the floor of the Senate is quite different. I believe that has been more apparent during the last 2 weeks, when we have had so many visitors in the galleries. It is a little difficult for them to understand why there are not more Senators on the floor. I know the Senator from Pennsylvania and I have had to explain on many occasions that the committees are meeting and that there is a great deal of work that is being done in the committees, and that the floor situation is not at all indicative of the work of the Senate. I believe that a rule of germaneness would focus attention on that point.

I would also suggest to the Senator that there are other than the specific rules he mentions which would bear some examination. I have said in the Senate for many years that probably we should also hold a legislative session of Congress and a fiscal session of Congress. We should change our fiscal year to correspond with the economic fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK. With the calendar year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With the calendar year; yes. We should meet in fiscal session after we have authorized expenditures and appropriations, so that we could bring matters into proper perspective. I do not know of any other parliamentary body in the world which does not have such an arrangement. It would give us much better perspective in our fiscal programs. We would not be legislating on the floor and meeting in committee, and authorizing expenditures with the right hand sometimes not knowing what the left hand is doing by way of appropriations.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator, even though many of the rules of the Senate have been tried and tested over the years and we sometimes get provoked and irritated by some of them. Nevertheless, long experience has proven that they do work well in the Senate.

We all realize that changing times require changes in the rules. In committee we can transact business with great dispatch, but that is not the case on the floor of the Senate. I believe that the committees fulfill their functions well. The Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana and I have sat in committees where we have not been hindered by the rules of the committee as we are on the floor of the Senate. We should make changes in the rules. I commend the Senator for making his suggestions.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his helpful comments. We have discussed together in the past, as he says, changing the timing of the Senate and House sessions, so that we could take care of the fiscal business of the country and get it done after we have passed authorizing legislation. I am sure such a procedure would save many hours and many legislative days.

I ask the Senator if it is not true that this change could be effected by a resolution adopted by Congress by a majority vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much that the matter will be given careful consideration by the leadership of the House and the Senate.

I should like to make one further comment about what the Senator has stated. He has a reputation in the Senate, as Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of getting things done in his committee. Business is transacted expeditiously. The committee is not always in accord and a minority may feel differently from the majority, but the business is handled quickly. I point out, though, that even in his committee, in connection with the Strauss nomination last year, there were interminable hearings, which went on and on and on, far beyond the time necessary to establish the basic facts. There are certain other committees, on which I serve, in which the rules of the Senate are used for the purpose of delay, so that a vote cannot be taken on an important pending matter, because as soon as the bell rings for the Senate to come into session the point is made that we are meeting irregularly and without authority. That means that the Senate sometimes has to meet late so that a committee can finish its business. If that is not done, the committee cannot finish its business. There are some committees—not any for which my friend from Washington is responsible—where there should be some change made in connection with committee meetings.

DR. J. A. HILL, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF WEST TEXAS STATE COLLEGE, OPPOSES COLLEGE TUITION INCREASES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of Texas' most distinguished and be-

loved educators, Dr. J. A. Hill, president emeritus of West Texas State College, recently warned that hiking tuition "would unquestionably close the door to thousands of Texas' most capable and worthy young people."

I am happy to say a word on this subject while the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is on the floor, because yesterday I received from him a copy of Sir Percy Snow's Rede lectures on higher education in England, Russia, and America, setting forth the shortcomings found in those three countries. It was pointed out in the fourth of these lectures that the number of engineering and scientific students being educated in the United States and in England together are approximately half the number of engineering students who are being educated in institutions of higher learning in the Soviet Union.

Proposals are usually made in my State, and in most other States, to raise tutition fees in State-supported schools in order to finance higher education.

At the turn of the century about 30 percent of our students obtained their higher education in institutions of higher learning supported by the States. Now 60 percent of the students in America go to State-supported institutions, and the percentage is increasing.

The Dallas Times Herald, one of the four or five of the large newspapers in my State, in support of Dr. Hill's position, observed:

> Raising the financial barrier between Texas youths and advanced education would, indeed, be ill advised. The State government's financial difficulties should be solved another way. Texas and all other States need to be educating a higher percentage of their young people, not a lower one.

This is a commendable development, because in the past many of the large newspapers in our State have always recommended raising tuition fees every time they needed more money to support institutions of higher learning.

The distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. Moss] will recall that when he appeared before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was developed that in Utah 64 percent of all the young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are attending institutions of higher learning. That is the highest percentage in the United States. In my home State, the percentage is about 31 percent, which, I believe, is somewhat similar to the percentage in the State of Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Texas not agree with me that the percentage of high school graduates going on to college from both Texas and Pennsylvania is far lower than the best interests of our States require?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is far lower. The States are close together in percentages, and I think that in each State the percentage of high school graduates who will go on to college should be doubled.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Texas not agree with me that one reason why young people in both Pennsylvania and Texas are not going on to college in the numbers we think advisable is financial restrictions?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I could not agree more thoroughly with the Senator from Pennsylvania. Not only is it one reason, but the overwhelming reason is the lack of financial resources to enable the young people to go to college. Some say it is lack of motivation, lack of ambition, lack of drive and direction. Mr. President, the American people realize now that education is the golden key to the opportunity which unlocks the door to the goal of a fuller life, but oftimes through illness, impaired earning capacity, or the unfortunate passing away of the wageearner of the family, children are left orphans and are not able to go on to higher education. Lack of money to enable them to go further is the overwhelming reason why the top half of youngsters who graduate from high school are unable to go on to college. The financial difficulties of their families make it impossible.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Texas will be interested, I feel sure, to know that Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, has appointed a Commission on Pennsylvania Education, on which I have the honor to serve. One of the branches of our inquiry has to do with higher education in Pennsylvania. I am a member of the task force which is dealing with that subject. We shall have a meeting later this week at which I hope we will adopt a rule which is being recommended by the very able staff of our task force. It will be that there should be no further increases in tuition in any institution of higher learning in Pennsylvania which gets any part of its support from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I believe that will be a sound rule. I wonder if the Senator from Texas will agree.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I agree. I think it is one of the most forward-looking recommendations concerning institutions of higher education that I have heard of in years. Over and over, across the country, we know there has been tuition increase after tuition increase in institutions of higher learning, whether they be State supported, church oriented, or purely private institutions.

In the last 8 years alone, the average tuition increase in colleges in the United States has been 72 percent across the board. Going back a little further, since World War II ended, the increase in tuition has been about 100 percent. Considering those increases, families having two, three, four, or five children of college age are finding it increasingly difficult to send the children to college.

I think that if the recommendation outlined by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is adopted by the State of Pennsylvania, not only will it have a terrific impact in Pennsylvania, but the impact will be felt across the country, because Pennsylvania has a unique system of education.

Is it not correct to say that Pennsylvania supports a number of its privately endowed colleges? Does Pennsylvania not provide money to privately endowed colleges for higher learning? I believe I have seen such a statement, but I ask the Senator if the correct figure which Pennsylvania spends on its private colleges is about 89 percent of all money spent by the States of the Union upon higher learning in private institutions.

Mr. CLARK. I suspect that is true, although in actual dollars the amount is not so enormous. Pennsylvania has 14 State colleges. We used to call them State teachers colleges. They are colleges where more than 50 percent of the teachers who instruct in Pennsylvania's primary and secondary schools are trained. They are supported entirely by the State.

We also have our land grant college, Penn State University, which is an enormous institution, doing magnificent work. It, too, receives a substantial State subsidy.

In addition to that, Pennsylvania has something like 19 other institutions of higher learning, including the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, and a number of medical and professional schools which receive a substantial appropriation each year, running anywhere from $300 to $3,000 a student in terms of a State subsidy, in an effort to improve the quality of instruction and also to enable those institutions to increase their enrollment to help take care of the enormous demand for education throughout the State.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Am I correct in my assumption that the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Pittsburgh, and the rest of the group of colleges, which the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned, are not State-controlled institutions?

Mr. CLARK. They are entirely private institutions. I can brag a little about the University of Pennsylvania. It was organized by Benjamin Franklin before the United States of America came into being. It has had a very substantial private endowment since that time.

In addition to that, the University of Pittsburgh, as most persons know, is supported in a very fine way by the Mellon family. It also is a private institution having a rather substantial private endowment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is it not true that private endowments are known to be insufficient to take care of the numbers of youths who are seeking admission to institutions of higher learning?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And they are not reaching out for new sources.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the point made by the Dallas Times Herald that a higher percentage of our young people should have an opportunity for higher education is undeniably valid. Dr. Hill and the Dallas Times Herald have earned the thanks of Americans who are dedicated to improving the educational status of our people.

More than a year ago the Senate, by a vote of 57 to 31, passed the cold war

veterans educational bill, which would have assured that some 4 million more Americans would have a chance to go to college.

It is unfortunate and shameful that now, more than a year later, veterans who need and have earned this educational assistance should see that this bill is bottled up by the chairman of the House Veterans Committee. There is still time for action in the House on this measure, which is important to the future earning ability of millions of American families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keeping College Within Reach," published in the Dallas Times Herald of August 8, 1960.

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

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Aug. 8, 1960]

KEEPING COLLEGE WITHIN REACH

Weighty objection is raised by Dr. J. A. Hill, president emeritus of West Texas State College, to proposals for increasing tuition at State colleges and universities.

Hiking tuition, declares Dr. Hill, "would unquestionably close the door to thousands of Texas' most capable and worthy young people." The veteran educator says his statement is based on a long and intimate association with student aid agencies at WTS.

Keep in mind, he notes, that it already costs the average student $1,000 or more a year to attend a public institution of higher learning in Texas. What percent of families, he asks, can afford such costs for one, two, three, or more children?

Raising the financial barrier between Texas youths and advanced education would, indeed, be ill advised. The State government's financial difficulties should be solved another way. Texas and all other States need to be educating a higher percentage of their young people, not a lower one. The times demand increasing numbers of persons equipped with bachelor, master, and doctor degrees. Economic progress and our security hinge on educational advance.

Early in our Nation's history, providing free—i.e., tax-supported—education through grade school was considered desirable. The goal of free public education then became a high school diploma for as many youths as could acquire it. Today free, or at least relatively inexpensive, advanced education should likely be considered the goal most appropriate to the public interest.

Increasingly, a college diploma is required to command the status once open to high school graduates. If States make it too difficult for youngsters of modest means to attend their public colleges and universities, the pressure for Federal subsidies and scholarships will merely be increased. Dr. Hill's counsel to the legislature is sound.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia. In yielding to him I remind the Senate that the distinguished Senator is himself an official on the boards of two different institutions of higher learning in this country. He was a college professor before he was elected to the House, where he rendered outstanding service. He was chairman of his department of the faculty in one university. He made distinguished contributions to the cause of higher education as a teacher and on the governing boards of two colleges before he came to the Senate, which he adorns, especially because of his work on behalf of educational measures and other measures designed to advance the educational interests of the American people. It is a great pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the gracious and generous remarks of the Senator from Texas.

However, I do share with him the concern that at the level of the higher institutions of learning in this country we should not curtail or endanger the advantages of this necessary educational process. As my colleague has indicated, many young men and young women do not lack either the drive or the determination to further their training. But in many instances they are under the impact of the high cost of living and, very frankly, often burdens of an emergency, which the Senator has also mentioned. They find it impossible to acquire the 4, 6, or 8 years of higher education and graduate work which is so vital to them in preparing for positions of leadership.

I am a member of the Advisory Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. This organization represents a worthwhile effort for private institutions which have no public financial support. There has been, Mr. President, a very intensive attempt to keep tuition fees at the minimum—at the minimum, of course, commensurate with the necessity to pay adequate salaries to the dedicated members of the teaching staffs.

So I commend the Senator from Texas for once again calling the attention of the Senate to this problem; and I also applaud him for the hearings he has conducted on many legislative proposals looking toward a better informed youth. The young people of our country will thus be better able to serve the Nation in these troubled times and to also possess a sense of achievement and service.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his remarks. His contributions to education, both in private life and in the legislative bodies—in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States Congress—have been numerous and have extended over a long course of years.

The Senator from West Virginia has referred to the hearings. In connection with all the measures for aid to higher education which have been pending before the Congress, he has been in the forefront in advocating support and in recognizing the need for support.

Mr. President, I wish to read part of the editorial which was published in the Dallas Times Herald:

Early in our Nation's history, providing free—i.e., tax-supported—education through grade school was considered desirable. The goal of free public education then became a high school diploma for as many youths as could acquire it. Today, free, or at least relatively inexpensive, advanced education should likely be considered the goal most appropriate to the public interest.

Increasingly, a college diploma is required to command the status once open to high school graduates.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the aid by the Federal Government which many of us advocate be given to the colleges of the country is not a newfangled notion, because in his message to the second Congress, in 1790, President George Washington recommended that the Congress appropriate aid to the institutions of higher learning, and said it was up to Congress to decide whether it would establish a University of the United States or would grant such funds to the already established educational institutions.

So, Mr. President, this proposal is nothing new. If it was good enough for George Washington, it should be good enough for those of us today; and I sincerely hope that at this session the Congress will do something about it.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580), the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for printing under the rule, an amendment to House bill 12580 to provide that taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained age 65. The amendment reads as follows:

At the end of the reported bill, insert the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

"System tax for persons over 65

"SEC. 801. That, effective with respect to service performed after the calendar quarter in which this Act is enacted, section 3121(b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the definition of employment) is amended (1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (16), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and (3) by adding the following new paragraph: "(18) Service performed by an individual who has attained the age of sixty-five."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this amendment is one of several in which I am interested, which would benefit our rapidly growing group of senior citizens.

Mr. President, social security was originally conceived of as a primarily self-supporting Government-run plan for old-age insurance. On this premise, it seems to me that after a man has paid social security taxes for many years and after his employer has paid a like amount, when the employee reaches retirement age he should be able to receive the benefits of those payments, and not be forced to continue to pay taxes to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance fund.

Under our social security laws, when a man reaches age 65, he is eligible for benefits. If he elects to continue to work, and thereby sacrifices all or a part of his benefits, he is still faced with the fact that any additional taxpayments he makes do not serve to increase his benefit level to any significant ex-

tent. He is being taxed because he is working; for if he were not working, he would not be taxed. This is obviously wrong; and, for this reason, I am hopeful the Senate will promptly act on my amendment.

Mr. President, in the same sense, I have long felt that another unfair element in our present social security system is the earnings limitation on persons over 65 years of age.

The earnings limitation problem has been met in part by the pending bill, wherein the committee has adopted an amendment to increase the limit on the amount which such persons are entitled to earn without losing their benefits from $1,200, or $100 a month, to $1,800.

It has long been my feeling that we should provide a much higher limitation than this. I am hopeful that we shall eventually do so. In my mind, there should be no penalty for a person who works after he has reached age 65.

Perhaps the step being taken in this bill is all that is possible at the moment. Social security is essentially an insurance system, and it seems to me that it places an undue penalty on older persons who wish to work. They are told that if they continue to work beyond a certain point, they lose their benefits. This is not right and I fully believe should be changed as soon as we possibly can.

The amendment I have sent to the desk is related to a somewhat similar subject. It concerns the provisions of the Social Security Act which state that a person over 65 years of age shall not be taxed if he continues to work.

The present situation penalizes one who continues to work after reaching age 65. He is taxed for working, but is relieved of the tax if he stops working.

I hope that at the appropriate time we may be able to discuss this matter further, and that the Senate will take favorable action upon it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the Senator from New York concluded? If he has, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, 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 further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LIMITATION OF PRESENT $1,200 ANNUALLY IN EARNINGS NEEDS TO BE INCREASED TO $1,800

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the proposals pending, there is rather wide agreement that the $1,200 limitation on earnings should be increased to $1,800. I listened with interest to the comments made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a copy of S. 3255, which I introduced several months ago, dealing with the need for the increase from $1,200 to $1,800. I also ask the privilege of having printed a statement which was given to the press at that time in reference to the bill I have just mentioned.

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

S. 3255

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without deductions being made from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (e) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800", and (2) such paragraphs and paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of such section are amended by striking out "$100 times" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$150 times".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after 1960.

STATEMENT

U.S. Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia are cosponsors of a bill, Senate 3255, introduced by the former to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals between the ages 65 and 72 would be permitted to earn without suffering deductions from insurance benefits payable to them under the Social Security system.

Under existing law the limitation is $1,200, and Senators BYRD and RANDOLPH said few citizens between 65 and 72 years can maintain an adequate standard of living on $1,200 plus social security benefits.

"Everyone is familiar with the inflationary pressures which have especially forced hardships on people with fixed incomes or pensions," they said, adding:

"Rising costs of food, rent, and medical care have been particularly harsh on our elderly citizens.

"Many social security recipients between ages 65 and 72 are able and willing to work and are in need of income in excess of the old-age insurance benefits for which they are eligible.

"We must not deny to our senior citizens the right to earn at least the minimum wage in their golden years before penalizing them for earning more."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated, "8–20–60—A," which I offer for myself and Senators COOPER, SCOTT, AIKEN, FONG, KEATING, KUCHEL, PROUTY, and SALTONSTALL, as a substitute for the Anderson amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, at the end of the bill, to add the following——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with. The amendment has been printed. I have explained it in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

The amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS for himself and other Senators is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 801. The Social Security Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVI—MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR THE AGED APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1601. For the purpose of assisting the States to improve the health care of aged individuals of low incomes by enabling them to secure, at cost reasonably related to their incomes, protection either against the expenses of preventive and diagnostic services and short-term illness treatment or against long-term illness expenses, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as the Congress may determine. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States with State plans submitted by them and approved under this title.

"State plans

"SEC. 1602. The Secretary shall approve a State plan under this title which—

"(a) provides for establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the State plan;

"(b) provides that each eligible individual (as defined in section 1605(a)) who applies therefor (and only such an individual) shall be furnished whichever of the following he may elect:

"(1) preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits, which, for purposes of this title, shall consist of payment on behalf of an eligible individual of the cost incurred by him for the following medical services rendered to him to the extent determined by the attending physician to be medically necessary (but subject to the limitations in section 1606)—

"(A) inpatient hospital services for not to exceed twenty-one days in any enrollment year, except that at the request of the individual days of skilled nursing-home services may be substituted for any or all of such days of inpatient hospital services at the rate of three days of skilled nursing-home care for one day of inpatient hospital services;

"(B) physicians' services furnished outside of a hospital or skilled nursing home, on not more than twelve days during any enrollment year;

"(C) ambulatory diagnostic laboratory and X-ray services furnished outside of a hospital or skilled nursing home to the extent the cost thereof is not in excess of $100 in any enrollment year;

"(D) organized home health care services for not more than twenty-four days in any enrollment year; and

"(E) such additional medical services as the State may elect (subject to the limitations in clauses (E) (vi) and (vii) of paragraph (2) and to the limitations in section 1608); or

"(2) long-term illness benefits, which, for purposes of this title, shall consist of payment on behalf of an eligible individual of 80 per centum of the cost above the deductible amount incurred by him for the following services (hereinafter in this title referred to as 'medical services') rendered to him to the extent determined by the attending physician to be medically necessary (but subject to the limitations in section 1606)—

"(A) inpatient hospital services for not to exceed one hundred and twenty days in any enrollment year;

"(B) surgical services provided to inpatients in a hospital;

"(C) skilled nursing home services;

"(D) organized home health care services;

"(E) such of the following services as the State may elect (subject to the limitations in section 1608)—

"(i) physicians' services;

"(ii) outpatient hospital services;

"(iii) private duty nursing services;

"(iv) physical restorative services;

"(v) dental treatment;

"(vi) laboratory and X-ray services to the extent the cost thereof is not in excess of $200 in any enrollment year;

"(vii) prescribed drugs to the extent the cost thereof is not in excess of $350 in any enrollment year; and

"(viii) inpatient hospital services in excess of one hundred and twenty days in any enrollment year; or

"(3) private insurance benefits, which, for purposes of this title, shall consist of payment on behalf of such individual of one-half of the premiums of a private health insurance policy for him up to a maximum payment for any year of $60;

"(c) provides for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim for benefits under the plan has been denied;

"(d) provides for payment of enrollment fees, payable annually or more frequently, as the State may determine by eligible individuals applying for long-term illness benefits or diagnostic and short-term illness benefits under the plan, the amounts of such fees to be determined by a schedule established by the State and approved by the Secretary as providing fees the lowest of which is equal to not less than 10 per centum of the per capita cost for the enrollment year involved of the benefits provided and the remainder of which vary in relation to the income (as defined in section 1605(b)) of the individuals;

"(e) includes provisions for individuals who, for the enrollment year involved, would not be eligible individuals but for the provisions of section 1605(a)(2);

"(f) includes such methods of administration as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan, including—

"(1) methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods;

"(2) methods to assure that the applications of all individuals applying for benefits under the plan will be acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(3) methods relating to collection of enrollment fees for long-term illness benefits or diagnostic and short-term illness benefits under the plan, except that the State may not utilize the services of any nonpublic agency or organization in the collection of such fees, and

"(4) methods for determining—

"(A) rates of payment for institutional services, and

"(B) schedules of fees or rates of payment for other medical services,

for which expenditures are made under the plan;

"(g) sets forth criteria, not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, for approval by the State agency, for purposes of the plan, of private health insurance policies;

"(h) provides that no benefits will be furnished any individual under the plan with respect to any period with respect to which he is receiving old-age assistance under the State plan approved under section 2, aid to dependent children under the State plan approved under section 402, aid to the blind under the State plan approved under section 1002, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan approved under section 1402 (and for purposes of this paragraph an individual shall not be deemed to have received such assistance or aid with respect to any month unless he received such assistance or aid in the form of money payments for such month, or in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care in such month (without regard to when the expenditures in the form of such care were made));

"(i) provides safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants for and recipients of benefits under the plan to purposes directly connected with the administration of the plan;

"(j) includes (1) provisions, conforming to regulations of the Secretary, with respect to the time within which individuals desiring benefits under the plan may elect for any enrollment year between the types of benefits available under the plan and may apply for the benefits so elected for such year and (2) to the extent required by regulations of the Secretary, provisions, conforming to such regulations, with respect to the furnishing of benefits described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) to eligible individuals during temporary absences from the State;

"(k) provides for establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for any persons, institutions, and agencies, providing medical services for which expenditures are made under the plan; and

"(l) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, the Secretary shall not approve any State plan under this title unless the State has established to his satisfaction that the medical or any other type of remedial care, together with the amounts, if any, included in old-age assistance in the form of money payments on account of their medical needs, for recipients of old-age assistance under the State plan approved under title I will be at least as great in amount, duration, and scope as the diagnostic and short-term illness benefits included under the State plan under this title.

"(m) makes provision (1) authorizing employees' pension or welfare funds to contribute to the payment of enrollment fees under the plan for or on behalf of eligible members or beneficiaries of such funds, (2) authorizing employers (including the State or any political subdivision thereof when acting as an employer) to contribute to the payment of their employees' enrollment fees under the plan, and (3) permitting any employee, or member or beneficiary of an employees' pension or welfare fund, to authorize his employer (including the State or any political subdivision thereof when acting as an employer) or trustee or other governing body of such fund to deduct from his wages or from such fund, as the case may be, an amount equal to his enrollment fees under the plan and to pay the same to the State agency administering the plan.

"Payments

"SEC. 1603. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, each State which has a plan approved under section 1602 shall be entitled to receive, for each calendar quarter beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1961, an amount equal to (1) the Federal share for such State of the total amounts expended during such quarter by the State under the plan as long-term illness, diagnostic and short-term illness, or private insurance benefits, plus (2) one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.

"(b) Payment of the amounts due a State under subsection (a) shall be made in advance thereof on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary, with such adjustments as may be necessary on account of overpayments or underpayments during prior quarters; and such payments may be made in such installments as the Secretary may determine. Adjustments under the preceding sentence shall include decreases in estimates equal to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered by the State or any political subdivision thereof, with respect to benefits furnished under the State plan, whether as the result of being subrogated to the rights of the recipient of the benefits against another person, or as the result of recovery by the recipient from such other person, or because such benefits were incorrectly furnished, or for any other reason.

"(c) For purposes of subsection (a), (1) expenditures under a State plan in any calendar year shall be included only to the extent they exceed the amount of the enrollment fees collected in such year under the State plan, and (2) expenditures under a State plan for preventive diagnostic and short-term illness benefits or for long-term illness benefits in excess of $128 multiplied by the number of individuals enrolled for benefits under such plan in such year shall not be counted.

"Operation of State plans

SEC. 1604. If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of any State plan which has been approved under section 1602, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 1602; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to parts of the State plan not affected by such failure) until the Secretary is satisfied that there is no longer any such noncompliance. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State (or payments shall be limited to parts of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"Eligible individuals

"SEC. 1605. (a) For the purposes of this title, the term 'eligible individual' means, with respect to any enrollment year for any individual, an individual who—

"(1)(A) is 65 years of age or over,

"(B) resides in the State at the beginning of such year, and

"(C) meets, with respect to such year, the income requirements of subsection (b); or

"(2)(A) resides in the State at the beginning of such year, (B) was an eligible individual for the preceding enrollment year, and (C) paid enrollment fees under the plan for the preceding enrollment year or had a private health insurance policy and the State made payments under the State plan toward the cost of the premiums of the policy during such year.

"(b) For the purposes of this title, the income requirements of this subsection are met by any individual with respect to any enrollment year if, for his last taxable year (for purposes of the Federal income tax) ending before the beginning of such enrollment year—

"(1) he did not pay any income tax, or

"(2)(A) his income did not exceed $3,000 in the case of an individual who, at the beginning of such enrollment year, was unmarried or was not living with his spouse, or

"(B) the combined income of such individual and his spouse did not exceed $4,500 in the case of an individual who, at the beginning of such enrollment year, was married and living with his spouse.

"(c) The term 'income' as used in subsection (b) means the amount by which the gross income (within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) exceeds the deductions allowable in determining adjusted gross income under section 62 of such Code; except that the following items shall be included (as items of gross income):

"(1) Monthly insurance benefits under title II of this Act,

"(2) Monthly benefits under the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, and

"(3) Veterans' pensions.

Determinations under this section shall be made (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary by regulations) by or under the supervision of the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the plan approved under section 1602.

"Benefits

"SEC. 1606. Subject to regulations of the Secretary—

"(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term 'medical services' means the following to the extent determined by the physician to be medically necessary:

"(A) Inpatient hospital services;

"(B) Skilled nursing-home services;

"(C) Physicians' services;

"(D) Outpatient hospital services;

"(E) Organized home care services;

"(F) Private duty nursing services;

"(G) Therapeutic services;

"(H) Major dental treatment;

"(I) Laboratory and X-ray services; and

"(J) Prescribed drugs.

"(2) The term 'medical services' does not include—

"(A) services for any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution) or any individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases; or

"(B) services for any individual who is a patient in a medical institution as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis, with respect to any period after the individual has been a patient in such an institution, as a result of such diagnosis, for forty-two days.

"Inpatient Hospital Services

"(3) The term 'inpatient hospital services' means the following items furnished to an inpatient by a hospital:

"(1) Bed and board (at a rate not in excess of the rate for semiprivate accommodations);

"(2) Physicians' services, nursing services, and interns' services; and

"(3) Nursing services, interns' services, laboratory and X-ray services, ambulance service, and other services, drugs, and appliances related to his care and treatment (whether furnished directly by the hospital or, by arrangement, through other persons).

"Surgical Services

"(c) The term 'surgical services' means surgical procedures provided to an inpatient in a hospital, other than those included in the term 'inpatient hospital services', including oral surgery, and surgical procedures provided in an emergency in a doctor's office or by a hospital to an outpatient.

"Skilled Nursing-Home Services

"(d) The term 'skilled nursing-home services' means the following items furnished to an inpatient in a nursing home.

"(1) Skilled nursing care provided by a registered professional nurse or a licensed practical nurse which is prescribed by, or performed under the general direction of, a physician;

"(2) Such medical supervisory services and other services related to such skilled nursing care as are generally provided in nursing homes providing such skilled nursing care; and

"(3) Bed and board in connection with the furnishing of such skilled nursing care.

"Physicians' Services

"(e) The term 'physicians' services' means services provided in the exercise of his profession in any State by a physician licensed in such State; and the term 'physician' includes a physician within the meaning of section 1101(a)(7).

"Outpatient Hospital Services

"(f) The term 'outpatient hospital services' means medical and surgical care furnished by a hospital to an individual as an outpatient.

"Organized Home Health Care Services

"(g) The term 'organized home health care services' means—

"(1) visiting nurse services and physicians' services, and services related thereto, which are prescribed by a physician and are provided in a home through a public or private nonprofit agency operated in accordance with medical policies established by one or more physicians (who are responsible for supervising the execution of such policies) to govern such services; and

"(2) homemaker services of a nonmedical nature which are prescribed by a physician and are provided, through a public or private nonprofit agency, in the home to a person who is in need of and in receipt of other medical services.

"Private Duty Nursing Services

"(h) The term 'private duty nursing services' means nursing care provided in the home by a registered professional nurse or licensed practical nurse, under the general direction of a physician, to a patient requiring nursing care on a full-time basis, or provided by such a nurse under such direction to a patient in a hospital who requires nursing care on a full-time basis.

"Physical Restorative Services

"(i) The term 'physical restorative services' means services prescribed by a physician for the treatment of disease or injury by physical nonmedical means, including retraining for the loss of speech.

"Dental Treatment

"(j) The term 'dental treatment' means services provided by a dentist, in the exercise of his profession, with respect to a condition of an individual's teeth, oral cavity, or associated parts which has affected, or may affect, his general health. As used in the preceding sentence, the term 'dentist' means a person licensed to practice dentistry or dental surgery in the State where the services are provided.

"Laboratory X-ray Services

"(k) The term 'laboratory and X-ray services' includes only such services prescribed by a physician.

"Prescribed Drugs

"(l) The term 'prescribed drugs' means medicines which are prescribed by a physician.

"Hospital

"(m) The term 'hospital' means a hospital (other than a mental or tuberculosis hospital) which is (1) a Federal hospital, (2) licensed as a hospital by the State in which it is located, or (3) in the case of a State hospital, approved by the licensing agency of the State.

"Nursing Home

"(n) The term 'nursing home' means a nursing home which is licensed as such by the State in which it is located, and which (1) is operated in connection with a hospital or (2) has medical policies established by one or more physicians (who are responsible for supervising the execution of such policies) to govern the skilled nursing care and related medical care and other services which it provides.

"Miscellaneous definitions

"SEC. 1607. For purposes of this title—

"Federal Share

"(a)(1) The 'Federal share' with respect to any State means 100 per centum less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States, except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be less than 33⅓ per centum nor more than 66⅔ per centum, and (B) the Federal share with respect to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam shall be 66⅔ per centum.

"(2) The Federal share for each State shall be promulgated by the Secretary between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the United States for the three most recent calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgations.

"(3) As used in paragraphs (1) and (2), the term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"Deductible Amount

"(b) The 'deductible amount' for any individual for any enrollment year means an amount equal to $250 of expenses for medical services (determined without regard to the limitations in clause (A) or (E) (vi) or (vii) of section 1602(a)(2)) which are included in the State plan and are incurred in such year by or on behalf of such individual, whether he is married or single, except that, in the case of an individual who is married and living with his spouse at the beginning of his enrollment year, it shall be an amount equal to $400 of expenses for medical services (so determined) incurred in such year by or on behalf of such individual or his spouse for the care or treatment of either of them, but only if application of such $400 amount with respect to such individual and his spouse would result in payment under the plan of a larger share of the cost of their medical services incurred in such year. Subject to the limitations in section 1608, the $250 amount referred to in the preceding sentence may be reduced for any State if such State so elects; and in case of such an election the $400 amount referred to in such sentence shall be proportionately reduced.

"Enrollment Year

"(c) The term 'enrollment year' means, with respect to any individual, a period of 12 consecutive months as designated by the State agency for the purposes of this title in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the State plan may permit the extension of an enrollment year in order to avoid hardship.

"Private Health Insurance Policy

"(d) The term 'private health insurance policy' means, with respect to any State, a policy, offered by a private insurance organization licensed to do business in the State, which is approved by the State agency (administering or supervising the administration of the plan approved under section 1602), which is noncancelable except at the request of the insured individual or for failure to pay the premiums when due and which is available to all eligible individuals in the State.

"Cost

"(e) The per capita cost of long-term illness benefits or diagnostic and short-term illness benefits for any year or other period shall be determined by the State, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, on the basis of estimates and such other data as may be permitted in such regulations.

"Election of medical services to be provided by State

"SEC. 1608. Any election by a State pursuant to the provisions of clause (E) of paragraph (1) or the provisions of paragraph (2) of section 1602(b) or of the second sentence of section 1607(b) shall be valid for purposes of this title for any enrollment year or other period determined by the Secretary only if an election is also made by the State under the other of such provisions so that, in the judgment of the Secretary, the per capita cost of benefits under paragraph (1) of section 1602(b) and the per capita cost of benefits under paragraph (2) of such section for such period after such elections bear the same relationship to each other as the per capita cost of benefits under each such paragraph for such period without such elections bear to each other.

"Advisory Council on health insurance

"SEC. 1609. (a) There shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Advisory Council on Medical Benefits for the Aged (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council') to advise the Secretary on matters relating to the general policies and administration of this title. The Secretary shall secure the advice of the Council before prescribing regulations under this title.

"(b) The Council shall consist of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Commissioner of Social Security, who shall be ex officio members (and one of whom shall from time to time be designated by the Secretary to serve as chairman), and twelve other persons, not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. Four of the appointed members shall be elected from among representatives of various State or local government agencies concerned with the provision of health care or insurance against the costs thereof, four from among nongovernmental persons who are concerned with the provision of such care or with such insurance, and four from the general public, including consumers of health care.

"(c) Each member appointed by the Secretary shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of the members first taking office shall expire as follows: four shall expire two years after the date of the enactment of this title, four shall expire four years after such date, and four shall expire six years after such date, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment. None of the appointed members shall be eligible for reappointment within one year after the end of his preceding term.

"(d) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council, shall receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 a day, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Savings provision

"SEC. 1610. Nothing in this title shall modify obligations assumed by the Federal Government under other laws for the hospital and medical care of veterans or other presently authorized recipients of hospital and medical care under Federal programs.

"Planning grants to States

"SEC. 1611. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States to make plans and initiate administrative arrangements preparatory to participation in the Federal-State program of medical benefits for the aged authorized by title XVI of the Social Security Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for making grants to the States such sums as the Congress may determine.

"(b) A grant under this section to any State shall be made only upon application therefor which is submitted by a State agency designated by the State to carry out the purpose of this section and is approved by the Secretary. No such grant for any State may exceed 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out such purpose in accordance with such application.

"(c) Payment of any grant under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine. The aggregate amount paid to any State under this section shall not exceed $50,000.

"(d) Appropriations pursuant to this section shall remain available for grants under this section only until the close of June 30, 1962; and any part of such a grant which has been paid to a State prior to the close of June 30, 1962, but has not been used or obligated by such State for carrying out the purpose of this section prior to the close of such date, shall be returned to the United States.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"Technical amendment

"SEC. 1612. Effective July 1, 1961, section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 541 of this Act) is amended by striking out 'and XIV' and inserting in lieu thereof 'XIV, and XVI'."

The table of contents on page 4 is appropriately amended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, everybody knows that the issue of medical care for the aged is a very important issue before the country, and a great deal is going to be sought to be made of it in this political season. Unfortunately that is true, but it is a fact of American life, and that does not necessarily make it bad.

There is one question which I think must go out to the country, and go out crystal clear, and that is, What can become law? The people in our country now are becoming sophisticated enough to want the answer to that question as they judge a situation, and they have to judge the pending issue by a reply to the question, What can become law?

Well, Mr. President, I think the votes here will show that no one proposition is going to run away with all the votes, or even going to command enough votes to override a veto, whether it is my proposal or that of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The committee bill, standing by itself, may well get a very substantial vote, and there is little question that, unless something comes up in connection with the committee bill which we do not know about now, the President will sign it into law if he gets it.

One thing the President of the United States has made clear; he will not sign a bill for medical aid for the aged that is grounded on the social security system. He has said that on a number of occasions, and very clearly. The last time he said it was at his last press conference. I think by now we ought to take his word for it. At his last press conference, on August 18, 1960, he was asked this question and made the answer quoted:

Mr. President, this administration has prided itself on being budget conscious, yet it is sponsoring a medical care program for the aged that will make a sizable dent in the General Treasury, while the Democratic leadership, which has been criticized in the past on spending issues, is sponsoring a so-called self-funding plan, pay as you go, as they put it. Will you comment on that, sir?

The President said:

Well, I say this: I am for a plan that will be truly helpful to the aged, particularly against illnesses which become so expensive, but one that is freely accepted by the individual. I am against compulsory medicine, and that is exactly what I am against, and I don't care if that does cost the Treasury a little bit more money there. But after all, the price of freedom is not always measured just in dollars.

Anybody who knows Dwight D. Eisenhower, having heard a statement of principle, which is with him practically an article of faith, I think would be laboring under a very serious illusion, and would expect the American people to share a very serious illusion, if they expect he is going to sign into law a social security plan for medical care for the aged.

The President is a man of conscience. He has not gone for my bill, either; and the benefits which are contained in the bill are far more extensive than the benefits in the administration's approach and in the Saltonstall bill, which were testified to before the appropriate committee. There is nothing in my bill which runs counter to the fundamental precepts of the criteria which the administration has set, and therefore, it seems to me, I should specify those criteria.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he desire to complete his speech first?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I understand my friend's devotion and loyalty to the President of the United States, and I respect him for it, but I wonder if the Senator from New York, who is a realist in these matters, does not agree that the most practical way to provide health protection for older people is by the use of the contributory machinery of the social security system for insurance covering hospital bills and other health aids. Is not that the practical way to do it?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think so. I spent a considerable time on Saturday explaining why I do not think so. I answered a very distinguished colleague of ours, who I think asked very searching questions, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I shall be very happy to debate this subject again with the Senator from Pennsylvania, whom I not only respect but also love as a friend.

Perhaps if the Senator will permit me to make some of the arguments, he will be inspired to ask some questions.

Mr. CLARK. I do not desire to detain either the Senator or the Senate. I hope we can have a prompt vote upon the Senator's amendment. If the subject was gone into on Saturday when I was not present on the floor, I shall be glad to read the Senator's comments and not pursue the matter further.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not make the statement with any intention of shutting off the Senator. If any questions occur to the Senator, as he hears me make comments, I ask him to forget about Saturday. That is hard work. If the Senator will simply ask me questions, I shall be glad to try to answer.

I really feel very deeply about this proposal. In fairness to myself, though it may seem odd to the Senator that the approach advertised as the liberal approach is one with which I do not find myself in accord on this issue, I explain it as follows: I have been interested in this subject for a long time. I introduced a bill upon this question in 1949, with the cosponsorship, interestingly enough, of the Vice President, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives; of the Secretary of the State, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives; of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives; of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who was then a Member of the House of Representatives; and of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], who was then a Member of the House of Representatives. The bill which was introduced adopted exactly the principle which is now contained in my proposal, which the administration has adopted.

Over all the years I have received a great deal of correspondence, I have engaged in a great many conferences, and I have done a great deal of research, on the matter. I have been on many television programs, on which I have been sharply cross-examined on the subject. Not content with that, with the enthusiastic cooperation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, I sponsored and conducted a seminar on medical care for the aged at the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University the past spring.

All of these discussions and ideas—all of this fact gathering—over the years has led me to have some rather deep feelings upon this subject in terms of what I think is the proper way to accomplish what we desire.

In addition, I have had to answer to myself, to my own conscience, in terms of this issue, as to what is the proper way to proceed.

I wish to state, in fairness to my colleagues in the Senate, the fundamental rationale which has animated me in the matter. I feel there is a very real and very important sociological question involved in extending the social security system to include medical care. I do not make these remarks in terms of "getting the camel's nose under the tent," but I make them very seriously. No matter what we may do now with respect to the Anderson amendment, with its very limited benefits schedule and very strict conditions about age—for example, age 68—this represents an important departure in national policy. We are opening up the social security system to a new concept, to a new purpose of health care, which I think puts us essentially in a national health scheme. It is bound to go further. Perhaps it will be extended to all social security recipients, whatever may be their ages. We are starting a system, a form of organization, a type of approach to medical care needs, which I think will take firm root as a new departure in American life.

If I were convinced that is the only way to do it—since I am absolutely convinced we must have Federal legislation for the aged—then I think I would be in favor of it. Perhaps I am too much of an egghead for my own good, but my difficulty is that I have been unable to be convinced that there is not a way to do this which is quite consistent with the pattern with which we have run our affairs up to now, to satisfy fully everything one wishes to do so far as medical care for the aged is concerned, without going into the rather new sociological approach for us, which, in our country, does seem to be running counter to the grain of the way our people like to handle their medical care, their relationships with doctors and hospitals. I do not know whether this is the result of the size of our country or the result of the nature of our people, who are not as homogeneous as the British.

I think the social security approach will take us out of the mainstream of American life. In all fairness, this is the rationale of my thinking. Obviously, I have deep feelings. Obviously, I have thought about the subject a great deal, because I have been living with the problem for a long time. In a sense, the whole thing has caught up with me, rather than me catching up with it.

I explain that to my colleague, because I have so much deep feeling about the matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Needless to say, I recognize the sincerity of my friend from New York as to his position. I also know he has thought long and deeply on this subject. I regret that while he and I are almost always in accord on objectives, we are occasionally in disagreement as to methods and procedures. This is one of those occasions.

I do not challenge in any way my friend's conviction or, indeed, his right to his conviction. Unfortunately, I simply happen to disagree with him. I think I have a little bit of support in his camp, because it is my understanding that the distinguished Governor of New York tends to agree with me rather than to agree with my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Is that not correct?

Mr. JAVITS. That is not quite correct.

Mr. CLARK. But almost correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to make this clear, because the Senator is entitled to the benefit of whatever it means, exactly.

From the recent past the Senator knows, no matter what may happen, of my devotion to the Governor of my State, who I think is a very great citizen and whom I backed when many people thought I was foolhardy to do so. He and I do not agree on this matter as to the social security aspect, but I should like to point out, in fairness to him, that he, too, has a very important qualification with respect to the social security approach. He says that he wishes to follow the social security approach, but he desires an alternative, which is for the recipient to have cash, so that the recipient may buy health insurance or coverage if he so chooses. This is a very important alternative.

Governor Rockefeller thinks that this alternative changes completely the basic principle of what is advocated in the Anderson amendment. He may be incorrect, but, as I have said, that is what he thinks, I know that, because I have had discussions with him myself.

The Senator is absolutely correct and is entitled to all the benefit which comes to his argument from the fact that my own Governor, for whom I have so much regard, whom I backed so assiduously for so long, believes the social security approach is the better approach, with the important difference between his concept and the Anderson amendment—this is not in the Anderson amendment, and it may be considered by its proponents to be quite contrary to the amendment—that the beneficiary should have a cash alternative to enable him to buy private coverage.

Mr. CLARK. I point out to my friend that under Blue Cross, under Blue Shield, and under various private insurance policies, it is almost always customary for the insurance company to pay the cash to the doctor or to the hospital and not to the patient so that he may do so. It occurs to me that this is a distinction without much difference, so far as the views of Governor Rockefeller are concerned.

Mr. JAVITS. I think Governor Rockefeller's views represent a very serious difference, because it is quite a different thing for many plans to be negotiating on a local level with many hospitals and many doctors from the Federal Government paying out Federal checks for vendors' services. I think that is a very different thing. I doubt very much that my Governor would agree with the Senator's statement that it is not a serious matter. I think he would consider it to be very important. He has always made the point to me that it is very important.

Governor Rockefeller is not for the social security approach as put forward by the proponents of the Anderson amendment in the Senate. He believes it is the best plan, provided it has this alternative which I mentioned.

Mr. CLARK. That may well be the case. I do not wish to detain the Senator further. I shall now read assiduously the Senator's speech of last Saturday.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Before I had my colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania, I was speaking on the question of what can be made law. It seems to me in respect of what can be made into law, the Senate does not have two alternatives. It has only one choice. May I emphasize that again. In respect of what can become law, the Senate does not have two alternatives; it has one choice.

We know now that another authority in our country which has a perfect right to pass upon Federal legislation has already declared as unequivocally as anyone could declare the unacceptability of a social-security plan of medical care for the aged. It seems to me the vote here will show that such a plan could not be passed over a veto. Certainly, our experience in the House of Representatives, if we needed any confirmation of that probability with respect to this bill, demonstrates it beyond peradventure. So those who would insist upon presenting the social security plan, anyhow, if it could ever complete all of its legislative steps, which is very doubtful in itself, will invite the President to veto it with full knowledge that it simply cannot become law, as all practical considerations appear to us now. I think that is a very heavy responsibility, a responsibility which I believe people ought to think over very carefully before they assume it, and which I think prospective beneficiaries will wish to think over very carefully as they assess the pluses and the minuses which result for the very extended debate on this issue.

On the other hand, perhaps one would be justified in saying "If that is the only way to get effective medical care for the aged, we shall try it. We shall force it. We shall do our utmost, anyhow. If the President vetoes, let him veto."

That is where I come in, because my amendment demonstrates that it is possible to follow the criteria which the President has laid down as meeting his views. I do not think any Senator will argue that the President is not sincere or does not have the same right to his views as we have to ours. The people elected him President, and that fact is one of the factors which must be considered in respect of legislation.

It seems to me the proposal I put forward to meet these criteria is the only one that has a chance—and I think an excellent chance—to become law, and to become law by virtue of the President's signature.

The four criteria laid down by the administration in the testimony of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Flemming are: First, that the plan should be voluntary; second, that it should be financed in part by the individual; third, that it should be financed on the part of government by a Federal-State partnership; and fourth, that the financing by the Federal Government should come out of the general revenues. Those are the four criteria set down by the administration.

The criteria set forth in my amendment to be laid side by side with those are, first, that it is voluntary. It is voluntary, as I shall describe in detail in a moment. Second, that some payment should be made by the subscriber, which is provided, modest though that payment may be; third, it should result from plans administered on the State level, which it does; and fourth, that the financing for it in the Federal establishments should come out of the general revenue.

In addition to meeting these criteria, my plan goes one step further. It is the only plan before us in a serious way which gives preventive care to the beneficiary and gives first cost care to the beneficiary. In short, under my plan, the beneficiary can get the benefit of care which is not merely care for catastrophic illness; and, second—and very importantly—he can get care without paying anything himself when he is ill.

Even under the Anderson proposal, looking at it in practical terms, the subscriber must pay the first $75 of costs. Under my plan he pays no initial medical care cost whatever. I think this is an extremely important part of this program which is before us in terms of medical care for the aged, and well worthy of consideration, for this reason:

The evidence shows that about 90 percent of all people who are over 65 and who have a greater incidence of illness than others—and they do—do not call for catastrophic illness care or chronic illness care; on the whole their problems are problems of temporary illness. Although they spend more money than most people do for medical care, they spend more money because they are ill more often or they are ill for a longer time each year than people who are younger, but the overwhelming majority of them do not require catastrophic illness care.

These are the figures which bear out that point, and I think they are extremely important in our consideration of this bill. Only 10 percent of the 16 million aged citizens, that is, those over 65 who are hospitalized—9.8 percent to be exact—actually need to stay 31 days a year or more in the hospital. In short, 90 percent do not require long hospital stays. For those 90 percent the average hospital stay is 14 days; the median hospital stay is 21 days.

For the figures upon that subject we are indebted to an official survey entitled "Health Statistics, Hospitalization, Patients Discharged From Short-Stay Hospitals, United States," published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that tables numbered 5, 14, and 15 of that factual survey may be made a part of my remarks.

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

TABLE 5.—*Number of patients discharged, number per 1,000 persons per year, and average length of stay by sex, age, and race: Short-Stay Hospitals, United States, July 1957–June 1958*

[Data are based on household interviews during July 1957–June 1958. Data refer to the civilian noninstitutional population of continental United States. Detailed figures may not add to totals due to rounding. The survey design, general qualifications, and information on the reliability of the estimates are given in app. 1. Definitions of terms are given in app. 11.]

Sex and age	Number of discharges in thousands			Number per 1,000 persons			Average length of stay in days		
	Total	White	Nonwhite	Total	White	Nonwhite	Total	White	Nonwhite
Both sexes:									
All ages	16,738	15,473	1,265	99.4	103.3	68.2	8.6	8.4	10.2
Under 15	2,801	2,580	221	53.2	56.5	31.6	5.5	5.2	10.0
15 to 24	2,901	2,624	278	137.5	142.3	104.7	6.5	6.5	6.8
25 to 44	5,868	5,377	492	128.5	131.6	102.8	7.2	6.9	10.4
45 to 64	3,413	3,195	218	99.0	101.9	70.0	12.0	11.9	13.9
65+	1,754	1,698	56	120.9	125.7	55.9	14.7	14.8	12.2
Male:									
All ages	6,090	5,677	413	74.4	77.8	46.4	11.0	10.6	16.5
Under 15	1,591	1,483	109	59.3	63.6	31.1	5.3	5.0	9.6
15 to 24	610	570	40	62.2	66.5	32.4	12.0	11.7	15.4
25 to 44	1,408	1,286	122	64.3	65.3	55.8	10.9	9.8	22.5
45 to 64	1,670	1,558	112	99.8	102.2	74.6	13.7	13.4	18.2
65+	810	780	30	122.0	126.5	62.9	15.8	15.9	12.4
Female:									
All ages	10,648	9,797	852	123.2	127.5	88.3	7.2	7.2	7.2
Under 15	1,210	1,097	113	46.9	49.2	32.4	5.8	5.4	10.4
15 to 24	2,291	2,054	237	202.9	208.1	166.8	5.1	5.0	5.3
25 to 44	4,460	4,091	369	187.6	193.3	141.8	6.0	6.0	6.4
45 to 64	1,743	1,637	106	98.3	101.6	65.8	10.4	10.5	9.3
65+	944	919	26	119.9	125.1	49.5	13.8	13.8	12.0

TABLE 14.—*Percent distribution of patients discharged by length-of-stay intervals according to sex and age: Short-stay hospitals, United States, July 1957–June 1958*

[Data are based on household interviews during July 1957-June 1958. Data refer to the civilian noninstitutional population of continental United States. Detailed figures may not add to totals due to rounding. The survey design, general qualifications, and information on the reliability of the estimates are given in app. I. Definitions of terms are given in app. II.]

Sex and age	Length-of-stay intervals in days						
	Total	1	2 to 7	8 to 14	15 to 30	31+	Unknown
Both sexes:							
All ages	100.0	10.4	60.0	18.0	7.9	3.5	0.2
Under 15	100.0	28.0	54.7	10.0	5.2	1.9	.2
15 to 24	100.0	9.7	76.0	8.9	2.8	2.1	.5
25 to 44	100.0	6.7	70.3	16.1	4.8	2.0	.1
45 to 64	100.0	6.0	44.5	29.6	14.2	5.5	.2
65+	100.0	3.8	37.4	29.7	18.7	9.8	.6
Male:							
All ages	100.0	13.7	48.2	20.8	11.4	5.6	.3
Under 15	100.0	28.4	55.9	8.6	4.8	1.9	.3
15 to 24	100.0	14.9	57.0	15.2	4.9	7.2	.7
25 to 44	100.0	9.9	53.8	22.0	8.7	5.5	.1
45 to 64	100.0	6.9	40.8	28.3	17.5	6.5	.1
65+	100.0	4.2	31.7	31.6	21.6	10.0	.9
Female:							
All ages	100.0	8.5	66.8	16.4	5.9	2.3	.2
Under 15	100.0	27.5	53.2	11.7	5.8	1.7	----------
15 to 24	100.0	8.4	81.1	7.2	2.2	.7	.4
25 to 44	100.0	5.7	75.6	14.2	3.6	.9	.0
45 to 64	100.0	5.2	48.0	30.9	11.1	4.6	.3
65+	100.0	3.5	42.3	28.1	16.2	9.6	.4

TABLE 15.—*Number of hospital-days by sex, age, and length-of-stay intervals: Patients discharged from short-stay hospitals, United States, July 1957–June 1958*

[Data are based on household interviews during July 1957-June 1958. Data refer to the civilian noninstitutional population of continental United States. Detailed figures may not add to totals due to rounding. The survey design, general qualifications, and information on the reliability of the estimates are given in appendix I. Definitions of terms are given in appendix II.]

Sex and age	Length-of-stay intervals in days					
	Total	1	2 to 7	8 to 14	15 to 30	31+
	Number of hospital-days in thousands					
Both sexes:						
All ages	143,322	1,736	42,538	32,200	27,963	38,885
Under 15	15,530	785	5,841	3,008	3,190	2,705
15 to 24	18,936	282	8,928	2,711	1,731	5,283
25 to 44	42,045	396	17,945	9,652	5,853	8,198
45 to 64	41,002	205	6,837	11,140	10,127	12,694
65+	25,809	67	2,987	5,689	7,061	10,005
Male:						
All ages	66,743	832	12,600	13,862	14,968	24,481
Under 15	8,456	452	3,404	1,481	1,679	1,440
15 to 24	7,310	91	1,412	1,023	608	4,178
25 to 44	15,291	140	3,446	3,254	2,617	5,835
45 to 64	22,877	115	3,116	5,282	6,205	8,159
65+	12,808	34	1,222	2,823	3,859	4,870
Female:						
All ages	76,579	904	29,939	18,337	12,995	14,404
Under 15	7,073	333	2,437	1,527	1,511	1,265
15 to 24	11,626	192	7,516	1,688	1,124	1,106
25 to 44	26,754	256	14,499	6,399	3,236	2,363
45 to 64	18,125	90	3,721	5,857	3,921	4,535
65+	13,001	33	1,765	2,866	3,202	5,135

Mr. JAVITS. This information shows that for both sexes in the age group of 65 and over the average length of stay in a hospital is 14.7 days. It shows that 9.8 percent of those 65 and over spent more than 31 days in a hospital in any one year. It shows, furthermore, that this 10 percent accounts for about 40 percent of the total number of days spent in a hospital by all over 65. In other words, those over 65 spent 25,809,000 days in hospitals, and the 9.8 percent who stay over 31 days represent 10,005,000 of that figure, or about 40 percent.

This is extremely important as a factor for this reason: The Anderson program which is presented to us is essentially a catastrophic hospital program. It is essentially pitched to the person who must stay for a very considerable time under hospital care. It provides for 120 days of hospital care or 240 days of nursing home care or 365 days, or a full year, of general health services in the home.

If we are going to legislate a program which marks such a tremendous wrench from the traditional way in which our country has handled its medical care problems, we are at least entitled to the comfort of knowing that this is something essential to the overwhelming majority of our people over 65. But essentially the thrust of this program for long-term hospital care applies to roughly 10 percent of those over 65.

I cite as authority for this point the findings of experts who met in a seminar which I conducted with the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York. I will key the Senate to the report of that very fine seminar, with the names of those who participated, who are probably among the most eminent doctors in the field of geriatrics in the United States.

That report showed that what was very desirable for our older people was preventive health care of the kind which is afforded by my amendment, and which is not afforded by the amendment of the

Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], without any invidious comment on that score, except to show the thrust of these particular bills.

It seems to me, therefore, that if we are architecturally to design a program—and certainly that is what we are trying to do here—for medical care for the aged, the least we should wish to reach in the first instance is the very broadest number of those who really need what we will provide. I respectfully submit that those who need it most in terms of the broadest number to be reached are those who will want preventive care, which is given by my bill.

I would strongly urge the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have tremendous respect, and who is in the Chamber, to look at the report on the seminar which I conducted, and which is found at page 138 of the hearings entitled "Social Security Amendments of 1960." The part of the hearings on page 138 to which I refer is entitled "Conference on the 'Role of the Federal Government in Problems of Health and Medical Research,' Saturday, March 12, 1936, 9:30 a.m."

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator feel that the findings of the seminar to which he has called our attention are substantially in support of the Javits amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. We had set out to develop the principles which I have been espousing for many years. We sought to design an amendment rather expressly to benefit from this fine body of expert testimony.

Mr. BUSH. In the seminar, was the substance of the amendment carefully set forth, so the participants had a chance to consider almost exactly what we are considering here today?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly correct, with this exception, that we did not go into the detail of the number of days of care, but laid before the seminar the fundamental principles which I was espousing. The purpose was to find out whether it met the needs of the vast majority of the aged.

Mr. BUSH. Did they endorse the four general principles of the Senator's bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I would not say that. I would rather have the Senator come to his own conclusion.

Mr. BUSH. I mean as to the Federal-State participation principle.

Mr. JAVITS. It was based more on the substance of the program that would be needed to take care of the whole problem, rather than the machinery. I invite the Senator to read it, because he will find they really gave outstanding support to the program which we had and to the program of preventive care as being the prime point.

Mr. BUSH. Is this in the RECORD now?

Mr. JAVITS. It is in the hearing at page 138 and succeeding pages.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to have the able Senator from New York call my attention to the seminar and the results of the seminar. I may not have a clear recollection, but it seems to me that when I read about it most of those present at the seminar recommended the social security approach.

Mr. JAVITS. No; that is not correct. That was not my impression of the seminar.

Mr. ANDERSON. They did discuss the need for additional preventive medicine.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The only thing I got from it was that they preferred the social security approach; that they felt that was the proper approach.

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all. I did not get that impression. I would appreciate the Senator's pointing out to me where in the discussion there was any indication that the social security approach was to be preferred.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, frankly, that was my impression that I gathered from it. I will have to check some more. I think that was the result. I can only commend the able Senator from New York for providing such a seminar. I took great joy out of the fact that it seemed to confirm my opinion.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe I am a fair kind of chairman, and that I tried fairly to summarize it. I would like to read to the Senator the last paragraph on page 143, which was the report at the time:

> In his summary, Senator JAVITS said that there could be health coverage for the aged in which the Federal and State governments would make some contribution as well as the individual concerned depending upon his income. Different plans for different States were indicated because of the widely different range of costs, standards, and available facilities. The Federal share in any plan might be covered by some form of tax, but appropriations out of general revenues—making the program voluntary for the individual rather than an added social security tax making it, in effect, compulsory—seemed indicated.

I do not wish to put words into the mouth of everyone who participated, or in any way tie them into backing the principle of my program or supporting my bill, but I did not think that at the time this matter was discussed I tried to not give a fair summary of the discussion at the conclusion.

I will say this to the Senator. I have little doubt that—if the Senator will look at the people who participated—anyone will say that this was a loaded seminar.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. JAVITS. No. I have no doubt that among the many who were present, whether doctors or not—because some were specialists in the field, even though they were not doctors—some may have believed that the social security approach was preferable, or a better plan, to the one that I sponsored. I have little doubt about it.

However, I do believe that that is quite symptomatic of the discussion raging in the country.

When we were through I felt that the consensus was that the voluntary plan would preserve more eggs and break fewer eggs, and particularly that what they wanted was a plan which was heavily premised on preventive care. I believe the whole direction of the conference, and the remarkable competence of all those people, was directed toward an emphasis on preventive care.

Mr. ANDERSON. I call attention to the page opposite to the page from which the Senator has read.

I read from page 142:

> Dr. Steinberg made his own proposal which would earmark an increase in the social security tax for placement in a separate trust fund to provide hospital care for the aging in which the Federal Government would participate as it does now in the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. JAVITS. That does not surprise me at all, because, without having read even through all these statements, I was positive that there were some persons who felt as the Senator feels.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy to have the Senator discuss this point. I am happy, also, that he participated in such a fine seminar. I only say that there are many people who are very seriously concerned about a program which raises some question over a means test, because that rules many of them out.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to talk about the means test, if I may. We are faced, in the discussion of the bill, with a very interesting anomaly. It seems to me that the position of the two political parties has been almost completely overturned and reversed in a very interesting way. It may have some bearing on the merits of our respective approaches. I might say to the Senator that no matter how he or I may vote on this matter, he will sleep well and comfortably, and so will I, because I believe that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the other Senators who joined with both of us have immeasurably moved our parties along this road to the point where the aged will be well cared for no matter which amendment we vote tomorrow. I am positive both parties' business is going to get done. I am just as certain of that as I am that I am standing here today. So I think none of us has to apologize for our roles.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To make the record complete about what was said at the seminar, I think there ought to be read into the RECORD several sentences following the sentence quoted by the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator from New York will permit, I should like to read what follows:

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be delighted to have the Senator from Ohio do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read from page 142 of the hearings:

> Dr. Steinberg explained that his approach differs from the Forand bill in that the Government does not pay for hospital service as such but purchases voluntary health insurance on an actuarial basis. However it does make coverage mandatory since the Government would buy Blue Cross insurance for the aged.

Dr. McGuinness recommended that the cost for such program come out of general revenue or out of a compulsory tax. Dr. Rappleye warned against Federal participation and said that Dr. Steinberg's approach had been rejected in LaGuardia's administration. Dr. Bourke cautioned against the purely welfare approach to the problem and called again for an integrated community health program in which the contribution to the system would come out of the general revenue.

I assume, then, on that diverse approach, that the Senator from New York made his final summary, which he read a moment ago.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly correct. I think it is fair to say that if we tried to nail these doctors down—and even the other individuals there—as to whether they were for or against the social security approach or were for some other approach, we would be doing an injustice to the purpose of the seminar.

The purpose of the seminar really concerned the kind of health care which would be the optimum for older people. That is, after all, what they were most competent to judge, rather than the sociological, political, and governmental implications of how it shall be done.

The only point in respect of which I cited the seminar as an authority is the point that preventive care is, in the view of these outstanding experts, the No. 1 priority, in their view, for a medical care plan for the aged. I tie that to my bill in pointing out that my bill does give the prime emphasis to preventive care, and to first-cost care, that, therefore, being preventive care. I think that is very heavily borne out and substantiated by the seminar, and I have cited the seminar as authority for that proposition rather than the proposition that it shall be done through social security, which is more or less our argument rather than the argument of the doctors. I would not want to bring the doctors into that particular hassle, as to which their competence would not be superior to that of any Member of this body, as I am sure they would be the first to agree.

I shall finish the argument which I began, and which I should like to reconstruct somewhat, so that we may keep its lineaments. I started by saying that what we who are deeply interested in this subject, are interested in it, considering the division of voting and considering the strong position of the President, a President who, we know, does not know any curlicues in the political game, and has told us what he will do. I think everyone will agree upon one thing he will do. This raises, then, a very serious question that if we want to act now, we must act in accordance with reality on some of these principles. I point out that my program follows some of those principles, and I am engaged in demonstrating that, because there is adequate coverage for our older citizens, and that, therefore, a departure from that principle is unnecessary.

Then I shall go into the factors of the cost of administration, and the arguments pro and con; then to the question of a Presidential veto, and point out that even if this Chamber should send to the other Chamber the social security approach, we must remember that the other Chamber has already acted quite contrary to that approach in the bill it adopted; and that before there could be a law, even if we sent our bill to the House, there would simply have to be an agreement with one of the legislative Chambers, which has hardly shown itself, so far, to be congenial to the social security formula. Hence we have not only the Presidential situation, which is serious enough, but also the need for concurrence by the other Chamber, which I think is equally serious and at least equally valid.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The conclusion seems inescapable, then, that the social security approach would probably never get to the President in this Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. It is very doubtful, to say the least, and one does not have to guess about that. The record is replete with such views.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from New York was a Member of the other body, as I was. He knows that the Committee on Ways and Means has the power to report bills under a closed rule; and when a bill is reported that way, there is not a thing in the world that a Member of the House can do about it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New Mexico and I have both served in the House and have also seen the House turn down a rule, on occasion, or amend a rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know; but I can count on the thumbs of one hand the number of times I have seen the House reject such a rule.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly correct. I am glad the Senator said that, because he is a man of much greater experience than I am, having been a Cabinet officer as well as a Member of the House.

We all know that this is a highly political issue, on which, if ever the House was going to undo the closed rule, as we call it technically, they will do it. But apparently there is not enough muscle, in terms of votes, behind the idea that after a closed rule—and the House did accept a closed rule, notwithstanding the fact that the Forand bill, as the Senator knows, which was the bill they were considering there in very much the same form as we are here considering the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, had been an issue which had been very hotly pursued by many people throughout the country. Nonetheless, the House Members went along with the rule on a very limited bill. It seems to me that was the vote on the Forand bill. I am not claiming it as that, but it seems to me that, for all practical purposes, that was so, and every Member knew it when he voted for the closed rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. I simply suggest to the able Senator from New York that time after time we voted on the floor together on positions we knew were just as hostile as they could be to the rules of the House of Representatives. I also remind him that it was not too long ago that a bill came from the House of Representatives which concerned certain financial matters, especially interest rates. The Senate went ahead and passed what we thought was desirable. Some of the items found their way into the law.

So, much as I have respect for the other body, and as fine a committee as I think the Committee on Ways and Means is—and I had the pleasure to serve on it—I think also that the Senate should do its best, and trust the House to do a good piece of work along with us.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New Mexico has made, in his usual splendid style, the classic argument for doing what the Senator recognizes we should do. I think, also, that we who are considering the matter have a right to look at the actualities, especially in this season, remembering that we are at the tail end of one Presidential administration and are about to embark on a very sharply contested, exceedingly important presidential campaign. We are faced by a very unusual set of circumstances which does not happen very often, and does not happen, certainly, in connection with our normal considerations; and we will pass a bill and hope for the best.

Today, under the circumstances I have described, and which all the world knows, we have to take a pretty careful look at what we are doing in terms of its projection into law. It may prove to be very improbable and extremely prejudicial for us, on far more grounds than are concerned on the bill, to go forward and say, "OK. We will pass this bill, whether it becomes law or not, knowing full well that when we vote for it, it will not become law, and that the chances are very much against its becoming law."

I do not think the classic argument on that score is applicable to the existing situation, unless one wishes to wear blinkers; and I do not think the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body want to wear blinkers. I believe that all of us realize that regardless of what is done on this floor, this issue will be a major issue in the political campaign and will have large overtones and will be of importance in our history, and even in the history of the world.

So I believe that even those who believe that, in addition to working on these major issues, we should concentrate our attention on the issues of war or peace, will agree that this measure and similar ones must be considered to be on the most important level.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I join the Senator from New York in supporting his amendment, and I also join him in his concern in regard

to meeting the problems of medical care.

In addition, I am concerned—as are many of the people of the Nation, in my opinion—that the problem involved in this issue and the problem of providing medical care for the aged—and these problems must be solved—have become a sort of football in the political campaign. I suppose that cannot be avoided; and I suppose that when these bills are before us, we must vote on them.

I do not say that in criticism of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], because year after year and month after month he submits very worthwhile measures.

But certainly it is rather cruel to the older people of the country, who are seeking some congressional action in this field, that an issue of the importance of this one has become a political football in connection with the campaign. I think that is very bad and indeed regrettable.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly the Senator from Kentucky always voices both his own conscience and the conscience of a great many of us; and I, too, deprecate the political situation in connection with this issue.

The bill which provides for medical aid to the indigent who cannot meet their medical bills will, if enacted, go into effect on October 1 of this year. That will be a real step forward; and certainly both parties have progressed a long way on this road. It seems to me that both parties are materially committed to providing material help and an excellent standard of care by the Federal Government to those over 65 years of age.

However, it seems now that this issue will become involved in a political wrangle in the country. I join the Senator from Kentucky in deprecating that situation. It is most regrettable, indeed, that this issue will be on the political bargain counter; and I am very grateful that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and many of our colleagues have the feeling that this issue dates back to 1949, when this subject, in terms of health care, was before the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from New York will yield, I should like to ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to his proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. From the remarks of the Senator from New York, I understand that he is firmly of the belief that the President will veto any bill which takes a social security approach. Both the Senator and I are very much concerned about that. The Senator from New York states that his bill will cost the Federal Government approximately $450 million a year.

Mr. JAVITS. I used that figure, and in a moment I shall go into detail and shall explain both the upper limits and the lower limits.

Mr. McNAMARA. And the cost of the amendment to the States will be an equal amount, will it not?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. The upper limit is approximately $460 million; the lower limit is approximately $320 million.

Mr. McNAMARA. The so-called Kerr-Frear bill would cost $300 million, would it not?

Mr. JAVITS. $200 million is the estimate set forth in the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. But I understand that the cost the first year will be $300 million, and thereafter the cost will drop.

In short, we arrive at a figure of approximately $750 million.

Mr. JAVITS. No; a figure of $650 million.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does not the Senator from New York think the President would as readily veto a bill which called for that expenditure?

Mr. JAVITS. No, because—although I do not have inside information—I have read to the Senate what the President said. At his press conference of the other day—the last one he held—he said:

> Well, I say this. I am for a plan that will be truly helpful to the aged, particularly against illnesses which become so expensive, but one that is freely accepted by the individual. I am against compulsory medicine, and that is exactly what I am against, and I don't care if that does cost the Treasury a little bit more money there. But after all, the price of freedom is not always measured just in dollars.

Mr. President, given the principles covered by my amendment—and they are principles the administration has been for—and notwithstanding the fact that extra cost is involved and the fact that the benefits under my amendment will go considerably farther than the administration has gone, it is my belief that the President would sign a bill of that kind.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for another question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I read in today's newspapers, with considerable interest, that the Vice President approves that approach to the solution of this problem. Does the Senator from New York have the Vice President's assurance about that, or is it just newspaper talk?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think it is newspaper talk, at all. I stated to the press that it was my understanding that the Vice President supported this approach. I understand from the press that that was subsequently confirmed, in his behalf. I have no doubt whatever as to the validity and the substance of that support.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is very interesting.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I come now to the details of my amendment. I have already dealt with the broad outlines of the philosophy which underlies the amendment, and I have dealt with some of its historical background.

My amendment provides that any State—any one of the 50—may bring into the Federal Government's program a plan for giving health care to its older people, which plan shall apply to those 65 years of age or older who otherwise would not be benefited by this bill. In other words, they are not in receipt of old age assistance and they are not medically indigent. All over 65 years of age whose income does not exceed $3,000, in the case of an individual, or $4,500, in the case of a couple, will be eligible to come under a State plan, regardless of whether they are eligible for social security. I point out that the age provision in my amendment is 65, as against 68 in the Anderson amendment.

The potential number of persons who are eligible under my proposal is 11 million. I should like to account for these figures and also for the income brackets concerned.

There are 16 million people in the country who are 65 years of age or over. Of the 16 million, 2,400,000 are on old age assistance. It is estimated that between 500,000 and 1 million, in every year, will be the beneficiaries of the medical indigents aspect of the committee bill—the so-called Kerr-Frear plan. That makes a total, in round figures, of approximately 3 million, let us say.

That leaves 13 million people who are aged citizens. Again, it is estimated that of those 13 million people, approximately 2 million will, for one reason or another, whether by virtue of high income or for other reasons, fall outside the purview of my amendment, leaving 11 million eligible.

The 2 million figure is a rather interesting one. Obviously it must be an estimate. Based upon what we know about income limits, for example, we know that of the 16 million older citizens, only 4 million pay an income tax. But the 2 million is a very interesting figure because it is exactly the number of those who are entitled to social security, but do not draw it because they report greater earnings than those permitted by the social security law. So that we get a fairly compensatory relationship in respect of the people who are excluded, except when we get into the 65-68 category, because that cuts down the potential of the Anderson amendment to about 8¼ million.

I think this is a very serious and a very important point, because the potential under my amendment is then 2¾ million more merely by virtue of this age limit.

The age point is a very important point in assessing why it is more desirable to have a plan like mine than the social security plan. We are constantly inhibited in the social security plan in terms of costs, because we do not want the social security taxes to get out of line. Under the social security taxes, a burden is put on only 60 percent of the income of the individuals of the country.

I started to develop this point before: As between Democrats and Republicans—the whole world is turned topsy-turvy—the Democrats are for a program, on the whole—I do not say every one of them will vote that way—which puts this responsibility on the part of the population which is in the lowest income level, and only on part of the population. Hence, it becomes subject to the very argument which has been made here so often against the sales tax as a method of financing the Federal Establishment. The social security tax is put on about 70 million payers who are responsible for 60 percent of the income. On the other hand, my plan puts the responsibility on the totality of the income of persons who pay income taxes, because it comes out of the general revenues, and therefore spreads the burden widely and upon the basis of ability to pay, rather than on the basis of wage brackets, which come into consideration under social security. It seems to me in this case the roles of the parties have been reversed, and in quite an extraordinary way.

To continue the description of my amendment, a State, therefore, brings in a plan covering the people whom I have described as the ones who are eligible. Here are the only restrictions which are placed upon that plan by the amendment. The plan must give three options: The option of preventive care, the option of catastrophic care, the option of enabling the individual to participate in the purchase of a health insurance policy of his own.

Those options are mutually exclusive, the individual is entitled to take one of the three. Under his first option, the option for preventive care, the Federal Government participates in financing the cost between a minimum limit of care and a maximum limit of care. The minimum limit of care gives the beneficiary 12 home or office visits by a physician—incidentally, the only one of these plans which gives direct physician service. Second, it gives the individual the first $100 of ambulatory diagnostic laboratory or X-ray service. It gives 24 additional home health care services as prescribed by a physician and when necessary; 21 days of hospital or equivalent nursing home care. I say "when necessary" because the amendment provides it shall be done on certification of a physician as necessary.

That is the minimal package. We estimate that that package will cost, taking the country as a whole, and based upon 75 percent participation, in actuarial terms, $90 per person per year.

The maximum package of preventive care calls for physician's services 12 days, office and home; inpatient hospital services, 45 days; unlimited ambulatory X-ray and laboratory services; unlimited organized home health care services; and skilled nursing home services, 135 days.

This is an extremely valuable and a very substantial coverage for the individual, on a first-cost basis, with heavy emphasis on its preventive character.

We estimate that package, and I have worked out these estimates with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will cost $128 a year per person covered.

The Federal Government will participate overall to the extent of 50 percent of the cost which is involved within those lower and upper limits of a minimum and maximum plan in the preventive care package, and the $450 million cost for the Federal Government, which I have figured is the cost of the maximum package for individuals covered.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. In estimating the $90 cost per person covered, and the $128 cost per person covered under the second option, is it assumed, in arriving at those figures, that all who are eligible will participate in this plan?

Mr. JAVITS. No. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare told us 75 percent is the fair estimate to assume in considering plans of this character. So all our figures are based on 75-percent participation.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. We come now to the second option.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am studying the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, and I am trying to get organized in my mind which of these sections deals with the minimum plan and which deals with the maximum plan. I am looking at page 4.

Mr. JAVITS. The minimum plan starts on page 2, under the heading, "State Plans"; and the actual minimum services are set forth on page 3.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Subsection (A)?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; subparagraphs (A) to (D), inclusive.

Then there is the second option, which is set forth on page 4.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Beginning on line 5?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. The third option is set forth on page 5, beginning at line 13.

Then we find the upper limits of these plans; and I will have one of my assistants check it out and we will key the Senator to them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I come now to the second option, which is the catastrophic care option. I should like to point out, before I leave option No. 1, which in my opinion will prove to be the most popular option should the plan be adopted, that option No. 1 gives very extensive benefits both in the minimum and the maximum packages, and particularly in the maximum package. It gives very large benefits to the individual which start at once. There is not any deductibility; that is, no sum which the beneficiary needs to expend. There is not any coinsurance; no expenditure the beneficiary must contribute to the aggregate expenditure. It is absolutely first care cost available immediately for a person who is ill and needs any one of these services or any combination of them.

The one thing which I wish to emphasize about the first alternative is the fact that I think it deals very intelligently with a problem of tremendous importance to the States; the problem of overutilization of hospital and other institutional facilities. I cannot begin to impress upon my colleagues the critical importance of this point. It will be noticed that the Anderson plan—as is true of the McNamara plan, the Forand plan, and others—is essentially a hospital plan. These plans give varying degrees of coverage in hospitals.

I think these plans give far more extensive degrees of coverage than experience indicates to be required, at the cost, therefore, of reducing other types of coverage which would be extremely helpful to those who are aged. In any case, there is substantial hospital coverage.

Mr. President, almost anywhere in the country—North, South, East, West, and certainly in the big cities—people can check for themselves as to the experience of getting into a hospital. What will be our situation, Mr. President, when 8¼ million people 68 years of age or over find that the only way in which they can get free service is by an extended stay in a hospital?

Mr. President, we know our country very well. Does anybody believe honestly that our hospitals will stand up under this burden until at least a tremendous amount of construction and development is done to bring them abreast to the demand? In our country, with 100 Senators and 437 Representatives, we can imagine the clamor which will go up from our older people if a bill has been passed and signed into law for their benefit, under which they can go to a hospital if they are social security recipients or eligible for social security, yet they find, when the time comes to go to the hospital, they cannot get in and have to wait in line—and for God knows how long?

Mr. President, I can think of few things which could turn out to be as cruel or disillusioning as that. I yield to no one with respect to my interest in providing a medical care plan which the aged can enjoy, which will do them some good. In addition, nothing else will raise such a backfire of opposition to the medical care plan, so as possibly to destroy it before it gets off the ground. By doing this, we may defeat the program.

Be it said to the credit of all those who say, "Let us have a pretty good look at this thing," this is one thing I certainly hope we shall have a very good look at before we break the backs of the hospitals, which are already heavily overtaxed, by placing a premium, as we would, upon an extended stay in the hospital. I think that is a most important point with respect to anything we do. I hope very much it will have the serious consideration of my colleagues.

Mr. President, as I said, the second alternative in my plan is to pay for the cost of long-term, catastrophic, or other expensive illnesses. This alternative plan provides for a minimum of 120 days of hospitalization, up to a year of skilled nursing-home services, and organized home health care services. It provides for surgical services in the hospital. All

of these are provided to the extent of 80 percent of the cost after expenses of $250 for any or all of such services in any one year are incurred.

In the second option, the catastrophic illness option, we do have the coinsurance, and we do have deductibility. I point out on the issue of deductibility that the Anderson plan has deductibility to the extent of $75. Second, I point out that I have set forth in terms of the second alternative the minimal package.

A State has the right to propose a package which is not less than the minimum, but it may also go to a very attractive maximum. I shall detail the maximum package in a minute.

The brackets of cost, as we estimate them now, are $90 for the minimum and $128 for the maximum for each beneficiary each year.

Mr. President, the State can, in lieu of improving its package to the maximum, utilize the additional money which it can get from the Federal Government and which it contributes to reduce the $250 deductibility. There is absolutely no inhibition on any State which prefers to make its minimum and maximum packages come closer together, in terms of benefits, and prefers to utilize the Federal contribution and the State contribution in order to reduce the $250 deductible item. That is a very important point, since it will give great flexibility to the States.

If, on the other hand, a State chooses to have the maximum benefits, to which the Federal Government contributes, without reducing the $250 deductible provision, keeping the 20 percent coinsurance, then it can get the following benefits in its plan: Hospital care for 180 days, skilled nursing home care for a full year, organized home care services for a full year, surgical procedures of all kinds, laboratory and X-ray services up to $200 a year, physician's services, dental services, prescribed drugs up to $350, private day nursing, and physical restoration services.

Mr. President, there simply could not be a more attractive package of benefits than that. It is far more attractive than anything which is offered to us in the Anderson plan, or in the Forand plan, or in the McNamara plan, or in any other plan.

Mr. President, this is a perfectly feasible option for the individual or the family which is not very much worried about the first $250 of cost in respect to an illness. These may be people of modest means, who can find $250 to look after themselves. What they are really worried about is a catastrophe which might hit a member of the family, to lay him up for a long period of time. This comprehensive illness package is fantastically good on that particular issue.

The third option is the option to draw up to $60 a year as 50 percent of the cost of any medical care policy or health insurance policy which the individual might want. That represents the third option under the bill.

How would the subscriber fare with respect to it? The proposal would adopt the principle of requiring the subscriber to pay a modest fee in order to join in the plan. Taking the lower and upper limits of the packages which I have described, that fee would range from $9 to $12.80 a year for each person covered. That is not a great deal, Mr. President. I do not use the "great deal" in absolute terms, for people of substantial earnings. I use it in terms of those very modest income persons who are concerned.

Mr. President, this would give the individual subscriber a sense of participating directly, a sense of a dignified partnership in respect to such a plan as this. It would give him an interest in the plan in terms of its operation, in terms of its cost, and in terms of its general conduct both for him and for others who might be covered.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator repeat for me the fee he mentioned?

Mr. JAVITS. The fee is 10 percent of the cost of the package of coverage. The cost, in which the Federal and State governments participate, ranges from $90 to $128 as it is now provided in the proposal. That would mean the yearly cost for each subscriber would be somewhere between $9 a year and $12.80 a year.

Mr. BUSH. So the subscriber would be paying on the order of 10 percent of the total cost?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly correct.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Perhaps the Senator has elaborated on this point already. If he has not, I should like for him to state in his speech the facts upon which he has determined that the cost per person under his minimum plan would be $90 a year, and that the cost under the maximum plan would be $120 in one case and $128 in another case.

Mr. JAVITS. May I correct the Senator to say that it is $128 in both cases?

The costs are ascertained by extensive surveys made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and they are authoritative figures from a governmental agency which, without in any way affecting whatever might be its position on the proposed legislation, did the actuarial job of ascertaining the cost.

Mr. COOPER. Is any assistance in ascertaining the estimated cost to be gained from comparisons with the charges of private insurance?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; I am sure that in coming to its estimate of figures the Department had available the actuarial experience of insurance companies, cooperatives, and group practice units, organizations, such as the Health Insurance Plan of New York, HIP, and other plans of that character. A very extensive body of experience is now being built up by the Federal Government health plan, which incidentally bears far more similarity to the plan that I propose than to a social security plan. It also provides for options, requires participation by the subscriber, and so on.

I believe there is very little challenge to be found in the validity of these cost figures. I believe HEW has done an excellent job. I am sure they have given the very same estimates to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and others concerned as they have given to me. I believe this can be taken as an authoritative basis upon which we may proceed.

In terms of the overall cost of the plan, if the entire potential of eligible individuals subscribed or, let us say, 11 million, we would have a contribution by individuals of roughly 10 percent of the whole package of cost. So it is easy enough to figure that costs would then be in the area of $1 billion.

It appears to me that my plan contains a highly desirable type of participation, by which the subscriber himself would have a feeling that he belonged. I like that idea very much. It has been pointed out, for example, that as the years go on, the individual payer of social security under the social security plan will ultimately come into his own in terms of collecting the benefits in respect of medical care.

I respectfully submit that that is not going to be true for a very considerable time, because Senators will remember this tax will be levied upon everyone who pays social security taxes, no matter how young, and that at least for some time many of those who will be getting the benefits will not have paid social security taxes for it, because if that plan is successful, it will go into effect now or next year or some time near to now.

I still respectfully submit that when we come to a medical care plan, which is susceptible to so many problems, difficulties, irritations, frustrations, and dissatisfactions, the current participation, the fact that the individual beneficiary will be paying out a few dollars—say $9 or $10 a year in order to obtain coverage—is a very strong point in its favor. Participation gives the plan a character and body within the content of existing operations in the medical care field, which should I think be gratifying to the individual, and should therefore enhance the quality and character of the way in which this whole operation is administered.

I believe that one of the very strong points of my plan is that we would not in a sense lay aside the enormous structure of insurance, cooperative plans, group practice units, and pension plans now in existence.

For example, some retired teachers were in the other day studying the proposed plan, and with the greatest sympathy, because under my amendment we do not propose to discard every other plan, and to make or plan a big national system. On the contrary, my amendment provides various types of coverage, which make it attractive for people to carry some coverage on their own.

We would also open to every State the opportunity to contract with existing insurance plans and existing health plans to give a package of coverage somewhere between the minimum and the maximum. If that action cannot be accomplished, we give the State the flexibility,

to put such a plan into effect itself. My plan is far more accommodating to that approach than is the social security approach.

Let us remember that 127 million Americans, well over 70 percent of the population, are now actually covered by some form of health or medical care in a private sense.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The other day I observed in the newspaper an article which stated that the distinguished majority leader had referred to the so-called social security plan, the Forand-type approach, as being a pay-as-you-go plan. Is it not true that the plan of the Senator from New York is also a pay-as-you-go plan?

I ask the question because as we use the pay-as-you-go definition in ordinary municipal and State finance, we contrast pay-as-you-go through taxes as against borrowing and then paying back later. That is the classic definition of pay-as-you-go. It seems to me that this plan is as much a pay-as-you-go plan as the social security approach, because it involves no borrowing. The taxes are raised in the same year that they are presumably paid.

It is the intention of the Senator from New York that it should be that way?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. My plan is far more qualifying under the orthodox concept of what is meant by pay as you go than is the social security plan, because when one says "pay as you go," he contemplates current general revenues being utilized for governmental expenditure.

Mr. BUSH. Exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. To say that social security is pay as you go is something of a euphemism. The term falls outside the context of what we usually mean when we say "pay as you go," because the taxes, for example, are direct taxes. I pointed that out before. They come from those who are not the recipients of the benefit, in the main. They come from those who may ultimately receive the benefit.

In addition, I think the entire social security establishment—and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is a far greater authority on this subject than am I—has complex problems in it as to financial viability, return on investment, and different types of trust funds. It seems to me that pure pay as you go, as we define the term, to mean when we work for the benefit, or we feel a certain thing ought to be pay as you go, means pay as you go out of general revenue appropriations. I am not challenging the right of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and his colleagues to claim that they have a form of pay as you go, but I certainly do not feel that it is fair to say that theirs is a pay-as-you-go plan and mine is not.

Mr. BUSH. That is exactly the point I wish to establish, and I thank the Senator for confirming my feeling in that respect.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say, first of all, that I would not enter into a controversy with the Senator from New York on the question of what is pay as you go and what is not pay as you go. I merely remind him that under his plan $450 million must come from the States. The States must get that from their taxes, and that usually means increasing the sales tax, which falls hardest of all on the working classes.

Not long ago the Senator from New York came to the Senate with a proposal which appealed to me very much. It had to do with the repeal of telephone tax. He felt that the telephone tax should be repealed as a Federal tax, and that the telephone tax should be an available tax to the States. I must say that it made a great deal of sense.

We had some problems, of course, which arose in the Committee on Finance, which did not make it quite workable.

The great difficulty I have found with the Senator's program—and I say this in all kindness—is that many of the States are having great difficulty in this connection, in not being able to meet all the demands on them. The fact that the great State of New York came here asking for the repeal of the telephone tax indicated that the State has problems. When we start to say to the States, "Bring us another $25 million or $50 million of money for the operation of this medical plan," we are running into some difficulties there.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, so that I may comment at this point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I cannot weep too many tears over the good State of New York, because it has contemplated a tax reduction of 10 percent next year, as a result of the substantial surplus it has acquired under Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have commended Governor Rockefeller for that. I have also commended him on favoring the direct social security tax approach in connection with the proposal before the Senate. So we are able to commend him both ways, and quite properly so.

Mr. JAVITS. I would point out that the social security tax will fall on those in the lower income brackets without any participation by the general public who pay taxes, either to the States or to the Federal Government.

I introduced a schedule in the RECORD on Saturday, which I know the Senator from New Mexico will examine, if he has not seen it already, showing that there will not be a very appreciable burden on the States in terms of the plan. The RECORD indicates that in respect of these health matters, for which there is an important public demand, the States always find ways and means of entering into these programs.

I have introduced in the RECORD previously, and will again today, the analysis which shows the adherence to Federal-State programs in the health field as being very rapid in the first year—all the States come in—and the desirability of State participation is so great in terms of citizens of every State that there is a real case to be made for the States joining.

Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico was out of the Chamber when I mentioned this earlier. There is such a great diversity of medical facilities in the various States that, quite apart from what the Senate may do on his measure or mine, I am deeply concerned by the fact that we will be giving an offer of universality to older people about which they may find themselves clearly disillusioned, when we think of the fact that under the Senator's amendment a long-term stay in the hospital is possible for many people who are newly come to it, out of the eight and a quarter million of the potential which the Senator thinks would be covered, and the fact that that is a free benefit—and I say this honestly, and no one need to be a malingerer, although we have our share of them—there will be an inducement to go to the hospital for almost anything.

I am frankly worried about the impact upon our facilities. I question whether most of the people will not be very unhappy with us—myself and the Senator from New Mexico—because we cannot deliver what they think they can have tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock. He is a Senator of conscience, and it is a very serious point with respect to our approach to this situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table at page 145 of the hearings entitled "Promptness of State Response to Grant Programs." It bears out my statement, made to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that the States move with alacrity with respect to these health programs. I believe it is fair to say that they would move with great alacrity with respect to the program which we are discussing now.

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

Promptness of State response to grant programs

Program and year began	Number of States participating	
	1st year	By end of 3d year
General health grants, 1936	All	--------
Tuberculosis control grants, 1944	All	--------
Cancer control grants, 1948	49	All
Mental health grants, 1948	45	All
Heart disease control, 1950	48	All
Hospital and medical facilities construction, 1947	All	--------
Water pollution control, 1956	All	--------
Vocational education, 1918	All	--------
Vocational rehabilitation, 1920	8	34
Extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, 1955	32	46
National Defense Education Act (4 titles), 1959	45–48	(1)
Library services, 1959	36	49
Old-age assistance, 1936	41	50
Aid to the blind, 1936	26	43
Aid to dependent children, 1936	26	41
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled, 1950	33	37
Maternal and child health services, 1936	47	All
Crippled children's services, 1936	37	49
Child welfare services, 1936	33	49

[1] Inapplicable.

Mr. JAVITS. I should also like to call attention to the RECORD of Saturday, when I made quite an extended speech on this subject, and included a table which shows the responsibility of the individual States on the maximum and minimum package basis. I respectfully suggest that as we go through these States, on the basis of a 75-percent participation, which is the basis estimated for me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it is found that, except in the very large States, it is by no means a great burden which is placed on the States, considering the number of people who would be concerned, and I believe these States will look with favor rather than with disapproval upon this type of participation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Anderson amendment, and I would appreciate it if the Senator from New Mexico would give me the information I seek. Does the Anderson amendment provide for the payment of doctors' fees?

Mr. ANDERSON. It does not. The committee bill makes provision for physicians, but the amendment makes provision for hospital care, nursing home services, and home health services, not for physicians.

Mr. CURTIS. For a hospital to provide these services, it must have a contract with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. To get payments from the trust fund, a hospital has to have an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CURTIS. I call attention to the Senator's amendment, first to page 6, lines 14 to 17. This section defines inpatient hospital services. On line 14, page 6 it states:

> Including laboratory, diagnostic X-ray, anesthesiology, physiotherapy, and other ancillary services which are customarily furnished to inpatients either by the hospital or by another person under agreement with the hospital.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. At the top of page 8, lines 1 to 4, the language further defines a hospital and provides:

> Is primarily engaged in providing diagnostic and therapeutic facilities for surgical and medical diagnosis, treatment, and care of injured and sick persons by or under the supervision of physicians or surgeons.

Is it the intent of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that the hospital services which I have mentioned—X-rays, anaesthesiology, physiotherapy, diagnosis, treatment, and care of sick persons—shall be carried on by private physicians, or will they be carried on by nursing efforts?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Nebraska has switched sections. If he will stay on the first section, it will be easier.

Mr. CURTIS. All right.

Mr. ANDERSON. Laboratory, diagnostic X-rays, anaesthesiology, physiotherapy, and other ancillary services will be covered only if customarily provided by the hospital.

Mr. CURTIS. But will the hospital carry out those functions by using physicians?

Mr. ANDERSON. They may use physicians.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not the practice that such things as diagnostic X-ray are a duty to be performed by a recognized physician?

Mr. ANDERSON. In many cases a hospital will have a person who is a physiotherapist. In the next hospital the work may be done by contract with a local physician. The hospital may have a local physician who is an expert in physiotherapy. But my amendment does not contemplate the practice of paying physicians engaged by the patient to give him services.

Mr. CURTIS. In the next section, under the term "hospital," particularly as set forth at the top of page 8, the terms used are "surgical and medical diagnosis, treatment, and care of injured and sick persons." Does that call for physicians?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a definition of what constitutes a hospital; it is not a definition of what constitutes a service covered by the amendment. It simply provides that a hospital is an institution which is "primarily engaged in providing diagnostic and therapeutic facilities for surgical and medical diagnosis, treatment, and care of injured and sick persons." That applies to people who come under social security, under private care, or who simply happen to go there or are taken there because of an accident.

That section tells what a hospital is, but it is not an inclusive term as to the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that; but construing the two sections together, is it still the Senator's contention that the amendment does not call for the services of physicians, regardless of how they are paid or by whom they are hired?

Mr. ANDERSON. If a physician is a specialist in physiotherapy and has a contract with a hospital to take care of all the people who come to the hospital, his bill will not be rendered to the patient, but will be rendered to the hospital, and the hospital bills will be paid under the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose an eligible person is in a hospital for surgery, and the surgeon requires that a licensed physician must administer the anesthesia. Is the anesthesiologist provided by the hospital? Is he a part of the hospital's staff?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the individual engages an anesthesiologist is payment of the physician's fee covered under the amendment? It is not.

Mr. CURTIS. The physician who administers the anesthesia.

Mr. ANDERSON. The anesthetic can be taken care of by the hospital. If it is billed from the hospital, it becomes a part of the hospital bill. If the doctor bills the patient directly, the amount does not come out of this fund.

Mr. CURTIS. If that is true, what is the situation with respect to X-ray treatment and diagnosis? Will the hospital be permitted to provide them?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. If the X-ray work is done by a technician in the hospital, then that function is covered, because it is a part of the hospital bill.

Mr. CURTIS. But suppose the technicians are licensed physicians. Can the billing still be done by the hospital?

Mr. ANDERSON. If a private hospital has a contract with a physician, and the payment is made direct to the hospital.

Mr. CURTIS. In that case, who selects the doctor?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is nothing in the bill which has anything to do with the selection of the doctors. A person can go to a hospital, and the patient and the hospital can make such arrangements as they wish for anesthesia, for diagnostic X-ray, and so forth. In general, diagnostic X-ray work is not done by a physician—certainly in a large hospital it is not done by a physician. It is a part of the hospital's service, and, as such, is taken care of by the hospital, and, therefore, would come under this phraseology.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will find, if he investigates the operations of hospitals, that the matters about which we are talking are medical services which require a licensed physician.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may simply say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have been X-rayed many times, sometimes by a physician and sometimes not by a physician. However, I think that I have not been X-rayed for at least 25 years by physicians; therefore, I assume that persons other than doctors can take X-rays.

Mr. CURTIS. But the amendment uses the term "diagnostic X-ray." Certainly technicians who are not licensed to practice medicine do not interpret X-rays or perform the service required for diagnostic X-rays.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a difference between the taking of an X-ray and the reading of it.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will simply stay with the term "diagnostic X-ray," he will be all right; but if he starts to go into the question of what the physician does afterward, then he is in a different field. As a matter of fact, it is contemplated that the patient will go to his own doctor and will ask his own doctor if he needs to go to a hospital. He can be admitted to the hospital only if his doctor says he needs to go to the hospital, to be eligible for the care. So his own doctor has full charge of the patient while he is going to the hospital.

Mr. CURTIS. But he must also go to a hospital which has a contract with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and that hospital, to perform the services mentioned here, will have to utilize doctors. There is no provision in the bill that the patient has anything to do with the selection of those doctors. Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. On the contrary, the patient has the fullest control over the doctors who take care of him. The Senator cannot find here a line which says the patient must go to one physician or another physician. He is allowed to

select his own physician and the doctor can then decide whether he wants to send the patient to the hospital. If the doctor wants to send the patient to a hospital, he can send him to a hospital which has a contract. If he does not want to go to the hospital which has a contract, he can go anywhere he wishes. But if he goes to a hospital where there is a contract, he can there get anesthesia, he can get diagnostic X-rays, he can get physiotherapy, and other ancillary services.

Mr. CURTIS. Can he get drugs?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Someone decides that he needs drugs, the kind, and in what amount. Somebody interprets his X-rays. Somebody else administers the anesthesia. All these functions require doctors. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from New Mexico point out the provision of the amendment which gives the patient the right to select his doctor.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is putting his question on the wrong basis. He ought to find the provision of the bill which states that the patient cannot select his doctor.

Mr. CURTIS. All right; I can.

Mr. ANDERSON. This provision relates not to medical service; it relates to hospitals and similar institutions. If the Senator will keep his mind on hospitals and get it off doctors, we will get along all right. The patient selects his own doctor, and the doctor decides whether the patient should or should not go into a hospital.

I went into a hospital not too long ago because a doctor had looked at something and said, "It might be serious. I want to take a picture of it." I did not have to go to the hospital. I had that small growth on my back for years, but the doctor wanted to have it X-rayed and taken out, and he did. No one told me what doctor to go to. A patient, under this amendment, is allowed to go to his own doctor.

An attempt is apparently being made to say that this is socialized medicine. It is not.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not trying to say that. I am simply trying to have the Senator point out where it is not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course it is extremely hard to prove a negative. Will the Senator from Nebraska try to prove a positive? Let him put his finger on a line in the bill which says the patient cannot have his own doctor.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not only in the bill——

Mr. ANDERSON. Where?

Mr. CURTIS. But the distinguished Senator has verified the statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Where?

Mr. CURTIS. Let me finish, please—that the hospital must be one which has a contract with the Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right. We have established that. But that——

Mr. CURTIS. All right; he must go to that hospital. And once he gets into the hospital, separate and apart from any freedom of choice, he is entitled drugs and to diagnostic X-rays and to a number of other things, as mentioned in this measure, many of which will have to be administered by licensed physicians. The Secretary will have determined what hospital the patient will go to——

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no, no.

Mr. CURTIS. The hospital must have a contract.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right; and it will be found that every hospital will have a contract. We will have no trouble at all with that situation.

But I ask the Senator whether he can find anywhere in the bill any provision to the effect that the patient's right to select his own physician will be taken away from him.

Mr. CURTIS. All right; let the Senator from New Mexico tell me where that right is given to the patient, by means of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. This amendment relates to hospital services.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that; and the hospitals will be vested with the right to administer medicine, and the medicine will have to be administered by doctors. And is it not true that the hospital will select those doctors?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, it is not true that the hospitals will select doctors to administer medicine.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator's bill does provide that the doctor of the patient's choice may diagnose and may take X-rays, and all that will become part of the hospital provision included in the bill. Is not that the Senator's intention?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. We have been over this point several times, but let us go over it again: Even if the hospital has a contract with some physician who works in the hospital to do diagnostic X-ray work—which ordinarily will be done by an X-ray specialist, and if the hospital specialist does that because the patient chooses him as his private physician the bill for it will be part of the patient's bill, and he will have to pay it.

Mr. CURTIS. But the X-ray diagnostic work will be done by the physician or the specialist who had made the contract with the hospital.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. If the Senator goes to the Naval Hospital, where Members of Congress are entitled to go and to receive the equivalent of hospital care for a small fee, I do not believe that the Senator from Nebraska has ever decided who will take the X-ray pictures of him. If he has, he is in a class by himself, because I have been there frequently to have X-ray pictures taken, and I never decided who would take the pictures. Someone comes into the room, puts me into an ill-fitting suit, and takes an X-ray picture of me. As an ex-member of the coronary club, along with some other persons, I have an X-ray taken of my heart every once in a while. But that X-ray picture is not taken by a physician who is selected by me. Instead, he is a student physician out there.

Mr. CURTIS. I am pleased to have the Senator's statement on that matter. The hospital will make those provisions, and the hospital will make its contract with the Secretary.

Now I wish to turn to another matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. But has the Senator from Nebraska found in the bill any provision which would make it impossible for the patient to select his own doctor?

Mr. CURTIS. There is nothing in the bill to state that the patient can select his own doctor; and as I understand the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, the hospital will have the doctors of its choice do that work.

Mr. ANDERSON. The patient can have the head of Bellevue Hospital fly down there and take the X-rays, if the patient wants him to but those services will not come under the amendment. But if the patient wants to use the hospital's X-ray specialists, they will take the X-rays and the X-rays will be paid for under the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that that will be no different from the procedure under Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

Mr. CURTIS. But a patient does not have to subscribe to them unless he wishes to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. But the Senator is talking about the control problem.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I am talking about the practice of medicine which must take place in a hospital and which cannot be separated from the other hospital services. Nothing in this bill gives the patient the right to select the doctors; and the author of the bill says that is a prerogative of the hospital.

Mr. McCARTHY. But the original choice is the patient's. The patient will have the right to choose the doctor. If a patient goes to Mayo Clinic, he does not say, "When I enter your clinic, you must have Dr. So-and-So take the X-rays of me."

I have a brother who is a surgeon in a clinic; and a patient who goes there does not say, "Dr. McCarthy must take the X-rays."

One who goes to that clinic takes "the package"; and that is done everywhere in the Nation today.

Mr. CURTIS. But that is a voluntary "package."

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator referred to Blue Cross. Is one who goes into a hospital under Blue Cross allowed to state who will take the X-rays of him or who will give him physiotherapy?

Mr. CURTIS. I am talking about the part of the services which must be performed by licensed physicians.

Mr. ANDERSON. That decision is made purely by the patient; and then his physician decides whether he will be given certain drugs or whether he will receive physiotherapy; and no one else has a word to say about it.

Mr. CURTIS. But according to the bill he is entitled to receive certain services from the hospital.

Mr. ANDERSON. If his physician decides he needs physiotherapy, the patient is entitled to that; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Let that part of the bill speak for itself.

Now I wish to ask about page 2, lines 9 and 10. That provision pertains to those who are entitled to benefits.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Line 8 says the person must have attained age 68; and line 9 and 10 use the words: "is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under section 202."

That does not mean that he has to be drawing them, does it?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, he could be 69 years of age, and still working, and earning more than $1,200 or $1,800; and he would be entitled to receive these hospital benefits, would he?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, there is no work test, as there is under OASI.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no work test and there is no means test; that is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. This is my last question: If the Anderson amendment is adopted, it will be in addition to the provisions of the committee bill, will it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Will an individual be entitled to draw benefits under both parts, if both of them become law?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not think so, but I do not know what the States would do. The States would have a right to set up their own criteria. I do not think it would be possible to draw benefits both ways. The only way that a person on social security—if he was on public assistance, he would have no problem—could draw benefits would be if he were medically indigent and could not obtain the benefits anywhere else. But if he were on social security, he could not say he was medically indigent; and therefore he could not draw both.

Mr. CURTIS. If a beneficiary under OASI had passed 68 years of age, but was drawing the minimum benefit, he would be denied the right to have his doctors' bills paid, under the committee bill, then, according to that explanation?

Mr. ANDERSON. First let me say that a moment ago I believe I gave an incorrect answer. If an individual were receiving benefits under the social security section, he might be eligible—and several of my colleagues have tried to point that out to me—under the other provisions as well.

Mr. CURTIS. Even if he did not run out of funds, he would be eligible to receive both at the same time, would he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. First, he would have to be medically indigent.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose a beneficiary under OASI, who was past 68 years of age, were drawing the minimum benefits. If he availed himself of the hospital services provided under the Senator's amendment, could not he—under the provisions of the bill—have his doctor's bill paid?

Mr. ANDERSON. I apologize to the Senator from Nebraska; I was interrupted for a moment, and did not hear all of his question.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the answer is "yes."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, I should be glad to answer the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly; I am glad to have the Senator from Minnesota do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. And if, following my answer, the Senator from New Mexico wishes to disagree with what I have said, of course, he will be at liberty to do so.

The language of the committee bill refers to medically indigent.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. And the explanation we had of it was, it covered someone who might not be indigent to the point of receiving old-age assistance, but who might be indigent insofar as being able to meet his medical expenses was concerned. In addition to the benefits provided by the committee bill, if the Anderson amendment is adopted, it will take into account also whatever benefits the patient would have through the social-security approach. Therefore, this would be a layer which would fall below that which is recommended in the committee bill, and an individual would not draw double benefits, but, depending on State programs, I am sure they could fit into this concept. If this amendment is adopted, I am sure the intention will be clear that there will not be double payments, and that the concept would come into effect only after an individual had exhausted all his resources, private funds, or social security or other plans, and he would then be indigent and would come under this plan.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Nebraska did not mean to use the term "double benefits," or to imply it. The Senator from Nebraska did not mean that two sources would pay the same benefits. But it is possible for a person to qualify for benefits under the Anderson amendment and still be in such financial condition as to get benefits, including the benefits under the committee bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. My attention has been called to page 6 of the report, wherein is stated the following:

> Benefits under a State program may be provided only for persons 65 years of age or over to the extent that they are unable to pay the cost of their medical expenses.

If they had social security benefits and they were sufficient, they could not come under the State plan. If they were not sufficient, they could.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. I appreciate the expression by the author of the amendment of his views on the language. In what I shall say further I am not attempting to put words in his mouth or interpret his understanding of it. I wish to state my own view of it. My view is this: I believe that if this amendment is adopted—and experience will bear it out—we are inaugurating a system of Government medicine, channeled through the hospitals, under which a hospital must have a contract with the Secretary, and the Secretary has a right, upon notice, to take the contract away, and that as a part of those hospital services there will be certain categories of medical care, and it will be the hospital which is under contract to the Secretary that will select those documents.

I predict that if this proposal is passed it will be like every other social program. It is a beginning, and it will be enlarged and go forward. That is the history of such legislation. So if we adopt the Anderson amendment, we are starting a system whereby one entity contracts with the Government, and that entity selects physicians, and possibly surgeons, but at least physicians——

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield, briefly.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made some remarkable statements. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the medical programs for veterans.

Mr. CURTIS. In general, yes.

Mr. GORE. When a veteran goes into a veterans hospital because he needs X-ray therapy, or osteopathic treatment, or a tonsillectomy, or any one of 101 different things, does not the veterans hospital either provide a Government physician or call in a private physician qualified for the particular function needed by the veteran?

Mr. CURTIS. Very definitely.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator call that Government medicine?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, it is Government medicine in a restricted sense, for a portion of our population; but it is Government medicine.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator call that socialized medicine?

Mr. CURTIS. Not necessarily, because it is for a special class, and it does not spread to everyone. A veterans hospital is Government medicine.

Mr. GORE. What is the difference between socialized medicine and Government medicine, according to the Senator's definition?

Mr. CURTIS. That is a matter of semantics.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has been using terms rather eloquently, and I just wonder what he means by them.

Mr. CURTIS. In a broad, general sense, there is not much difference.

Mr. GORE. Then, insofar as it affects the Government, the doctor, and the patient, would the Senator say it is both Government medicine and socialized medicine?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not regard veterans' care as socialized medicine, to the extent that it is direct Government medical treatment, and I believe that the vast majority of Americans recognize it as such and do not object to it.

Mr. GORE. I am not raising the question of its advisability or inadvisability, but the Senator has said there is not much difference between socialized medicine and Government medicine. Would the Senator be so kind as to explain to the junior Senator from Tennessee just what that difference is?

Mr. CURTIS. I will be happy, at another time and place, to give the Senator my definitions.

Mr. GORE. I would enjoy a private conversation with the Senator, but the Senator has been using prejudicial terms on the floor of the Senate to describe an amendment of which I am a coauthor, and I would like to know what he means by those terms.

Mr. CURTIS. I mean exactly this: If the Anderson amendment is adopted, it is the beginning of Government direction of the practice of medicine and the treatment of the ill—not for a restricted group of veterans, but for our population generally. It is the beginning of it.

I prefaced my statement, in thanking the Senator for his remarks, by stating anything further I said I did not attribute to him, but was stating my belief.

Mr. President, to my mind perhaps the greatest indictment of the Anderson proposal is that it would give medical benefit to a part of our aged population over 68 regardless of whether such persons have retired or not and regardless of their income. The medical benefit would be a rather generous one, and unless the recipient is still working, he would have paid nothing for it. For such people the plan would not be a contributory system.

At the same time the Anderson proposal excludes perhaps approximately 3 million or 3½ million aged people, or people beyond the age of 68, who will draw nothing under the plan.

The Senate should remember that one group will draw nothing. It is said that they have not contributed. Unless one over 65 is still working in covered employment and he does not happen to be a beneficiary under the OASI, he will get those benefits for which he has contributed nothing. It means a greater burden on the young people, on the middle aged, and on the people who are working.

Next year, under the terms of the amendment, a self-employed person, a farmer, or a small businessman will pay $234 social security taxes if he earns a gross of $4,800. If we never add another amendment or increase the benefits after the passage of the Anderson bill, by 1969 such a farmer or professional man or businessman will be paying $342 a year for social security alone, because he pays at a rate of 1½ times what an employee pays. An employee will likewise have an increase in his taxes if the Anderson amendment is passed. He will have remaining less money from his paycheck. The money that is deducted will be used to pay some people over 68 medical benefits regardless of need and regardless of whether they are retired, and at the same time will deny benefits to approximately 3 or 3½ million people who are over 68. It is not a bill that can be defended upon its fairness, even if there were no other objections to the proposal that we have before us.

I believe that an analysis of the bill will indicate that it is a political hodgepodge. It will not take care of our needy aged. It will not treat all of our aged alike. It will be the beginning of Government medicine. It will lessen the take-home pay of every worker in the country and every self-employed person without treating all of our aged uniformly.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will permit, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for calling the attention of the Senate to what I believe is one of the serious objections to the Anderson amendment. Everyone should realize that by adopting the Anderson amendment we would place a burden on 60 percent of the people of this Nation who pay social security taxes, not only to take care of building a health program for themselves, but to carry it as an additional tax to the general tax program levied on the people of this country. I think it is unfair to place this burden on the young people who are raising families and educating their children. The tax burden, as has already been mentioned, is 3 percent each on employer and employee. That percentage rises to 4½ percent in 1969 or 1970. In addition to that tax, it is proposed to impose a tax for a health program. I think it is a burden that we should not ask our young people to carry.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas. His statement is particularly cogent when we realize that this is not a program designed to take care of all people over 68. Its benefits will go only to some of the people; 3 or 3½ million people would be denied benefits. The Anderson amendment does not even provide a test that the recipient must be retired.

I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

During the delivery of Mr. CURTIS' remarks on the Anderson amendment to H.R. 12580:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may yield to me for the purpose of proposing a unanimous-consent agreement, with the understanding that the colloquy will appear at another part of the RECORD, and that the Senator from Nebraska will retain the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have pending the Javits amendment. I have conferred with the author of the amendment and the chairman of the committee, as well as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the minority leader, and other members of the Finance Committee. I think most Members of the Senate would like to know when we anticipate a vote and would like to have us set a time for voting on both the Javits amendment and the Anderson amendment. If that is the consensus of the Senate, I should like to propose this unanimous-consent request, in accordance with the regular form: That when we conclude our deliberations today we stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow; that when we convene tomorrow, we have a morning hour for not to exceed 1 hour; that the time from 11 o'clock to 2 o'clock, if that much time is needed, may be devoted to the Javits amendment, the time to be equally controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the opponents of the amendment; that we have a vote on the Javits amendment not later than 2 o'clock; that following the vote on the Javits amendment we have time controlled between the conclusion of the vote and 6 o'clock on the Anderson amendment, with the proponent, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], in control of the time in favor of the amendment, and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] in control of the time in opposition to the amendment; and that at not later than 6 o'clock we vote on the Anderson amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I am a party to this agreement, I wish to make one thing very clear. The Senator used the term "the usual agreement," which includes the rule of germaneness. I know what the Senator intends. I am sure he will agree with me that the unanimous-consent agreement should provide that for the purposes of the unanimous-consent agreement both my amendment and the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] shall be deemed to be germane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Germane to the bill, surely. There are other things, in the usual form, like no time on a motion to table, and things like that.

Mr. JAVITS. I have one other point. Mr. President, it is understood that the unanimous-consent request does not apply to all amendments to the bill, but only to the Javits amendment and the Anderson amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is true. We do not go beyond the two amendments.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the majority leader said we may vote any time up to 2 o'clock. Does the Senator mean by that that we shall vote at 2 o'clock?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. If Senators wish to yield back their time, we could vote at 1:35 p.m. In no event would we go beyond.

Mr. BUTLER. We would not go beyond 2 o'clock.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I did concur in the suggestion which was made first because I know that some time will be devoted to the morning hour. If we start at 11 o'clock on the Javits proposal, there will be an hour and a half for each side, which is not too much time. I think these matters should be properly discussed. There is no disposition on our part to delay or to defer action on these two major proposals. I think an hour and a half on a side would be adequate.

After we vote on the Javits amendment there will be roughly 3½ or 4 hours to devote to the Anderson proposal. That will be approximately 2 hours on a side. The reason for the additional time is that there was only a short session on Saturday, and not too many Senators

were present. I think the matter is of such import and significance that it deserves the extra discussion.

I concur in the unanimous-consent request, unless there is some Senator who has other ideas about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I direct a parliamentary inquiry to the Presiding Officer. Under the rules of the Senate can we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at a time certain on the following day without preceding the consent agreement with a quorum call? Would it not be subject to a point of order if it were entered into without there being a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule with respect to the quorum call relates only to the passage of a bill or resolution and does not apply to amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are considering only two amendments. That rule would apply to the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It applies only to the passage of the bill, and not to any amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is understood we are dealing with two amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Both of which are considered to be germane, and there is to be a time certain, or before, at which we shall vote; namely, 2 o'clock on the Javits proposal and 6 o'clock on the Anderson proposal?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I do not know whether the majority leader overlooked this or not, but I understood the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] had a speaking engagement in Detroit at noon tomorrow. Has the majority leader taken that into consideration? Would he prefer to postpone the vote to convenience him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not want to play politics.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We would be glad to cooperate with him and give him time to get back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we all know the Senator's interest in cooperating with Democratic presidential nominees.

I told the Senator privately a few minutes ago what I am willing to restate publicly, that I thought one of the greatest injustices I had ever seen practiced in the Senate was practiced the other evening when the Senator from Massachusetts was charged with having caused the Senate to go out early when he had nothing whatever to do with it, when advance notice was given, when the minority leader was a party to that agreement, and it was printed in the RECORD. Subsequently the statement was made that Senators did not have information about when the Senate would go out.

The Senator from Massachusetts said to me upon that occasion, and he has repeated to me since, that he does not want any plans which he may have to in any way interfere with when we come in or when we go out. He will adjust himself to whatever schedule the Senate might set.

I have not consulted him about this. I do not intend to. I rather think that if he has plans the Senator from Delaware has knowledge of they are unknown to me, and he can either readjust his schedule or readjust his plans.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure my majority leader that my words were in no way critical of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, but were only offered in the spirit of cooperation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In fact, I have not criticized the Senator's absence half as much as the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I simply wish to be cooperative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It reminds me of when I was back on the farm and had just finished milking, with a great big bucket of milk filled, when the old cow drew her tail across the milk bucket.

I understand it for what it is.

I wish to add that the schedule is worked out particularly to suit the Republican leadership, because they have a conference tomorrow morning. We do not wish to come in too early. We should like to have a morning hour, so that there will be no chance of having any votes before the leadership gets here. I do not think that is a matter which ought to be a part of the agreement, any more than any plans of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let us get this straight. I have not heard anything about this agreement being for the convenience of the Republican conference. Suppose we change the voting hour to 10:30 a.m.?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would have no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That suits me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The minority leader told me that.

Mr. BUTLER. We can vote at 11:05, if that is the desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The minority leader told me. He usually knows whereof he speaks. He said he did have a conference. As I recall, there is a television performance down there every Tuesday morning. I gathered he felt that 11 o'clock would give him enough time to perform his duties at the White House and also be able to be in attendance at the Senate when any business was taken up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no secrets. We have the regular Tuesday morning leadership conference at the White House. Insofar as I know, it begins at 8:30 a.m. When it is concluded there will be that delightful moment when we have a conference with the press and then go out in front of the White House, where one has an opportunity to ventilate his opinions and views over three networks. It is one of those priceless things. I would not give it up for anything. [Laughter.]

So I suggested that we come in at 10 o'clock and that there be a morning hour of not to exceed 1 hour, which will give me an opportunity to be present and to participate in the discussion.

All I know, like Will Rogers, is what I read in the newspapers. I had in mind that the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts is scheduled for an appearance in Detroit. My understanding is that that appearance is at 12 o'clock.

I have flown to Detroit and back a great many times, sometimes in a two-motored plane, and sometimes in a four-motored plane. I know there is a downtown airport. One does not have to go all the way to Willow Run in order to board a plane. One can fly from the heart of Detroit and return here in 2 hours. So if there is an appearance, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] can get back in time to vote, certainly on the Anderson amendment. I do not know how deeply interested he might be in voting on the Javits amendment, but at least I did have it in mind, because I like to be not only indulgent, but also fair and to give full and adequate opportunity to every Senator, no matter what high estate he may seek, to be here and to have his vote recorded at the proper time. I thought, therefore, that a vote at 6 o'clock on the Anderson amendment would be time enongh, and I think the majority leader agrees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think anyone who reads the RECORD can see some of the problems we have in attempting to pass legislation through this body. I hope all Senators will take notice that we will remain in session this evening as long as Senators may desire, and then we shall come in at 10 o'clock to proceed to vote at 2 o'clock on the Javits amendment, and not later than 6 on the Anderson amendment. We do not expect any rollcall votes this evening.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, was the request agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement was agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That upon the convening of the Senate at 10 a.m. tomorrow (Tuesday, August 23, 1960), the consideration of morning business be in order until not later than 11 a.m.; that at said hour the Senate resume the consideration of H.R. 12580, the Social Security Amendments of 1960, and proceed with debate on the so-called Javits (and others) amendment to the so-called Anderson (and others) amendment until not later than 2 p.m.; that the intervening time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents and controlled, respectively, by Mr. JAVITS and the majority leader; and that a vote be taken on said amendment at not later than 2 p.m.; that the Senate then

proceed to the consideration of the Anderson amendment and that debate thereon proceed until not later than 6 o'clock p.m., the time to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. ANDERSON and the minority leader, and that the Senate vote at not later than 6 o'clock p.m. on said amendment: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to either of said amendments shall be in order.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 107. An act to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship-mortgage insurance, in order to include floating drydocks under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title;

S. 2830. An act to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1960 campaign the equal-opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580), the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senate in its wisdom decides that it is either necessary or advisable at this time to pass legislation in this field, I shall certainly favor and support the legislation reported from the committee and supported on the floor by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and various other Senators. However, I think that most of us are in trouble in our thinking about this whole subject. I know that insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has received many communications from young people within his State complaining about the fact that the proposal to increase the social security taxes in order to put the proposed program upon the Social Security System would be hurtful to the young people at a time when they are faced with heavy responsibilities and heavy expenses as they are rearing their families.

I know also that from my State, where I suspect the percentage of elderly people is as great as in any State in the Union and perhaps greater, has come voluminous mail on this subject, a great preponderance of it coming from elderly people, indicating that they do not want the Government to interfere in this field.

At this time I simply rise to note that in a casual inspection of reputable newspapers today I have noted quite a number of scholarly and well-informed editorials calling attention to the fact that we are proceeding too hastily in a matter of such great importance, and the further fact that in the judgment of the editorialists we are guilty of great unwisdom if we rush into legislation in this field at this time and during this session.

Mr. President, the first of the editorials which I mention is from the Baltimore Sun. It is headed "Care and Votes." I ask that the whole editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CARE AND VOTES

Medical care for the aged is at this moment the foremost issue in the presidential campaign. Political leaders of both parties in the Senate, where the battle is currently waged, are guided, we may be sure, not so much by what is good for the citizens affected as what is most likely to attract their votes.

The Democratic platform calls for an extension of social security under which all aged persons in that program would be eligible for medical benefits regardless of financial status. The proposal incidentally involves another deduction from the pay envelope.

The Republican alternative has been an administration bill limited in scope, aimed at helping the aged pay for catastrophic illness. There is a wide gap between it and the Democratic offer. So long as Mr. NIXON had nothing else to offer he was handicapped in dealing with the issue of medical care. He now has thrown his support to a plan proposed by Senator JAVITS, of New York, which would provide preventive care and other medical aid to all persons over 65 years old excepting about 2 million with incomes judged substantial. There is every indication that the Javits proposal is designed to replace the administration bill (in both the Federal contribution would come from general funds). Mr. NIXON'S support considerably strengthens his bid for the old folks' vote.

Still another medical care plan, far less ambitious, is now before the Senate, having been voted out favorably by the Finance Committee. It is a somewhat stronger version of a bill passed by the House but confined to helping the indigent and the medically indigent.

Thus in the brief time left in the present session the Senate is confronted with at least three medical-care proposals differing widely as to details and relative costs. The time is too short for the careful consideration they deserve. It would be better if action were deferred until after the election, leaving the respective candidates to make whatever political capital they may out of the proposals now in the air.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall quote from the editorial only the first and the last paragraphs, which read as follows:

Medical care for the aged is at this moment the foremost issue in the presidential campaign. Political leaders of both parties in the Senate, where the battle is currently waged, are guided, we may be sure, not so much by what is good for the citizens affected as what is most likely to attract their votes.

Then, in its closing paragraph, this fine editorial states the substance of the position of that paper, as follows:

Thus in the brief time left in the present session the Senate is confronted with at least three medical care proposals differing widely as to details and relative costs. The time is too short for the careful consideration they deserve. It would be better if action were deferred until after the election, leaving the respective candidates to make whatever political capital they may out of the proposals now in the air.

The second of the editorials is from the Washington Daily News, the Scripps-Howard paper in the National Capital. It is headed "Get the Facts." I ask unanimous consent that the whole editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

GET THE FACTS

A former Cabinet officer, Marion B. Folsom, has come up with the most sensible proposal yet for dealing with the complex problem of medical care for the aged.

First, Mr. Folsom, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would have the dying session of Congress drop its scheduled attempt to enact a medical care program—because there is no emergency to justify hasty legislation.

Then he would have an advisory commission appointed to study the entire field of health insurance for persons over 65, with instructions to report by next March 1 to the new Congress and new administration. The commission, he said, should include representatives of the medical profession, insurance industry, employers, labor unions and the general public. To avoid partisanship, the commission could be appointed jointly by the Democratic chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees and the Republican Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"This is the logical way of getting the best possible program," Mr. Folsom says. "You would be surprised how much agreement you can get on a plan, once the facts are known."

We agree. Certainly not enough facts are at hand to justify helter-skelter enactment of legislation of such a far-reaching nature. And the facts, when known, just might be surprising.

Two Emory University professors, for example, have surveyed 1,500 persons over 65, using probability sampling, and found only 8 percent who knew of some unfilled medical needs. And lack of money was the least important of the reasons given for not having the medical needs met.

Many facts should be turned up by the White House Conference on Aging, scheduled for January, which would be of great assistance to an advisory commission such as suggested by Mr. Folsom.

This harried and politically minded Congress would do the country a great service by heeding Mr. Folsom and permitting the assemblage of facts which would show just how much and what kind of a medical care program is needed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read only three short paragraphs from the editorial, as follows:

A former Cabinet officer, Marion B. Folsom, has come up with the most sensible proposal yet for dealing with the complex problem of medical care for the aged.

First, Mr. Folsom, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would have the dying session of Congress drop its scheduled attempt to enact a medical care program—because there is no emergency to justify hasty legislation.

Then, proceeding with the suggestion for the appointment of an advisory group and for the bringing in of recommendations of that group early next spring, the editorial concludes the discussion with this paragraph:

This harried and politically minded Congress would do the country a great service by heeding Mr. Folsom and permitting the assemblage of facts which would show just how much and what kind of a medical care program is needed.

Mr. President, the third of the editorials touches me even a little more closely than the other two, because it is based upon the preliminary recommendations of two very able professors at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., an institution of learning, of which I have the honor to be a graduate, and of which I have been a trustee for many years.

I ask unanimous consent that the whole editorial, which appears in today's issue of the New York Daily News, be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

OLD FOLKS AND DOCTORS

"When we asked the respondents: "Do you have any medical needs now that are not being taken care of?"—92 percent said, "No." However, for the remaining 8 percent who knew of some unfilled medical needs, we have to distinguish various reasons for the failure to relieve the need. Financial reasons were the least important ones."

The quotation is from a preliminary report on elderly Americans' medical needs, or lack of them, by Profs. James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck of Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.

HOW MANY REALLY NEED "MEDICARE"?

The report is based on interviews with 1,500 old people representing a cross-section of our "senior citizen" population.

Of the 1,500 persons interviewed, 64 percent had health insurance to meet medical bills. All but the above-mentioned 8 percent were confident that emergency sickness expenses could be taken care of in one way or another—by their insurance, or by drawing on their bank accounts, mortgaging their homes, getting help from their children, and so on.

The Emory University team found very little enthusiasm among these people for Government medical aid—and a lot of fear that excessive Government spending would drain away what is left of the dollar's buying power.

This report is respectfully recommended to the attention of Members of Congress, in both parties, who are currently shrieking to the high heavens that we've got to blanket our "senior citizens" into an overall socialized medicine scheme or catastrophe will follow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it might be well to call special attention to the text of that editorial, which is entitled "Old Folks and Doctors" with the byline, "How Many Really Need Medicare?"

First, the editorial quotes from a report of the two able professors of Emory University:

"When we asked the respondents: 'Do you have any medical needs now that are not being taken care of?'—92 percent said, 'No.' However, for the remaining 8 percent who knew of some unfilled medical needs, we have to distinguish various reasons for the failure to relieve the need. Financial reasons were the least important ones."

The quotation is from a preliminary report on elderly Americans' medical needs, or lack of them, by Profs. James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck of Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.

The report is based on interviews with 1,500 old people representing a cross section of our "senior citizen" population.

Of the 1,500 persons interviewed, 64 percent had health insurance to meet medical bills. All but the above-mentioned 8 percent were confident that emergency sickness expenses could be taken care of in one way or another—by their insurance, or by drawing on their bank accounts, mortgaging their homes, getting help from their children, and so on.

The Emory University team found very little enthusiasm among these people for Government medical aid—and a lot of fear that excessive government spending would drain away what is left of the dollar's buying power.

I digress to say that that very fear, which is voiced as having been found by these two able analysts in the minds of so many of the elderly people whom they interviewed among the 1,500, which they say is a fair cross section, appears in the majority of the letters, going into the hundreds, which I have received from elderly people within the State of Florida. They fear that excessive Government spending will drain away what is left of the dollar's buying power.

The chief objection to all these extravagant and expensive programs which are being urged as a result of ultra liberal planning and current insistence, is that the objectors believe greater inflation will result, and that the purchasing power of their dollars, in many cases saved by frugal living throughout their lives, will be taken away or reduced in such a measure as to deprive elderly people and other citizens of the security and the fruits of their labors.

I close the quotation from this able editorial with this paragraph:

This report is respectfully recommended to the attention of Members of Congress, in both parties, who are currently shrieking to the high heavens that we've got to blanket our "senior citizens" into an overall socialized medicine scheme or catastrophe will follow.

Mr. President, I believe these three editorials, which are typical of many which will be found in the current press of the Nation, indicate that there is a strong case now existing for postponement of this whole matter until we can have more light on it.

However, I say again, if in the judgment of a majority of the Senate the pressures of the moment and of the political campaign, which impinge on so many here, are such that we must pass an act in this field, I hope it will be an act along the lines recommended by our able committee.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, we are now approaching the final days of decision on how to meet effectively and on a dignified basis the high cost of medical care for the aged.

Several Senators have proposed solutions to this No. 1 problem of the aged and I should like to take this opportunity to present a brief evaluation of them based on the 18 months' study conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman.

In the course of our comprehensive study, the members of the subcommittee had the benefit of the knowledge and views of many scientists of the very first rank in the field of gerontology. They were also able to discuss health problems of the aged with hundreds of local administrators—public and private—working with the elderly right in their own communities in seven major cities across the country. We received communications and recommendations from hundreds and thousands of additional professionals in the field. In a unique undertaking, we heard from the aged themselves as they spoke directly to us at our hearings in the various cities. We made personal visits and spoke with residents in homes for the aged, housing projects for the elderly, senior centers, nursing homes, rehabilitation hospitals, and other facilities.

As a result of these studies, hearings, and reports, I should like to set forth the best thinking in the field as guidelines for a program of health services.

The objectives of a good health program are:

First. To prevent illness when possible; to limit disability by early diagnosis.

Second. To provide acute treatment in hospitals.

Third. To assure that convalescent and rehabilitation services are given in a proper facility.

Fourth. To provide long-term care in the patient's own home whenever possible.

Fifth. To purchase these high-quality services at reasonable costs.

Sixth. To finance the services through a prepaid insurance system which emphasizes independence and freedom.

In achieving this, the following should be avoided:

First. Interference with the current pattern of medical care.

Second. Excessive use of hospitalization, and any incentive for such excessive use.

Third. Financial or other obstacles to early securing of medical care.

Fourth. Unnecessary use of any single group of scarce health professionals.

Fifth. Encouragement of low quality care.

Sixth. Imposition of a means or charity test to finance medical services.

THE RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT

With this experience and these guidelines in mind, we drafted and introduced S. 3503 as a balanced program of medical insurance benefits for retired persons—men 65 and over, women 62 and over. The bill extended its benefits to the retired aged outside of the OASDI system as well as to those eligible for social security benefits. The system would be financed primarily through social security with relatively small supplementary appropriations out of the general fund to cover the costs of the non-OASI eligibles.

I was honored to have 23 other Senators join me as cosponsors in what I believe—and as confirmed by communications from outstanding students and practitioners in this field and by hundreds of letters from the aged themselves—as the soundest proposal suggested—both medically and financially. I take what may be inordinate pride in this bill, since the final draft was not mine alone, but the thoughts, ideas, and

works of many minds. The bill is soundly financed through a one-quarter of 1 percent increase in the social security tax on the employer and employee in its first 10 years of operation, and an additional one-eighth of 1 percent on each after 1972. In this respect it is not bound by the myth of the level-premium concept but rather by the more realistic and effective recommendation of the Congress' Advisory Council on Social Security. This official body recommended that OASDI financing be based on 15- to 20-year estimates with congressional review thereafter. It thus provided the maximum amount of health benefits at a minimum cost at the earliest possible time, and on a sound, actuarial basis.

However, I am now of the opinion—as we come down to a final decision—that the present course of practical wisdom requires acceptance of a medical insurance bill limited to a one-half of 1 percent increase in the social security tax on a level-premium or long-run estimate—calculated to take into account cost changes over the next 100 years.

Because of this financial limitation, I have joined Senator ANDERSON and Senator KENNEDY in cosponsoring an amendment to H.R. 12580 which I trust will pass the Senate. The Anderson-Kennedy bill constitutes a sound, effective program for meeting the health costs of the aged on a dignified basis. It provides for diagnostic services to emphasize prevention; for adequate hospital care and treatment; and for suitable skilled nursing home care and home health services, thus emphasizing medical care in the community and in the home. It thereby deemphasizes excessive use of hospitalization and institutionalization. At this point I ask unanimous consent to include a memorandum explaining the details of the bill.

The Anderson-Kennedy bill is one that I am very happy to cosponsor since it meets the guidelines and criteria I set forth earlier, but within the level premium of one-half of 1 percent of payrolls limitation. I urge all those who have supported S. 3503 and all other Senators to join in enthusiastic, concerted approval of the Anderson-Kennedy amendment.

There are two other proposals on which I would like to comment.

THE KERR-FREAR BILL

The Kerr-Frear proposal expands medical care for old-age recipients primarily by injecting more Federal funds into State programs. It also adds a new category for medically indigent or medically needy outside of old-age assistance. This latter category will be helpful to some extent and I shall support these improvements in medical care under public assistance. We need, however, to add—as a complementary bill—the Anderson-Kennedy social security approach.

Standing alone the medical assistance part of the Kerr-Frear proposal has the following weaknesses:

First. It cannot go into effect in any State until that State has authority to raise the necessary funds to match Federal grants.

Second. It continues the means or charity test approach which requires income and asset investigation.

Third. Being open ended, it would cost as much as $2½ billion a year—$1.7 billion Federal—if all the States came in and provided all of the benefits potentially available to the 10 million eligibles.

Fourth. First-year cost estimates under the bill—Federal, State, and local—are approximately $116 million, which we estimate will cover a potential group of not more than 460,000 people over the entire country, of whom perhaps 46,000 will actually receive medical benefits, because of insufficient income to meet their medical bills.

Fifth. When the program is in full operation, estimates indicate a cost of $165 million, representing a total eligible population of about 660,000 for the Nation, with about 66,000 who would actually receive benefits as medical indigents.

The Kerr-Frear bill thus is a proposal to assist less than 1 million potentially medically needy outside of old-age assistance—leaving more than 12 million unprotected.

Sixth. At present approximately half the States are not able to match Federal funds for the medical care of their old-age recipients in an adequate manner. Additional funds for the increased payments under the vendor payments provision combined with the needs of the medical indigency program would be extremely difficult to secure. Such a decision at the State level might result in cuts in other necessary State services.

In summary, I would like to repeat that the Kerr-Frear proposal is very helpful for a small number of the most needy aged but can only meet the medical costs of the aged effectively if the Anderson-Kennedy social security bill is added to it. The Anderson-Kennedy amendment will not increase the cost on the Federal Treasury, since it will be financed solely through the social security system on an insurance basis.

THE JAVITS-HEW BILL

The other bill I would like to evaluate is the amendment to H.R. 12580 proposed last week by Senator JAVITS as representing the new combined approach of Senator JAVITS and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is a proposal which I am sure is offered with sincerity and after extensive study, and has a number of sound medical features. However, it has several over-riding weaknesses which lead me to oppose the bill:

First. It depends on action by the States to put the proposal into effect—State Governors have already voted 30 to 11 in favor of the social security approach as against the Federal-State grant approach.

Second. It calls for the establishment of a national income test to be adopted by the States. Persons over 65 therefore would have to prove that they are in need before being considered eligible to receive medical payments.

Third. It is estimated to cost about $1 billion a year with only about 75 percent participation; $450 million of this sum would come out of the Federal general revenue budget; $450 million from the States; and $100 million from the individual aged. If the $450 million in Federal outlay were added to the cost of the first year of full operation of both programs proposed by the Finance Committee (around $300 million), there would be a total expenditure by the Federal Government of three-fourths of a billion dollars annually from the general budget.

Fourth. The aged person himself would have to pay an enrollment fee annually and would have to choose between a short-term care program or a catastrophic illness program. My view is that the set of benefits should be balanced between these two objectives as in the Anderson-Kennedy bill.

It proposes a third alternative that the Federal and State Governments may subsidize private insurance companies up to a maximum of $60 with the aged individual also paying $60.

I should like to summarize by saying that an approach which depends on new State taxes, which calls for the means or income test, which requires payments by the elderly themselves, and which—when added to the Finance Committee expenditures—will cost $750 million a year by the Federal Government, is not a suitable alternative. The social security method of financing the medical costs of the elderly is fiscally prudent and humanly dignified.

ADVANTAGES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY METHOD

After 25 years of successful operation of the social security system, I do not feel that the relief-public assistance-means test approach should be offered as a solution to this problem.

The advantages of the social security approach are:

First. An individual, during his working lifetime, pays a small premium for a paid-up medical policy upon retirement.

Second. He thereby can pay for his medical care in retirement through benefits which he receives as a matter of right regardless of his economic status. This is the dignified, self-reliant, self-respecting way.

Third. Contributions are paid by the person only while he is working, not while he is retired. Benefits will not depend upon annual or biennial appropriations in State legislatures but will come out of an insurance reserve.

Fourth. The cost of administering a plan under social security is about one half the combined administrative cost of Federal, State and local operation.

Fifth. The social security approach would provide a basic medical insurance plan for the aged, not a complete one. It would thus allow private health insurance to flourish as a supplementary program, similar to what occurred with private life insurance after the passage of the Social Security Act. Supplementary policies for physician and surgical services and for catastrophic illness could be made available to the aged at very low rates. Premiums to younger age groups could be lowered and health policies sold more widely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, following my remarks, a brief statement on this subject which was published in the Washington Insurance Newsletter of August 15, 1960.

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

THE SOCIAL SECURITY APPROACH
(By Senator PAT MCNAMARA)

The August session of Congress has convened with one of its major purposes being the enactment of legislation creating a Government-sponsored program of financing the basic health needs of America's aged citizens. Responsible Senators and Congressmen, in both parties, all agree on the crucial facts in support of the need for such legislation: (1) The increase in health problems, especially chronic illness, associated with the aging process; (2) the low income status of the aged, especially in the upper "old age" brackets incurring much of the chronic illnesses; and (3) the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of using unreplenished assets to meet the high costs of adequate medical attention.

I have documented these points in a detailed speech in the Senate on June 2, 1960. While fully recognizing the positive role played by nonpublic insurance programs in protecting the vast majority of younger, employed persons and their families, I am convinced that the ability of such programs to provide truly adequate protection for the aged population against their higher risks and costs of health maintenance is really limited. Both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I are in agreement on this point.

As I will make clear later on, however, this new legislation can create the conditions for a new and expanding role for private health insurance. The background for such a statement is as follows:

Under S. 3503 the retired persons medical insurance bill introduced by myself and 23 other Senators in May, an aged person would be entitled to the following benefits:

1. Ninety days of hospitalization per year.

2. One hundred and eighty days of skilled nursing home care or two days for each unused hospital day.

3. Two hundred and forty days of home health services, or 2⅔ days for each unused hospital day.

4. Outpatient diagnostic services (lab tests and X-rays).

5. A substantial portion of very expensive drugs and medicines. (Precise details to be determined after several months' study by Secretary of HEW.)

This, in the opinion of the health experts we consulted, should be the basic core of a health care program for the elderly, to be financed through a combined one-half of 1 percent of taxable payroll (three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed). It would provide a sound foundation—I repeat, a foundation—for a preventive and rehabilitative medical approach to the health problems of nearly all the aged of this country. The provision of diagnostic services, skilled nursing homes, and home health care would be an incentive toward the rational and efficient use of hospital beds.

It should be noted that the benefits provided are not comprehensive: For example, all physicians' and surgeons' fees are excluded, as are dentists' charges; costs beyond 90 days of hospital stay per year (or their equivalents in nursing home days or home health care) are not provided; a portion of the cost of drugs and medicines would still have to be paid by the patient.

In other words, we are talking only about a foundation of a sound and balanced health services program, just as the old-age benefits under the social security system itself (which was 25 years old on August 14 of this year) established a foundation for retirement income, on top of which private pension programs have been built and have been expanding ever since. By using the same administratively efficient and inexpensive mechanism of the social security system, working people would contribute while in their productive years toward a fund that would provide them with basic medical benefits when they have retired—but only basic benefits.

Payment for much, but not all, of the ordinary (but expensive) costs of proper medical attention would be made available through legislation to our aged citizens, regardless of their financial means, without any degrading pauper's test. The effect of such legislation is to open a wide area of activity for supplemental health and medical insurance through private channels. From a dollars-and-cents point of view, the millions of older men and women with inadequate protection today (or none at all) are not, in any realistic sense, potential customers for meaningful private health insurance policies.

But with a Government-sponsored program, more of the aged of America would then be able to afford supplemental health protection, to protect themselves against the many costs not provided through a public program, including the services cited in the list of benefits not provided by such bills as S. 3503—and all the other major legislative proposals, as a matter of fact. It would thus be possible for millions of older persons (and their adult children) to purchase, for a very low cost, oldsters' insurance for physicians' and surgeons' fees, private hospital room costs, private nursing care, and truly catastrophic, major medical expenses, from private plans.

There are other potential effects of Federal legislation for basic health protection of the aged. For example, a private program now covering the employed population, and also the retired workers previously covered when employed, would be relieved of the extra costs due to the high illness rates of the retired. The insurance industry would then be in a position to offer improved policies for just the employed alone. And there is always room for improvement in such programs.

I am convinced also that if a worker knows his future medical expenses during retirement are assured, he will be in a better position, and he will be more willing to pay for wider protection now. This is certainly so in the face of the growing health consciousness of the younger generations of America. As these generations learn of the remarkable progress that is now possible in modern medicine, they will want to exploit these possibilities. And the insurance approach, or course, is the best way of prepaying for the costs of these new 20th century miracles.

What we are proposing in Congress today is merely the efficient financing of the costs of basic medical care for the aged. I hope that the hospital and health insurance industry of America will join other groups, and the general public, along with Congress, in recognizing the traditional compatibility of public and private solutions to national problems, in this case, the problem of financing the costs of basic medical care for our growing population of aged citizens.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, in concluding, I should like to state this issue in its starkest terms. The Senate and the people of the United States need to know that the choice we are making here is a choice between the degrading means test, charity approach of the administration, endorsed by the Vice President, and the route to dignity and self respect through social insurance, advocated by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON.]

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, in the course of the debate with regard to the amendments to the Social Security Act, a number of references have been made on the floor to a recent survey, or at least what is called a survey, of the medical needs and health attitudes of the aged. The survey was made by a number of sociologists headed by Dr. J. W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck, of Emory University, in Atlanta, Ga. The interpretation of their findings is to the effect that the vast majority of older people have no unfilled medical needs. This, if true, is in direct contradiction of what has been found by at least two established committees of Congress in both the House and Senate, and, of course, is contradictory of the findings made by many sociologists throughout the United States. Specifically, the authors state:

> Nine of every ten older persons report they have no unfilled medical needs and the remainder lists lack of money as one of the least important reasons for failure to relieve the needs.

This statement was contained in a press release prepared by Dr. Wiggins.

This survey has been used as the basis for a number of news stories and a news release of the American Medical Association. It has been widely publicized and has been given attention throughout the country and on the floor of the Senate.

I have made a rather hurried study of the report and have attempted to study the interpretations which have been put upon it. If true, it would indicate that much of the information which Congress has been gathering throughout the past few years is not accurate information because most of the studies conducted by Congress, and the reports which we have received from various departments of the Government indicate that there is a great unfilled medical need among the older people of our population. Those studies and inquiries indicate, too, that one of the principal reasons why the unfilled needs of older people are not met is that such people lack adequate funds to pay hospital and medical costs.

I was somewhat surprised to learn that the American Medical Association would fully endorse and publicize the Wiggins survey, because on the basis of the great record of the medical profession in the United States, one expects them to deal rather with objective standards concerning any kind of survey or study. In my opinion, one could properly hope that the American Medical Association would apply the same standards which they apply in their own profession when they examine the reports of sociologists and others who pursue other studies and other disciplines.

Some of my early judgments on the report raise some question in my mind whether the sociologists of the United States, the men who are attempting to make a science of and to professionalize this field, are particularly happy about the nature of this report and the use to which these findings have been put.

The survey supposedly represents, or at least it declares that it represents, a sample of the attitude of the aged of the United States and reporting data from some 1,500 interviews with older people.

The news release and commentaries do not indicate fully the nature of this sampling or print any claims made by those who have lent their names to it that there has been a complete study.

For a survey of this type to be accurate, it would have had to be done scientifically, and the sample chosen would have had to represent truly a cross section of America's aged population.

The aged population of the United States is made up of a certain percentage of people who are on the old-age assistance rolls, a certain percentage who are on social security, and a percentage who are not receiving old-age assistance, and a percentage who are not on social security.

The population of persons over age 65 in the United States has some variables with regard to national origin, with regard to race, and with regard to sex. One would expect that any objective, scientific study of these variables and differences would have been given adequate attention and consideration. However, by their own admission, Dr. Wiggins and Mr. Schoeck actually did not conduct a survey of a true cross section of the 60 million people over age 65 in the United States, even if we assumed that 1,500 was a large enough sample number, to begin with—and there is grave reason to doubt whether such a sample would be adequate.

For example, they intentionally did not interview anyone over age 65 who was receiving old-age assistance. So that entire group was eliminated in the study. Yet this group represents 16 percent of the aged people in our population.

Because they said they lacked funds, they intentionally omitted nonwhite people over age 65. Such people represent 7 percent of the aged, and have very special problems, as anyone knows, and as sociologists, in particular, should know.

The Wiggins-Schoeck team intentionally omitted from their survey aged persons in hospitals, homes for the aged, nursing homes, and other institutions. Yet this group represents about 4 percent of the people who are over age 65, and certainly a group in the population having very special medical problems.

Dr. Wiggins admitted, but only after rather thorough questioning by other sociologists attending the International Gerontological Congress, in San Francisco, where he first reported his findings, that in his study about 20 percent refused to be interviewed or were in the not-available category. Neither his formal paper nor the AMA story about the formal paper bothered to mention this important point.

An additional 20 percent refused to be interviewed or were in the not-available category.

If we add up all these figures, they indicate that about 40 percent of the population in the 65-or-over age group has not been adequately covered in the survey which is the basis of that report. If we assume that there is some overlapping among the various categories, and that approximately 35 percent of the aged people in the United States were not covered in this publicized letter—at least, publicized as a scientific survey of America's older citizens—I think it fair to say that in the 35 percent not covered are many—perhaps the greater number—of those who have the greatest medical need.

If this report had been represented as a study of the medical and health needs of that section of our aged population which is best able to meet its medical needs and health costs, it might have been considered to be scientific; but it has not been presented as such a study.

Two claims of the Emory University study, by themselves, give, I think, if not conclusive proof, at least reason for grave doubts as to whether or not the sample reported is representative of the aged of the United States.

The authors assert, for example, that 64 percent of their sample report some form of health insurance. But even the insurance companies whose representatives have testified before Congress have issued a statement with respect to health insurance among the aged members of our population and claim no more than 49 percent. Secretary Flemming's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that only 42 percent of the aged have health insurance. Nevertheless the authors state that 64 percent of the people whom they studied had health insurance. This would indicate some discrepancy, it seems to me, in the sampling; a discrepancy so obvious that any sociologist having any claim to recognition or a status in the medical profession should have stopped short or at least should have made a special point and noted that this was a highly selective sample which was used as the basis of this survey.

The authors assert that 33.6 percent—almost 34 percent—of the aged in their sample are in the labor force, but the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor reports only 20 percent of the 65 and over population as being in the labor force today. Here is another discrepancy, amounting to 14 percent.

Again, that is an obvious indication that the sample was not truly selective and did not represent a cross section of the population of the Nation.

It seems to me that at the very least, Professors Wiggins and Schoeck would have checked such statistics to see how normal their sample really was.

Contrary to Professor Wiggins own statement in his San Francisco report, his sample was not based on an area probability selection. Instead, it was based on what is called the quota method, the much discredited technique used in the famous 1948 Gallup poll and in previous inadequate surveys. Apparently, the Emory sociologists merely got in touch with other colleagues around the country and asked them, for example, to get them such data on such-and-such a number of white, non-public-assistance aged in their respective parts of the country—in other words, to check on this highly selective group. In short, despite the author's statement, it is not true that "Each person in the universe from which the sample was taken had an equal chance to be included in the sample."

Now I come to a most vulnerable aspect of such "scientific" surveys. The Emory report emphasizes in the extreme the "high level of health" reported by the aged who were interviewed, and the same point is emphasized in the publicity issued by way of news releases by the American Medical Association. Apart from the matter of the distorted sample covered in the report, there is still the highly important question about the ability of an individual in an interview with sociologists to determine the actual state of his physical or mental condition or whether he has or does not have any unmet health needs. For the AMA to accept the statement that 90 per cent of the aged have no unfilled medical needs is to fly in the face of the day-to-day clinical experiences of the doctors who are members of the AMA.

It seems rather strange that the American Medical Association would now permit some 15 or 20 sociologists to report on how many people in the population have unmet medical needs and how many do not have unmet medical needs. That is certainly contradictory of suggestions which come almost regularly from the doctors and from the American Medical Association; namely, that all people, whether sick or not, should have regular medical examinations by doctors. I suppose the next step would be for the American Medical Association to get out a sort of "medical do it yourself kit," or to get a sociologist to do it. In this case, they take the position that the sociologists could make a study of 1,500 people, and then could say, "None of them is sick; all these people are in good health." If that is the case, I think the medical profession should look to the American Medical Association, because we could expect such procedure to lead to a very dangerous trend in medical practice.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I do not believe the statement made was "no one is sick." What term was used? Was it "unmet"?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, "unmet medical needs"; that was the language which was used in the survey.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator from Minnesota compare that with unrequited love? [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARTHY. I suppose the question would be whether the subject was fully aware of what was happening to him, and I suppose in each case there

would be a possible area of misunderstanding and of failure to diagnose the symptoms properly.

I should like to read a statement which has a bearing on this subject. I refer to a monumental and rather far-reaching medical science research project completed by the Commission on Chronic Illness, and published in at least four volumes of data and evaluation. Part of this project dealt with the very question of the discrepancy between self-evaluation of medical need and actual medical need as determined by thorough clinical examination of the persons making their own self-evaluation in oral interviews.

The results of this type of verification of self-reported diagnoses by actual clinical examinations have also been published in a shorter article by three of the participating scientists in the studies made by the Commission on Chronic Illness, Dr. Ray E. Trussell, M.D., M.P.H., F.A.P.H.A., now of Columbia University; Dr. Jack Elinson, Ph. D., a recognized national expert on interviewing techniques, and also now at Columbia University; and Dr. Morton L. Levin, M.D., assistant commissioner, New York State Department of Health. The article appears in the February 1956 issue of the American Journal of Public Health, pages 173 to 182.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in brief, they state categorically the woeful inaccuracy resulting from merely asking people to tell an interviewer how their health is:

For example:

Less than one-fourth (22 percent) of the conditions found by clinical evaluation was matched with conditions reported in the family interview. This proportion of match is for clinically evaluated conditions believed by the examining clinician to have been present in the period covered by the family interview and which presumably should have been reported.

Yet the American Medical Association endorses a sociologists' inquiry which states that all the old persons they interviewed thought they were feeling relatively well.

The article also states:

Six out of ten cases of clinically evaluated heart conditions were not reported in the family interview.

In other words, 6 out of 10 were not properly diagnosed, and their actual condition was discovered only upon clinical study or examination.

The article also states:

Nine out of ten "neoplasms"—

In other words, in the nature of cancer—

(benign and malignant) established by clinical evaluation were unreported in the family interview.

Yet the American Medical Association was publicizing a study made by sociologists who said that the old persons they interviewed said they did not think anything was wrong with them. On the other hand, the scientific study showed that 9 out of 10 of those who had cancer did not know they had it when they were interviewed.

As another example, a third of the cases of diabetes found through clinical tests were not reported in the family interview.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If all that the AMA survey asserts is true, how does the Senator explain the concern we find so widespread throughout the country and in both Houses of Congress in regard to the enactment of a bill to deal with this subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say it is hard to understand how a study so obviously unscientific and so superficial as that one could be proposed as deserving of serious consideration by the Senate, as it attempts to deal with the problem of providing better medical care for the elderly people in our population.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As further evidence of the widespread concern, did not both national parties at their conventions give serious consideration to this subject, and did not both of them assert it was a matter of prime national concern?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Tennessee is quite correct. Until this amazing study showed up within the last few days, I think it was generally accepted that the figures developed by the Special Senate Committee on the Problems of the Aged—and the committee conducted hearings under the direction of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]—were correct. The committee reported that among persons 65 years of age or older, 76 percent had one or more chronic conditions; and among persons of all ages, 41 percent had one or more chronic conidtions. Yet, in the face of that 76 percent figure, which was reached after the most thorough studies, a handful of sociologists say that 9 out of 10 of those interviewed think they are in good health—or, in other words, that 10 percent of them had some kind of disability which was needful of some medical care.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. How would the Senator rationalize the support of the committee bill approach by the American Medical Association if it believes in the accuracy of the report to which the Senator is addressing his remarks?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be difficult for me to explain it. I would hope the AMA itself might give some explanation because I believe it is now in a very contradictory and indefensible position.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to read from the committee report describing this bill, an approach which the AMA supports:

It would cover all medically needy aged 65 or older; it would cover every such person including those under the social security system, railroad retirement system, civil service system, or any other public or private retirement system whether such person is retired or still working, subject only to the participation in the program by the State of which they are resident; it would cover the widows of such workers as well as their dependents who meet the age 65 requirement and are unable to provide for their medical care.

I turn to another sentence in the report:

The State has wide latitude to establish the standard of need for medical assistance as long as it is a reasonable standard consistent with the objectives of the title.

Does not the Senator think that describes a comprehensive measure?

Mr. McCARTHY. It certainly would not justify our accepting the studies which came from Emory University, from the comments which have been made in the last 2 days.

Mr. GORE. If nobody needs this care, the committee has certainly shown great concern for a need which has not been shown to exist.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct; the Senate, the regular committees, and the special committees have wasted a great deal of time.

Mr. GORE. The sentences I have read from the report are somewhat nullified by other statements and paragraphs in the report, which I must say I find a bit ambiguous; but, to say the least of it, or the most of it, the pending bill, which is one of wide scope and one which has the support, less the amendments added by the Senate, of an overwhelming proportion of the House of Representatives, is a very costly bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, something like $340 million without social security.

Mr. GORE. And yet, according to the report to which the Senator has referred, it is utterly unneeded.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator has indicated, up until the last 2 days it was accepted that there was a need for the program, although there was disagreement as to what the nature of the program should be. But if we were to accept this statement and the argument relating to putting it under social security, we might carry it further and say there is no need for the other two proposals being considered by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Why is it free enterprise and why is it free medicine for a State to pay the bill of a physician out of funds which are provided in large part, up to 80 percent, by the Federal Government, but an amendment providing assistance and medical care and hospitalization, but no payment of doctor fees, paid from the social security fund is socialized medicine?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is difficult for me to explain that, because, traditionally, one of the socialist tenets has been that an individual would be paid according to ability and would receive according to need. The Senator may recall that we were—I will not say shocked—somewhat surprised when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before the Finance Committee and said he was opposed to putting this program on a pay-as-you-go basis by having it incorporated in the social security system, because he thought it should be paid for out of general revenues, which are obtained by taxes, which are more progressive. So he was advocating a social system of collecting from the people on the basis of their ability to pay, under a progressive tax system, and then paying out those funds on the basis of need.

So I suppose one would have to say that the Senator from Tennessee and I were conservative and somewhat antisocialistic because in this instance we favor incorporating this system into the social security system, into which people pay out of their earnings.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator have any explanation for this logic, or illogic?

Mr. McCARTHY. They make some very quick changes from one proposition to another as they come before our committee. If we look at the taxes the administration has proposed this year, every tax the administration has proposed has been in the nature of an excise or transaction tax. We have no proposals from the administration to improve the progressive scale, have we?

Mr. GORE. None.

Mr. McCARTHY. None whatsoever. When this bill is before us, they become advocates, proponents, and defenders of the income tax system.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator really believe that the position of the administration turned on the theory of taxation?

Mr. McCARTHY. While I hesitate to attribute motives to the administration, I think in this case their position with regard to taxation was a matter of expediency. I think it was a part of the manifestation that they had no great spirit for the passage of any legislation in this field, and, as we had indicated, in the last day or two they have come up with their own program, known as the Javits proposal, which was never presented to us in committee, even though we finished hearings on this bill last week.

Mr. GORE. Is that not another example of a whole series of tardy acts?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is quite correct.

There are other studies by definitely established reputable agencies and research organizations, whose findings refute and cast strong doubt on the validity of the AMA-advertised Wiggins-Schoeck paper. The National Health Survey, for example, was established by the Congress to collect accurate—I repeat, accurate—information on the health of the population. Its techniques are the best known to science and are approved by a distinguished advisory committee.

The National Health Survey's sample of the older population is about eight times larger than that of Wiggins-Schoeck. The results of that continuing survey are part of the Government's official documents.

For example, 76 percent of those 65 and older have at least one chronic condition.

Forty-two percent of the general population are limited in activity because of chronic illness.

Older persons see physicians 40 percent more often and spend more than twice as many days in the general hospitals as people who make up the general population.

Mr. President, I do not wish to belabor and prolong my critique of the Emory survey. There is much more I could say about it, and I think the sociologists will have much more to say about it as the discussion on the bill and on the issue continues.

I wish to quote from some of the leading sociologists in the field of aging who have made some remarks about the Wiggins-Schoeck survey at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the comments be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McCARTHY. The reputation of the men whom I intend to quote is very high in scientific circles. Many of them are internationally known.

First I wish to quote from Prof. Noel Gist of the University of Missouri, listed as one of the cooperating sociologists in the Emory project; who wrote letters to his local newspaper, the Missourian (which carried a news story about the survey, based on the AMA news release), and to the American Medical Association:

I had nothing to do with the planning and sampling procedures, the tabulation of data, or the formal presentation of conclusions. Presumably the American Medical Association was given access to the data to use as it desired. The data are being used deceptively for political purposes * * * the persons interviewed represented, in a sense, the financial "elite" of the older population. * * * The AMA news release, intentionally or otherwise, ignored these qualifications. Instead, it has presented data on a limited and restricted sample of older persons as if this sample were representative of the aged population in general. For this reason the statements in the AMA news release are both misleading and deceptive. The average newspaper reader would probably not be sufficiently informed to detect this deception.

For the reasons stated above, I object to the unauthorized use of my name in AMA propaganda. (From letter to the Missourian, Aug. 18, 1960.)

This morning's press carried a news story which, by implication if not by explicit statement, indicated my endorsement of the position of the American Medical Association regarding medical care for the aged in this country. * * * Although I participated in a study of aging to the extent of supervising the interviewing of a sample of rural residents in Missouri, I assume no responsibility whatever for any analyses made of the data or any conclusions by other persons. * * * Yet the news release, by the use of my name as a professional sociologist (and also the names of several other sociologists) undoubtedly leaves the impression that I endorse the conclusions presented in the news release of the AMA. This is entirely misleading. I do nothing of the sort. * * * It was quite obvious to me that the questionnaire sent to us was a very poor one, and seemed to be devised by amateurs in research. But since we agreed to do the interviewing for the project we completed the assignment. If I had known that this study was to be used for political propaganda I should not have undertaken it at the outset. (From letter to AMA, Aug. 17, 1960.)

The following are comments by sociologists attending the meeting in San Francisco where Dr. Wiggins presented his formal report:

I have read the paper and was in the audience when Prof. Wiggins made his presentation. Like several of the others present, I was astonished at the data and conclusions reported. The basic figures on income, assets, health status differ by as much as 100 percent from those reported by other studies during the past decade and from figures available through such standard sources as the Bureau of the Census, the Current Population Survey, and the National Health Survey. (Letter from Clark Tibbitts, chairman, executive committee for the Americas, International Association of Gerontology, Aug. 19, 1960.)

In reporting on their longitudinal study of occupational retirement, Profs. Gordon F. Streib and Wayne E. Thompson (of Cornell University) have in all of their work stressed the fact that although their sample includes people from throughout the country and from all walks of life, it cannot be considered representative of the older population of the United States. They acknowledge that their sample is relatively more affluent, and in relatively better health than the older population. However, when the Cornell respondents were asked: "Do you think that most retired people are able to take care of their medical expenses themselves?" more than one-half replied that they did not think so. (From statement prepared by Professors Streib and Thompson, Aug. 17, 1960.)

Professor Thompson was a discussant of the Emory survey, at the San Francisco gerontology meetings.

And from the cochairman of that meeting, Prof. Leonard Breen:

I did not see a copy of the final paper (by Professor Wiggins) until August 10, 1960, the day before it was read at the meeting of the Congress (of gerontology). I must report that I was appalled to read the paper which I found to be of poor quality of scientific research technique and writing. Indeed, I regretted at that point that I had been so naive as to have accepted the paper without having seen it in advance, especially since it would be presented before an audience of internationally known scientists who might think of this as representing American sociology. * * * When the paper was actually presented, there was an immediate reaction on the part of the audience, attacking its unscientific character, and the ease with which Wiggins and Schoeck jumped to untenable conclusions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of August 12, 1960, entitled "Challenge to Blue Cross"; an article written by Lawrence T. King entitled "America's Poor," published in the Commonweal of July 22, 1960; and an article written by

Roger Green entitled "Mild-Mannered, Bewildered Old Folks Find Selves 'Dumped' Into Mental Institutions," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of August 21, 1960.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1960]

CHALLENGE TO BLUE CROSS

Superintendent of Insurance Thacher's decision on the Blue Cross request for a 37-percent increase in rates is sound. In denying it for the time being—and in his analysis of why he did so—Mr. Thacher has shown exceptional discernment, both of the weaknesses in the Blue Cross case and of the progress it has made in filling the needs of the subscribing public.

Mr. Thacher's main objection to granting the full increase was well taken. It involves the new basis on which Blue Cross payments would be made to the member hospitals—the largest source of hospital income as well as the biggest item in the cost of Blue Cross operation. On principle, of course, payments should be related to the varying costs of hospital services given Blue Cross subscribers—which they have not been up to now but would be under the terms of the new application.

Mr. Thacher approves this principle but questions its application as proposed by Blue Cross in several important respects. They concern, for example, the inclusion for ratemaking of such costs as medical training, capital replacements and improvements; also emergency and outpatient care for the benefit of the general community. Also, he rightly points out that the cost basis for rates without adequate safeguards might result "in penalizing efficiency and subsidizing waste." The superintendent of insurance hasn't the power under the law to impose changes in Blue Cross operations, but presumably a revised request would be granted if Mr. Thacher's objections are met.

His opinion adds impact to the rapidly rising public demand for the reduction of unnecessary hospital costs—unwarranted admissions, too-long patient stays, uncalled for surgery, etc. As Mr. Thacher suggests, Blue Cross could generate powerful pressure to that end by the conditions for membership imposed on the hospitals. But his opinion is far from purely critical. He rightly welcomes the increased coverage—such as for infants and emotional disorders—administrative improvements and the increased representation of the public on the Blue Cross Board of Directors, though the hospitals and the medical profession still dominate.

The 7 million subscribers of Blue Cross and the public, through its interest in better community health, await a revised and prompt Blue Cross application with the greatest concern—one, we hope, that will call for a good deal smaller rate increase.

[From the Commonweal, July 22, 1960]

AMERICA'S POOR

(By Lawrence T. King)

Our present age of affluence is replete with contradictions. As the gross national product soars to new heights and as personal income keeps edging upward—last year's advance was 4 percent over 1948's—we find it increasingly difficult to become disturbed over the pockets of poverty which continue to persist on the fringes of our national affluence.

Perhaps our complacency can be explained by the fact that an entire generation has come of age without any direct experience with the corroding effects of mass unemployment. Even at the height of the recession of 1958—when 7 percent of the labor force was out of work—most Americans were insulated from the effects of enforced unemployment since it was generally restricted to certain geographical areas and occupational, racial and age groups, a condition termed "class unemployment" by the social scientists to distinguish it from the mass unemployment of the depression years when as much as 25 percent of the labor force was idle.

Congress has given considerable attention to this problem of class unemployment. The most ambitious attempts to deal with it—area development legislation—have been vetoed twice by President Eisenhower, and the inability of Congress to override the President has been interpreted rightly or wrongly as reluctance on the part of the Nation at large to undertake costly Federal programs to aid depressed areas, on the assumption that the increasing level of national prosperity eventually will catch up with the problem.

Proponents of this view are quick to point to the latest figures put out by the U.S. Commerce Department which show that since 1947 the number of families and unattached single persons with annual incomes of less than $2,000 has shrunk from 25 to 14 percent while those earning $2,000 to $3,999 have declined from 38 to 21 percent. On the other hand, they point out that the number of families and unattached single persons making $4,000 to $5,999 has increased from 20 to 23 percent, those earning $6,000 to $7,999 have gone up from 9 to 18 percent, those in the $8,000 to $9,999 bracket from 3 to 10 percent, those in the $10,000 to $14,999 bracket from 3 to 9 percent, and those over $15,000 from 2 to 5 percent.

These figures do show that more and more Americans are ascending the economic ladder with fewer families left on the lower rungs. Cold statistics, however, have a way of masking the human factors involved.

It is of little comfort to those families earning less than $2,000 a year—7½ million, by Commerce Department estimates—to know that the general level of national prosperity is rising. And it is not surprising that those families with incomes of less than $4,000—35 percent of the national total—do not share the administration's economic optimism, especially when another Federal agency informs them that present living costs require a weekly income of $80.87 for a worker with three dependents and $73.31 for a worker with no dependents.

The median income for 1959—with half the families above and half below—was $5,300, and the model or most frequent income was $4,600. These figures are quite an improvement over those for 1947, when the median income was around $3,000. But balanced against the shrinkage in purchasing power since 1947—an income of $5,000 then was equivalent to $6,865 today—it is apparent that the increase in real income is not so spectacular as the Commerce Department figures would seem to indicate.

It is this constant shrinkage in the dollar—it is now worth 47.6 cents in terms of 1940 buying power—which accentuates the plight of those who remain in the lower income brackets. We may soothe our consciences with statistics and tell ourselves we never had it so good, but this does little to mitigate the misery of those who must fight a daily battle to make ends meet.

Just who are these people, the American poor consigned to live in the shadows of our national affluence?

They are the elderly living on social security payments or small fixed incomes from pensions, 74 percent of whom have an annual income of less than $1,000; the physically handicapped and infirm, who cannot compete in a competitive job market; the farmworkers engaged in the most basic of all labors but excluded from Federal and State wage-hour laws and often denied the protection of welfare aid and educational and health facilities of the localities in which they work; the racial minorities, "the last hired, the first fired," who in many sections of the country are barred from unions or placed in wage categories below those of the dominant group; the victims of geography who have seen once flourishing communities turned into depressed areas by technological advances, changes in consumer demand, depletion of natural resources and shifts in defense procurements or the location of military facilities.

The belief persists among many that these people somehow are responsible for their own condition. There are, of course, those who are chronically unemployed because they lack the drive which is so important in an acquisitive society and there are those who do not possess necessary job skills because of educational deficiencies or insufficient training. For the most part, however, they are persons victimized by conditions not of their own making.

Take the case of racial minorities. The higher incidence of unemployment among Negroes, the low wages paid to Puerto Ricans in New York and elsewhere, the lack of employment opportunities for American Indians, the exploitation of Mexican-American manpower in the Southwest, cannot be explained solely in terms of lower levels of skill or other objective standards. Dual wage standards for the same type of work, discriminatory hiring and firing policies, closing of union ranks and apprenticeship opportunities to Negroes and other practices have been definitely established as factors which reduce certain minorities to the role of drawers of water and hewers of wood.

Then there are those who live in areas which have become depressed—coal miners thrown out of work by automation and declining demand for coal, workers in wool-textile industry towns where plants have been closed as a result of competition from cheaper synthetic fibers, miners and smelter workers in areas where mineral resources have become depleted. Men who have spent a lifetime of productive labor in these fields do not find it easy to adapt to new jobs and skills, even when new jobs are available, and in most cases the jobs simply are not there.

The problem we face has been complicated by the fact that modern trends are operating against labor mobility. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY'S Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, which has just completed a comprehensive study of the situation, stated in its report to the Senate:

"Theoretically, a supply of unemployed workers attracts new enterprises to a locality; and in the absence of new jobs, laid-off workers are expected to move to a new locality. A number of studies since World War II have shown that the labor market does not actually operate in this way. The pockets of high unemployment in many localities have not diminished even though production has reached new heights throughout the Nation."

The committee suggests a number of reasons for diminishing mobility: Increased home ownership and increased number of children, personnel practices in hiring, and high risks attendant upon moving to a new locality. Fifty percent more families, for example, own their own homes today than at the beginning of the century. The committee has found that converting a tenant into a homeowner tends to reduce his mobility, and that a home is not a liquid asset in a community which has become depressed.

A definite link is established between the size of a family and a worker's mobility. Families are much larger today than they were 20 years ago, and figures based upon the 1950 census show that the migration rate among families with children is less than half the migration rate of families without children in comparable age groups.

Industrial and personnel practices are also cited as factors tending to reduce labor mobility. Insistence of industry on reducing job turnover and organized labor's success in winning seniority rights, pension plans and severance pay have all served to stabilize the labor force at the expense of the migrating jobseeker.

"A worker takes obvious risks," the report states, "in moving to a new locality. Usually a person who becomes unemployed puts all his efforts and financial resources into looking for work near home, relying on unemployment compensation for temporary support. By the time he decides there are no local opportunities he is near the end of his financial reserves. A West Virginia witness put the predicament this way: 'It's hard to go some place when you ain't got no money. It takes a little money to go some place to hunt a job, too.' He may have heard of jobs many miles away, but he knows from the experience of others that he will be the first fired in a layoff if he is the last hired. If he is an older worker, he will have difficulty in finding any work at all. He knows that if he is unsuccessful, he will have, in addition to the expense of moving his family to the new location, the expense of moving back. He knows, of course, he can go on alone, but this means family separation and perhaps family dislocation. Often he will have to spend everything he earns to take care of his own living expenses in the new location and have nothing to send home."

In his appearance before Senator McCarthy's committee, a district supervisor of public assistance for five West Virginia counties testified:

"I would like to talk about the results of unemployment. It is heartbreaking sometimes, as I talk to these people in need, that our department is in the position that we cannot help them. They want work that produces; they don't want work that is merely set up as a plan instead of assistance.

"A man came into the office not long ago and said: 'Lady, I am not disabled, and I don't want assistance. But I am 45 years of age; I have two children in high school; the rest of my children are in the grades, and they can't go to school because they don't even have shoes.' "

Teachers also testified and told of high absenteeism and dropouts because the children did not have the shoes or proper clothing. In schools fortunate enough to have federally subsidized hot lunch programs—not all schools have them because some lack kitchen facilities—pupils often get their only full meal of the day there. One teacher said most of her pupils save portions of their lunches and milk for younger children at home. Another told of her pupils' dislike of vacation periods because they never had enough to eat at home. It is little wonder that Congressmen from the area have pressed for a domestic point 4 program to aid their people.

If poverty remains endemic to the depressed mining areas, it is by no means confined there. The lowest per capita incomes are still to be found in the rural areas. There unemployment is not as great a problem as is underemployment, which the Department of Agriculture defines as "utilization of the human agent in economic activity that results in real earnings that are significantly less than are received by comparable resources in other uses." It is estimated that 1,200,000 farm males—almost one-quarter of the total number of farm males with income—are underemployed.

In a report published last year, the Department of Labor reported that despite increases in earnings for nonagricultural workers the income of farmworkers continued to decline. In 1957, annual average earnings of migratory workers for 131 days of farm and nonfarm labor was $859, as compared with $898 and 147 days for nonmigratory workers. In the face of the greatest burst of productivity in the Nation's history, the relative economic status of hired farmworkers continues to deteriorate.

Behind the statistics there is a sordid story of squalor, a story which was detailed at length by the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor at a hearing held last year in Washington.

There was the minister from Pompano Beach, Fla., who told of his experience among the migrants in that State: "Most camps are dilapidated shacks with large families living in one room with no windows. The toilet facilities are the outdoor privy type that are so filthy that many use the ground. The water supply is outside faucets with no water in the dwellings. Why should little children be forced to live in such filthy surroundings just because they were born in a migrant family?"

The chairman of the National Child Labor Committee testified: "Children who work in agriculture do not suffer from the harmful effects of their labor alone. Their whole way of life is deprived. They suffer from poverty, community rejection, inadequate housing, unsanitary facilities, etc. * * * Nothing is done to help them occupationally—to give them the education, preparation or special help they need to become productive citizens."

A doctor from Corpus Christi, Texas, appeared: "The children of migrant parents are born into a world completely of their own. * * * If the child lives to be of school age, he could possibly go to many schools on different occasions at different places but he will never average more than 3 years of schooling in his lifetime. His world will be from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Rio Grande. It will be his world, however, in that the only piece of property that he will ever own will be his grave. * * * I may be here because I am still haunted by the remembrance of a day 10 years ago when I found a dead mother with six children lying in the same bed, all covered with blood from the hemorrhage of a dying tubercular mother.

The continued existence of poverty of this sort in a nation that has amassed the greatest wealth in the history of the world must remain an affront to the American conscience. The poor, of course, will always be with us; but it is one thing to be poor because we live in a society in which there is not enough to go around—it is quite a different matter when we know there is enough to go around, when the poverty is the direct result of our national failure fully to utilize and develop human material resources which we have in abundance and which are the true sources of wealth.

The migrants, for example, are not poor because of the nature of their work. They are migrant workers because they are poor. And they are roaming country roads not because the farm economy needs them—they have no historical precedent in American life—but simply because of our failure to solve some of the basic social and economic problems of our time. Workers certainly would not subject themselves and their families to the vicissitudes of migratory life if other economic opportunities were available. They are there because there is nowhere else to go.

The casualization of the rural labor force has been given its greatest impetus by our inability to solve the farm problem. Agricultural economists in Washington have centered their efforts on reducing surpluses and forcing prices upward by encouraging marginal farmers to leave the land and seek jobs elsewhere. Industry, however, has not been able to absorb these displaced farmers, and they have, instead, joined the ranks of the farm laborers.

We Americans are prodigious capital builders, but in our preoccupation with stocks and bonds and corporate wealth we have concentrated our efforts in fields where our investments will produce the fastest and best returns. As a result, our capital investments are unevenly distributed—some areas are booming, others are blighted. The problem of the distressed areas must be seen in this perspective, for the condition will persist as long as we fail to expand the productive apparatus at our command by investment of public capital to counteract the imbalance of private capital.

We can, of course, continue to subsidize unproductive elements in our society through relief and welfare grants and makework projects. But programs of this sort, though necessary in a society beset by periodic economic readjustments, will never solve the problem. What is needed is a comprehensive social and economic program similar in approach to the TVA concept, a program which will upgrade an entire region and provide opportunities where none existed before.

It is futile to expect industries to locate in distressed areas unless there are economic incentives for them to do so. Cheap and abundant power and water, freedom from floods and duststorms, adequate transportation facilities and pleasant surroundings are some of the incentives which will attract industries and provide the diversified economic base so vitally needed in blighted rural and industrial areas.

The programs which will provide such incentives will not come from the private sector of the economy, for its capital can be invested much more advantageously elsewhere. It is to the public sector of the economy that these distressed areas must look. The unhappy fate that has befallen area redevelopment legislation should not discourage Americans from pressing forward for a bold, imaginative national approach to the problem of chronic poverty.

It is time that we faced up to the fact that the national economy is not truly served by budgetary considerations that block the full development of our physical wealth. In the long run, every dollar of public money invested in revitalizing undeveloped segments of our economy will pay high dividends in the creation of new wealth and opportunities for the poor Americans who have been left far behind in the Nation's march toward affluence.

[From the St. Paul, (Minn.) Sunday Pioneer Press, Aug. 21, 1960]

MILD-MANNERED, BEWILDERED OLD FOLKS FIND SELVES "DUMPED" INTO MENTAL INSTITUTIONS

(By Roger Green)

One of the profound tragedies of America's mental hospital system is that thousands upon thousands of old folks are being dumped into psychiatric wards along with the chronic insane.

In ward after ward at three huge public mental institutions, I saw gentle, mild-mannered old people—apparently quite normal except for minor eccentricities—sitting in meek resignation among babbling schizophrenics and brooding manic depressives.

Many of them are simply old, with no place else to go, no family willing to give them shelter and care for their simple needs.

Some of them have had a mild stroke or their minds are confused by the effects of senility. But do they belong in a mental institution?

"The usual pattern in this country seems to be for elderly patients, showing symptoms of delusional thinking, to come into a mental hospital and remain until they die," says the American Psychiatric Association Journal.

"Many (old) people are now being classified as psychotic who actually need nothing more than attention to their physical needs, their food, cleanliness, and so on. They will cause nobody much trouble, so they can be cared for quite easily in a facility other than a State hospital."

The APA, recognizing the red-hot controversy involved in the problem, adds:

"But there is no better place to discharge our responsibility to the sick aged than the State hospital. Lacking proper facilities (elsewhere), we are in no position to say they do not belong in a public psychiatric hospital."

On another note, Dr. William F. Sheeley, APA project chief, declares:

"The community is settling more and more senile persons into psychiatric wards formerly used only for younger mentally ill patients. Some of these elderly people have psychoses or are pretty forgetful and confused. Most of them simply need an old folks' home.

"We must begin a ruthless pruning job. We must return to the community those persons who are not really treatable and those who are not really (mentally) ill."

Several States, spurred by a combination of humanitarian motives and a desire to save tax money, are taking active steps to weed elderly nonmental cases out of State mental hospitals.

The money-saving factor stems from the fact that oldsters confined in a State mental hospital cannot qualify for a Federal old age pension.

However, if they are transferred to a nursing home they promptly become entitled to Federal old-age benefits—and thus the State, instead of paying for the care of old folks in a State hospital, can shift part of the burden to the Federal Government.

An Associated Press survey showed that Kentucky and Ohio, among other States, are moving in that direction.

Kentucky recently tightened its policy of admitting to State hospitals only persons afflicted with mental illness and barring old age as sufficient cause for admission.

The Blue Grass State has also launched a home-going program to place elderly patients who are not suffering from mental illness in boarding and nursing homes.

In Ohio, Gov. Michael DiSalle is pushing a program to transfer as many as possible of the State's 3,400 aged patients from State mental hospital to nursing homes where the Federal Government would pay about 52 percent of the cost. It would save the State several million dollars.

Voicing concern over DiSalle's policy, Dr. Robert A. Haines, Ohio director of mental hygiene, says many patients were not sent to mental hospitals originally because they were old but because they were mentally ill—and that they grew old in the institutions.

It is, of course, true that many of the chronic mental cases—and they are the ones with the least hope of recovery—grew old behind the walls of State mental institutions. Many of them have been there for 30, 40, or 50 years.

But it is also true, as noted by Dr. Ewald W. Busse, chairman of Duke University Medical Center's Department of Psychiatry, that "the proportion of elderly people in our mental hospitals is increasing at an alarming rate."

Dr. Leo H. Bartemeier, medical director at Seton Psychiatric Institution in Baltimore, Md., says:

"The increasing admissions of the aged to our mental hospitals create a staggering problem."

Forty percent of all patients admitted to mental hospitals are over 60 years old. Thirty percent are over 65. In New York State, for example, nearly 30,000 out of the State's 88,000 mental hospital patients are over 65 years old.

What this means, in terms of human tragedy and expense to the Nation's taxpayers, is underscored by a simple statistic: 94 percent of all mental patients over 65 will remain in hospital until they die.

How many of these old folks are genuine cases of mental illness—and how many are merely custodial cases, heartlessly dumped into the hospital as the cheapest and easiest way out—is anybody's guess.

Dr. Winfred Overholser, 68, longtime superintendent of the Federal Government's St. Elizabeths Mental Hospital in Washington, D.C., told the writer:

"There is no question that the old folks are increasing among our mental hospital patients. One reason is that our general population is getting older and there are now more old folks.

"More serious is the fact that we have a cliff-dwelling population, we live in apartments and row houses. So a slight disturbance by an older person leads to complaints and the family reacts by sending the offender off to a mental hospital."

EXHIBIT 1

[From the February 1956, issue of the American Journal of Public Health]

COMPARISONS OF VARIOUS METHODS OF ESTIMATING THE PREVALENCE OF CHRONIC DISEASE IN A COMMUNITY—THE HUNTERDON COUNTY STUDY

(By Ray E. Trussell, M.D., F.A.P.H.A.; Jack Elinson, Ph. D.; and Morton L. Levin, M.D., F.A.P.H.A.

This is a preliminary report upon a few observations of methodological significance to morbidity surveys. The findings presented have resulted from a survey of the prevalence and needs of individuals with illness and disability in an essentially rural population. It was conducted by the Hunterdon Medical Center in Hunterdon County, N.J., during a 3-year period, 1952–55. The original plans for two such surveys—one urban and one rural—were developed for the commission on chronic illness when one of the authors was director.[1]

The Hunterdon survey was one of the components of the long-range program of the commission which sponsored this rural study, assisted with consultation and minor financial participation, and carried out the parallel urban study in Baltimore, Md. The Hunterdon survey also was sponsored by and assisted with extensive staff participation from the New Jersey State Department of Health. A major portion of all studies and analysis of findings has been the responsibility of the National Opinion Research Center. Primary financial support was provided by the Commonwealth Fund which also made a substantial grant to the commission to enable completion of the urban survey.

[1] Morton L. Levin, M.D.

The rural survey was made under the overall direction of one of the authors[2] who was serving also as director of the Hunterdon Medical Center. The National Opinion Research Center participation has been guided by a senior study director.[3]

The survey findings are extensive and will deal also with the large gap between needs, as determined by team evaluation, and actual utilization. The data currently are being assembled into a sizable report which probably will not appear in final form before early summer of 1956. However, certain methodological facts are already evident. They are selected as of particular interest, because of their relevance to our very realistic need for better epidemiologic understanding of many long-term illnesses through accurate determination of prevalence and incidence in the population at large.

In the literature our present knowledge of prevalence and incidence is an accumulation of several approaches, such as household interviews; study of physician, institutional, and organizational records; and multiple screening. Much use has been made of data provided through an interview of a lay respondent by a nonmedical interviewer in a home setting where the cooperation of the respondent has to be solicited and is voluntary. Additional information has been provided by personal health diaries and by questioning physicians who have been asked to confirm, alter, or supplement diagnoses reported by their patients in household interviews. Multiple screening of large numbers of self-selected individuals, presumably well, has yielded much data which are suggestive but difficult to evaluate.

How valid are the statements made in household interviews and by physicians named as attending the reported conditions? What volume of disabling or potentially disabling conditions is not suspected as the result of multiple screening? Can a self-administered questionnaire be distributed to a population at large and return useful but less expensively acquired data? Partial or substantial answers to such questions are emerging from the Hunterdon County and Baltimore surveys. Three sets of observations now available from the rural study are presented at this time.

SURVEYED POPULATION

Enough descriptive data will be listed here to provide an overall picture of the population studied. Hunterdon County covers about 435 square miles stretching irregularly along the Delaware River in northern New Jersey. It is an area of farms, woodlands, small boroughs, rural townships, and a few small industries. In the 1950 census (total population 42,736) the 26 municipalities making up the county had populations ranging from 486 to 4,467 with only 2 of 2,500 people or more. The county seat of Flemington is located midway between New York City and Philadelphia, 50 miles in either direction, and 23 miles north of Trenton, the State capital.

The year covered by the survey as the primary study period was a year (midpoints 1951–52) in which the county was served by

[2] Dr. Trussell is executive officer, Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Elinson is senior study director, National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Ill.; and Dr. Levin is assistant commissioner, State Department of Health, Albany, N.Y.

This paper was presented before a joint session of the dental health, epidemiology, occupational health, and statistics sections of American Public Health Association at the 83d annual meeting in Kansas City, Mo., November 15, 1955.

[3] Jack Elinson, Ph. D.

approximately 25 general practitioners, 12 school and public health nurses, 2 small voluntary agencies (dental and turberculosis), and a traveling mental hygiene clinic. The county had no community hospital, no health department, no diagnostic facilities, and no specialists practicing within its boundaries.

Detailed population analyses are not essential to the present report. However, by comparison with the State as a whole, Hunterdon residents were above the median age, had a higher percent above age 65, a lower percent of nonwhite, a slightly lower average of persons per household, a lower median number of years in school, 10 percent less engaged in manufacturing, $700 less per family median income and 11 percent more than the State median of families with income of less than $2,000 annually. The county population was classified as rural farm, 22.9 percent; rural nonfarm, 59.5 percent; and urban, 17.6 percent. The population is not a homogeneous grouping of rural residents.

SURVEY PLANS

The survey steps as planned and the principal reasons for their inclusion are summarized as follows:

Phase 1: The utilization of a self-administered questionnaire was undertaken for two reasons. First, to determine the usefulness of such a questionnaire; second, to give every resident in the county an equal opportunity to participate in the survey and thus in the development of policies governing their local medical center based on findings of the survey. This step required that a self-administered questionnaire for each member of each family in the county be delivered to each household and returned on a voluntary basis. It was estimated that there were about 13,000 families with more than 43,000 members.

Phase 2: Following the use of the self-administered questionnaire, the county population was to be surveyed on an area probability sampling basis through the use of household interviews. The minimum goal for this step was to secure health histories from 4,000 family units. This number had been selected to give an estimated yield of at least 2,000 persons with "chronic" diseases. These families, since they would be representative of the county, would form the base for the next three steps of the survey. Each interview was to encompass the entire family health history within a single folder. It would attempt to ascertain for that family by a variety of question approaches the maximum amount of information available through a single interview about illness, disability, individuals in an institution, deaths in the family, and a variety of other details all pertaining to the 12 months preceding the interview.

Phase 3: In an attempt to ascertain the yield of information which could be secured by questioning physicians attending a rural population the third step of the survey was to be confidential communication with the physicians named by a sample of the individuals reporting illnesses. The information to be sought here was primarily diagnostic to allow for coding and comparison with findings reported through the self-administered questionnaire, personal interview questionnaire, medical examination, and multiple screening. One interesting methodological step was that half of the physicians were told what had been reported in the household interview, the other half were not.

The three approaches to ascertaining the health status of a population, as described, are not new in the field of morbidity surveys except for the completeness of the interview approach and certain built-in methodological studies. Similar projects, some on a much larger scale except for the self-administered questionnaire step, have been well documented elsewhere. The added steps made possible through the Hunterdon study are described in the following:

Phase 4: From among the total number of individuals listed in the household interviews, subsamples of stratified groups were to be drawn representing the various kinds of illness and disability reported, as well as individuals for whom no illness was reported. A total of 1,000 individuals was to be examined. These individuals were to be offered a complete evaluation by a team consisting of physicians, social worker, and public health nurse, together with such other consultants as they might need. The objective of the team was to define, with every resource available, the problems facing each of these 1,000 individuals and their families; what care they should have had in the past 12 months; and what optimum care for them would consist of in the next 12 months. The problems found were to be classified in a variety of ways in their relation to degree of disability, rehabilitative potential, preventability, employment, income, school attendance, and other community concerns.

Phase 5: From the 4,000 families not only the 1,000 individuals referred to in the preceding paragraph, but also 8,000 presumably well individuals above age 16 at time of interview were to be offered multiple screening in an effort to detect certain nonmanifest chronic diseases.

THE SURVEY [4]

Of basic importance to any such survey is the voluntary participation of the public. Without cooperation from adequate numbers of individuals, both lay and professional, the results of a survey are of limited value. Prior to the five steps of the survey it was necessary to obtain clearance with appropriate groups, insure the general alerting and cooperation of the public, followed by the steps of mapping, census taking, and division of the county into 900 areas as a basis for sampling.

In summary, setting the stage for the survey involved securing approval of the board of trustees of the Hunterdon Medical Center, the county medical society, and the public health advisory committee of the medical center. Letters of endorsement were received from the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and the State medical society. Five hundred schoolchildren, teachers, and other volunteers brought up to date or created large-scale maps of each of the 26 municipalities and secured a census listing in each of 900 areas into which the county was divided by delimiting certain natural boundaries, such as roads, rivers, and railroads. More than 40 public gatherings were addressed to orient organizations to the survey. Press and radio support of the project was generous. The entire county medical society membership signed a statement urging the public to cooperate and this document was photostated and published by all local newspapers. Every paper serving the area carried an editorial encouraging public participation. The project was influenced by the fact that the entire county was constructively involved in the creation of the Hunterdon Medical Center to which at least 75 percent of families had contributed and which was now conducting the survey.

With this as a background the five phases of the survey were activated in the spring of 1952 when 600 volunteers delivered questionnaires to households throughout the county. This was followed by 35 trained interviewers attempting to secure health histories during the summer from a third of the families in the county; by communication with a sample of physicians named by these families; by an intensive effort to evaluate by team approach subsamples of the stratified interviewed population; and by an invitation to go through multiple screening extended to all reportedly well people (above age 16) in the same families. This process required 5 months of full-scale planning and pretesting, 26 months of intensive survey work, and 6 months of winding up. At least a year will be required for analysis and report writing.

The productivity of the five steps was as follows: (1) From the 43,000 individuals to whom self-administered questionnaires were delivered, 23,900 were returned (56 percent); (2) 4,246 families (13,113 individuals) were interviewed representing 91 percent of all sought; (3) 329 physicians (by questionnaire regarding 1,569 patients) reported conditions, 86 percent of the physicians to whom verification forms were mailed replied, 70 percent of the total number of forms mailed out were returned filled out by the cooperating physicians; (4) 846 individuals representing 72 percent of the differential probability sample sought were given a complete medical, social, and nursing evaluation; and (5) 2,679 individuals presumably well were multiple screened from the same families, representing 34 percent of the 7,953 whose participation was requested.

METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

Three selected methodological observations which have significance for morbidity surveys have been chosen from among many for presentation.

1. Validation of a household interview by written questionnaires sent to physicians named as having attended the reported conditions.

It has been common practice to request information from physicians named by respondents in household interviews. The physician customarily has been told that what the patient said was wrong. He has been asked to confirm or alter the patient's diagnosis and to list or even checklist other conditions that were present. This procedure of telling the physician what the patient said has been questioned. Such a step has been regarded as destroying the independent nature of this way of securing morbidity data. Among other built-in steps, the Hunterdon study was designed to examine this question of the contamination of criteria.

As the third step in the survey, the interview folders from a sample of interviewed families were selected for medical verification. These were randomly divided into two groups of equal size and simple questionnaires were prepared for each physician named as having attended the conditions reported. The questionnaires were identical except that in half the cases the physician was not advised of what the patient had reported in the household interview.

Thus, 165 envelopes containing 651 questionnaires (1 for each condition) went to the 165 physicians named in half the family folders selected: these forms (form A) included the patient's reported diagnosis. As a control, 164 physicians received 687 forms (form B) representing the physician-attended illnesses in the second half of the family folders, but were not told what had been reported in the household interviews.

[4] Credit by title cannot be given here to the many staff members, consultants, and volunteers who performed the survey, but all are appropriately recognized in the final report.

All physicians received identical explanatory and followup letters and returned the forms with approximately equal degrees of cooperation.

The returns were matched according to a code which allowed for seven types of agreement. The matching was done by a physician and a statistician working as a team and according to rules which will be described in detail in the full survey report. Table 1 summarizes the results of this part of the survey.

The most striking differences found were that when the physician was not informed of the patient's reported diagnosis his own diagnosis agreed with the patient less often but he reported new conditions more frequently. The causes for these differences cannot be documented. The data also will be analyzed further in terms of selected diseases. The implications for morbidity surveys, while not clear, deserve study.

2. Validation of household interviews by medical examination of a sample of respondents.

TABLE 1.—*Relative productivity of 2 types of written questionnaires sent to physicians named in household interviews as having attended respondent reported conditions*

Degree of agreement between patient and physician	Form A—Physicians informed of diagnoses reported by patients		Form B—Physicians not informed of diagnoses reported by patients	
	Number of conditions	Comment	Number of conditions	Comment
1. Perfect	320	528 confirmed in some degree equal 92 percent	268	441 confirmed in some degree equal 75 percent.
2. Close	164		122	
3. General	27		31	
4. Vague or remote	17		20	
5. Negative statement by physician on diagnosis stated by patient.	10	48 not confirmed equal 8 percent	4	145 not confirmed equal 25 percent.
6. Reported by patient only	38		141	
7. New condition reported by physician only	131	Equal 22 new conditions for every 100-patient reported conditions.	292	Equal 48 new conditions for every 100-patient reported conditions.

NOTE.—This table is based on a study of those forms returned by physicians. Both A and B forms were returned in approximately equal numbers—75 and 72 percent, respectively.

A total of 4,246 Hunterdon families were interviewed by 35 trained and supervised interviewers, the interviews requiring from 30 minutes to 6 hours and averaging about 1½ hours. The questionnaires used inquired for each member of the family about illness, injury, or other conditions on the day before the interview, during the 4 weeks preceding and during the past year. They then covered a lengthy symptoms list, persons in institutions, deaths, and a long list of diseases by name.

The 13,113 individuals were then divided into 6 strata, ranging from people in institutions to people with no complaints, and the 6 groups were sampled at differential rates for team evaluation. The goal was 1,000 examinees, the yield was 846 representing 72 percent of all whose names were drawn. This degree of success was achieved after 1½ years of hard work. The story of recruitment of a sample for examinations is a saga in itself but cannot be recounted here.

The examinations were made in the Hunterdon Medical Center by the full-time staff, a group of accredited specialists with faculty appointments in New York University-Bellevue Medical Center. Responsibility for all studies was carried by two specialists in internal medicine and one in pediatrics. These physicians had unlimited access to laboratory and radiologic services and informal and formal consultation from the other full-time and visiting consultants. For example, a review of every 8th examination record shows that for 105 persons there were (in addition to routine pelvic examinations of adult women by the gynecologist) 95 formal consultations and 1,195 tests. Two hundred families were the subject of detailed study in the home by experienced social workers. All examinees were reviewed by the social workers and the public health nurse consultant. Finally, a team conference resulted in an extensive schedule of evaluation which is the basis for the next two comparisons with data previously secured through household interviews.

Although the survey will report in large measure on prevalence data and needs for care, reference is made here only to some problems of measuring morbidity. These comparisons provide a substantial basis for estimating overnumeration and undernumeration in morbidity surveys when a multiapproach questionnaire is used in household interviews.

A. Overreporting by the respondent in the household interview. (This section records how successful the team was in verifying in some degree what the lay respondents had reported to the interviewers.)

When family reported conditions are considered in 21 major classifications, the following order in proportion of match with clinically evaluated conditions emerges as presented in table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Validation of household interviews by medical examination of a sample of respondents (total 846)*

A. PROPORTION-OF-MATCH FOR FAMILY REPORTED CONDITIONS WITH SUBSEQUENT MEDICAL DETERMINATION

Order	Classification of condition (all conditions reported in family interview)	Percent matching clinically evaluated conditions (weighted)	Total cases reported in family interview (unweighted)	Order	Classification of condition (all conditions reported in family interview)	Percent matching clinically evaluated conditions (weighted)	Total cases reported in family interview (unweighted)
1	Diseases of the eye	98	145	14	Other diseases of the digestive system	48	171
2	Mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders	87	46	15	Diseases of the nervous system	45	82
3	Diabetes mellitus	85	28	16	Diseases of the skin and cellular tissue	34	74
4	Rheumatic fever and heart diseases	80	166	17	Symptoms, senility, and other ill-defined conditions	29	205
5	Neoplasms	75	67	18	Injuries and poisonings	24	62
6	Other diseases of the circulatory system	65	198	19	Diseases of the respiratory system	23	223
7	Diseases of the ear	63	57	20	Anemias and other diseases of the blood	19	33
8	Diseases of the genitourinary system	61	97	21	Infective and parasitic diseases	13	90
9	Allergic diseases	58	59				
10	Other impairments, including congenital	57	101		Total	47	2,206
11	Other endocrine, metabolic, and nutritional diseases	57	37				
12	Diseases of bones and organs of movement	56	138				
13	Dental and other diseases of buccal cavity and esophagus	53	127				

For convenience and ease of reference we may arbitrarily place all classifications of family reported conditions into four groups (according to overall proportion of match): well matched—80 percent, or higher; fairly matched—60–79 percent; poorly matched—40–50 percent; and badly matched—less than 40 percent.

Under the above arbitrary limits we can say that only for diseases of the eye, mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders, diabetes, and rheumatic fever and heart diseases are family reports relatively "well" matched with clinical evaluation.

Acute conditions reported in the family interview cannot be expected to match clinically evaluated conditions established 20 months after the family interview. We find, therefore, relatively "bad" proportions of match for infective and parasitic diseases, diseases of the respiratory system, injuries and poisonings, and diseases of the skin.

Vaguely reported conditions, including symptomatic descriptions, are also relatively "badly" matched with clinically evaluated conditions. Reported anemias, too, are relatively "badly" matched.

Conditions which were characterized in the family interview by some index of seriousness, such as "keeping a person from his ordinary activities yesterday" or "leaving a handicap or defect" or "still bothering" were less likely to be overreported. Similarly hospitalized and medically attended conditions were less likely to be overreported.

TABLE 3

B. PROPORTION-OF-MATCH FOR CONDITIONS FOUND BY MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF 846 PEOPLE WITH CONDITIONS PREVIOUSLY REPORTED BY FAMILY (FOR CONDITIONS BELIEVED BY CLINICIAN TO HAVE BEEN PRESENT IN PERIOD COVERED BY FAMILY INTERVIEW)

Classification of condition	Percent matching family reported conditions (weighted)	Total conditions found by clinical evaluation (unweighted)	Classification of condition	Percent matching family reported conditions (weighted)	Total conditions found by clinical evaluation (unweighted)
Diabetes mellitus	64	30	Diseases of the eye	20	470
Diseases of the ear	56	83	Infective and parasitic diseases	16	73
Allergic diseases	54	51	Diseases of skin and cellular tissue	20	76
Heart diseases and rheumatic fever	39	288	Dental and other diseases of buccal cavity and esophagus	11	192
Anemias and other diseases of the blood	39	8	Diseases of genitourinary system	11	230
Diseases of the respiratory system	38	108	Other impairments, including congenital	10	66
Diseases of the nervous system	37	85	Neoplasms	10	151
Injuries and poisonings	32	83	Other endocrine, metabolic, and nutritional diseases	6	183
Other diseases of the digestive system	31	180	Symptoms, senility, and other ill-defined conditions, and special examinations	4	82
Diseases of bones and organs of movement	30	197			
Other diseases of circulatory system	26	320			
Mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders	22	153	Total	22	3,109

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of the total number of conditions reported in family interviews with the total number of conditions found by medical examination of a sample of 846 respondents (unweighted data)*

Order	Classification of condition	Number reported	Number found	Difference	Order	Classification of condition	Number reported	Number found	Difference
1	Diseases of the eye	145	470	+325	13	Dental and other diseases of buccal cavity and esophagus	127	192	+65
2	Mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders	46	153	+107	14	Other diseases of the digestive system	171	180	+9
3	Diabetes mellitus	28	30	+2	15	Diseases of the nervous system	82	85	+3
4	Rheumatic fever and heart disease	166	288	+122	16	Diseases of the skin and cellular tissue	74	76	+2
5	Neoplasms	67	151	+84	17	Symptoms, senility, and other ill-defined conditions	205	82	−123
6	Other diseases of the circulatory system	198	320	+122	18	Injuries and poisonings	62	83	+21
7	Diseases of the ear	57	83	+26	19	Diseases of the respiratory system	223	108	−115
8	Diseases of the genitourinary system	97	230	+133	20	Anemias and other diseases of the blood	33	8	−25
9	Allergic diseases	59	51	−8	21	Infective and parasitic diseases	90	73	−17
10	Other impairments, including congenital	101	66	−35					
11	Other endocrine, metabolic, and nutritional diseases	37	183	+146		Total	2,206	3,109	
12	Diseases of bones and organs of movement	138	197	+59					

B. Underreporting by the respondent in the household interview. (This section records what proportion of conditions discovered by team evaluation had been reported previously in the household interview.)

As shown in table 3, less than one-fourth (22 percent) of the conditions found by clinical evaluation was matched with conditions reported in the family interview. This proportion-of-match is for clinically evaluated conditions believed by the examining clinician to have been present in the period covered by the family interview and which presumably should have been reported.

The proportion-of-match for clinically evaluated conditions varied greatly by type of condition. For diabetes, one out of three cases found by clinical evaluation was not reported in the family interview. Six out of ten cases of clinically evaluated heart conditions were not reported in the family interview. Three-fourths of the clinically evaluated "mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders" were unreported in the family interview. Nine out of ten neoplasms established by clinical evaluation were unreported in the family interview.

It was felt that this rather low proportion-of-match was perhaps not entirely attributable to failure of the family interview respondent to report known conditions or even to ignorance of existing conditions, but that a substantial part of the discrepancy might be attributed to the thoroughness of the clinical examination and the meticulousness of the clinicians in their reporting of minor and unimportant conditions. In order to confine the analysis to the more significant conditions, a comparison was made between clinical findings and family reports for those conditions only which clinicians considered to be "* * * currently or potentially disabling * * *" or which had been disabling in the year preceding the clinical examination. Two-thirds of the clinically evaluated conditions believed to have existed in the family interview year were considered by clinicians as disabling in the sense described.

The overall proportion-of-match for disabling clinically evaluated conditions was not importantly higher than for nondisabling clinically evaluated conditions (24 percent as against 18 percent).

Finally, table 4 is presented to compare the total number of conditions reported in family interviews for 846 individuals compared with what was found in medical examinations. (The reader is cautioned that this is an unweighted table and cannot be used for computation of rates or percentages.)

COMMENT

The data presented here are subject of course to much explanation which will be included in the final report. While these observations are brief (and much more detailed analyses will be reported subsequently), they are thought provoking with respect to the problem of securing accurate morbidity data. Surveys such as the Hunterdon and Baltimore studies are expensive, time consuming, and difficult. No attempt is made in this brief report to discuss epidemiologic studies of long-term illness, but the problems of accurate measurement of prevalence and incidence are evident and will require large-scale planning and financing for their further elucidation.

The data at hand suggest that for chronic disease household interviews may be expected at best to provide minimum estimates of morbidity.

EXHIBIT 2

COLUMBIA, MO., *August 18, 1960.*

To the MISSOURIAN:

The Columbia Missourian of August 16 carried a news story concerning a research in aging in which I participated during the past year. The story was based on information contained in a news release from the American Medical Association. This news release was presumably sent to many newspapers over the country. By use of my name (and the names of other participating sociologists) there is the implication that I support the conclusions of the AMA; namely, that the study "proves that the great majority of Americans over 65 are capably financing their own health care and prefer to do it on their own, without Federal Government intervention." I did not authorize the use of my name, nor does the study support such conclusions.

My participation in the research was only to the extent of supervising the interviewing of 80 persons living in rural sections of central Missouri. This project was planned and directed at Emory University, and I had nothing to do with the planning and sampling procedures, the tabulation of data, or the formal presentation of conclusions. Presumably the American Medical Association was given access to the data to use as it desired. The data are being used deceptively for political purposes.

The interviews in this study were entirely with noninstitutionalized white persons selected from different sections of the country. This meant that persons receiving old-age assistance, or in institutions for the aged, were not included in the sample of persons interviewed. Nor were Negroes. Thus the persons interviewed represented, in a sense, the financial "elite" of the older population. By definition the poorest segment of the aged group was excluded from the study. This is perfectly defensible if it is clearly understood, and stated, that the noninstitutionalized white population does not represent a cross-section of the older people in the country.

The AMA news release, intentionally or otherwise, ignored these qualifications. Instead, it has presented data on a limited and

restricted sample of older persons as if this sample were representative of the aged population in general. For this reason the statements in the AMA news release are both misleading and deceptive. The average newspaper reader would probably not be sufficiently informed to detect this deception.

For the reasons stated above I object to the unauthorized use of my name in AMA propaganda.

Sincerely,

NOEL P. GIST,
Professor of Sociology.

AUGUST 17, 1960.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: This morning's press carried a news story which, by implication if not by explicit statement, indicated my endorsement of the position of the American Medical Association regarding medical care for the aged in this country. I have also seen a copy of the news release, for August 15, upon which the story was based. Although I participated in a study of aging to the extent of supervising the interviewing of a sample of rural residents in Missouri, I assume no responsibility whatever for any analysis made of the data or any conclusions by other persons.

Last fall Prof. James Wiggins, of Emory University, wrote me inquiring if I would be willing to supervise the interviewing of 80 noninstitutionalized persons in rural communities of central Missouri, using, he said, a schedule that was under preparation in his office. He did not indicate the specific purpose of the study except to say that it was a national survey; nor did he indicate the source of the funds, except that a grant had been received from a foundation. I agreed to have the interviews conducted, and used the small stipend to employ my son and daughter-in-law to do the actual interviewing. We completed our part of the assignment and returned the schedules to him, properly filled out, some time in April.

I had nothing to do with the tabulations and analyses, nor did I see any of the data other than the information which we gathered in this area. Therefore I do not necessarily support the conclusions that some have drawn from the study. Yet the news release, by the use of my name as a professional sociologist (and also the names of several other sociologists) undoubtedly leaves the impression that I endorse the conclusions presented in the news release of the AMA. This is entirely misleading. I do nothing of the sort. I was at no time consulted about the use of my name for what is clearly political propaganda of the American Medical Association.

I do not know how adequate the sampling procedures were in the study, since the sample was presumably drawn at Emory University. But it was quite obvious to us that the questionnaire sent to us was a very poor one, and seemed to be devised by amateurs in research. But since we agreed to do the interviewing for the project we completed the assignment. If I had known that this study was to be used for political propaganda I should not have undertaken it at the outset.

Very truly yours,

NOEL P. GIST,
Professor of Sociology.

FINDINGS REGARDING HEALTH FOR THE AGED—CORNELL STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL RETIREMENT

In reporting on their longitudinal "Study of Occupational Retirement," Profs. Gordon F. Streib and Wayne E. Thompson have in all of their work stressed the fact that although their sample includes people from throughout the country and from all walks of life, it cannot be considered representative of the older population of the United States. They acknowledge that their sample is relatively more affluent and in relatively better health than the older population. At the same time, the Cornell sample seems to be similar to the Wiggins and Schoeck sample. For example, in the fourth wave of the Cornell study, which included responses from over 2,000 older persons, the question was asked: "How would you rate your health at the present time?" Sixty-five percent said "good" or "excellent," 29 percent said "fair," 5 percent said "poor" or "very poor," and 1 percent did not reply. This compares with 61 percent, 29 percent, and 10 percent, respectively, in the Wiggins and Schoeck paper. Also, like the Wiggins and Schoeck study, the Cornell study includes almost no one receiving public assistance, although unlike the Wiggins and Schoeck study this was not done intentionally.

However, when the Cornell respondents were asked: "Do you think that most retired people are able to take care of their medical expenses themselves?" more than one-half replied that they did not think so.

Moreover, when these people were asked: "Who do you think should provide for the older person who has stopped working if he needs help in meeting his medical expenses?" the modal response was "the Federal Government," and a considerable majority indicated some form of governmental support—Federal, State, or local.

AUGUST 17, 1960.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GERONTOLOGY.

MR. SIDNEY SPECTOR,
Chief Staff Investigator, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aging and Aged, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPECTOR: This is in reply to your request for an evaluative comment on the paper presented by Prof. James W. Wiggins before the social research division of the Fifth International Congress of Gerontology held in San Francisco August 7 to 12.

I have read the paper and was in the audience when Professor Wiggins made his presentation. I was astonished at the data and conclusions reported. The basic figures on income, assets, health status differ by as much as 100 percent from those reported by other studies during the past decade and from figures available through such standard sources or the Bureau of the Census, the Current Population Survey, and the National Health Survey.

In view of the magnitude of these differences, it seems to me that the results of the survey should be rigorously compared with data reported from commonly accepted sources, that the wording and form the questions asked should be reported and studied and that the method and nature of the sample should be subjected to careful scrutiny. If it is true, as has been reported, that public assistance recipients, nonwhite persons, and residents of institutions were excluded, these facts should be prominently stated. Allowing for overlap among them, these three groups account for close to 20 percent of the older population. Since these groups have, almost by definition, the lowest incomes, the least assets, and the poorest health, their exclusion necessarily results in a marked overstatement of the health and income status of the older population.

Modern social research methods, properly employed, lend themselves to obtaining valid and consistent results in most areas of inquiry. It is possible, also to subject most procedures and results to severe tests whenever there is a question as to accuracy of results. As a first step in evaluating the present study, it would seem essential to compare the age, sex, marital status, color, and nativity, educational, and income composition of the study sample with the known composition of the total older population as revealed by well-tested and proven sources. Then I believe the precise method of selecting the sample geographically should be reported and the result compared with the known geographical and urban-rural distribution of the older population. These are all matters which one would have expected to find in the initial report of the survey. No doubt they will be covered when final data are presented.

Data such as these are often used as bases for action on the part of public and voluntary organizations. It is essential, therefore, from the point of view of the older population and for the welfare of our whole society, that they be of irreproachable accuracy.

Sincerely,

CLARK TIBBITTS,
Chairman, Executive Committee for the Americas.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *August 19, 1960.*

Senator PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Aging, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The New York Times, under a Chicago, August 14 dateline, carries a story by Austin C. Wehrwein headlined, "Aged Said To Bar U.S. Health Aid." This story refers to and is based upon a survey conducted by Profs. James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck of Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., a report of which was presented at the recently concluded Fifth International Congress of Gerontology held in San Francisco August 7–12, 1960. Since I was the coorganizer of the section on "Population and Social Organization" in which the Wiggins-Schoeck paper was presented, I feel compelled to tell you something of the way in which the paper came to be included in the section, and the reaction of the scientists present at the Congress who participated in the section. I should add that the other coorganizer of this section was Dr. Pierre Naville of Paris, France, who had nothing to do with the Wiggins-Schoeck paper, nor was he even able to attend the conference. Thus, I was the person solely responsible for including the paper in our section.

I first learned of the survey when one of the survey interviewers (from Denver), wrote me suggesting that she might do a paper on her section of the study. I wrote back to her suggesting that for an international meeting, such a paper might be inappropriate, but that the report of the total study might be of some interest to us, and I then wrote to Professor Wiggins to that effect. On March 11, 1960, Professor Wiggins wrote me that they were "attempting to get an accurate picture of several aspects of the lives of 'normal' persons past 65, through the use of a national sample of this population." On March 29, 1960, I wrote Professor Wiggins inviting him to present a paper on his study at the International Congress of Gerontology, and suggested that "the very title 'A Profile of the Aging—U.S.A.' would seem to fit very well into an international meeting. I would hope your paper would set out this profile, perhaps contrasting it with other work a la the 'national character' studies which were so popular during and shortly after World War II."

On June 30, 1960, I wrote Professor Wiggins acknowledging receipt of an abstract of his paper for inclusion in our printed program for the congress. In that abstract, he said his paper would be "a preliminary report of some conclusions from a national area sample (United States of America) of 1,500 noninstitutionalized persons age 65 years of age and over. * * *" I did not see a copy of the final paper until August 10, 1960, the day before it was read at the meeting of the congress.

I must report that I was appalled to read the paper which I found to be of poor quality of scientific research technique and writing. Indeed, I regretted at that point that I had been so naive as to have accepted the paper without having seen it in advance, especially since it would be presented before an audience of internationally known scientists who might think of this as representing American sociology. Fortunately, I had taken the precaution of appointing a well-known, highly competent research sociologist as the discussant of the paper following its presentation (a standard procedure in meetings of this kind).

I discovered also, that a press release had been prepared and distributed prior to the presentation of the paper: this press release had not been prepared by the press staff of the congress, and I do not know now who did prepare it. The release was couched in such terms, however, which made it apparent that there were motivations in its release other than the dissemination of scientific knowledge.

When the paper was actually presented, there was an immediate reaction on the part of the audience, attacking its unscientific character, and the ease with which Wiggins and Schoeck jumped to untenable conclusions. The survey was badly designed, poorly conceived, and completely misleading. Not a single scientist present at the meeting rose to support either Mr. Wiggins or his paper, although some six persons other than the assigned discussant rose to take exception to him and the points he was trying to make. In sum, the study was totally discredited in the discussion which followed the presentation of the paper. As the organizer for that section of the congress, I have the responsibility for reviewing all of the papers presented and passing judgment on them for their possible inclusion in a volume of collected papers which were presented at the congress to be published in the near future. I had decided at the time of presentation of the paper that its quality was such as to make impossible its inclusion in such a volume, since we wish to publish only scientifically acceptable papers. I might cite for you only two points which come to my mind immediately. Wiggins and Schoeck throughout the paper refer to "modal" statistics. Even the elementary student knows that a mode is relatively meaningless without data on the frequency distribution on that item for which the mode is reported. Wiggins and Schoeck nowhere reported the frequency distribution, thus, in a distribution of 1,500 responses to a given question, it is conceivable that only two dozen responses of a given sort could be the mode. This is obviously totally misleading. Second, in the section on method, Wiggins and Schoeck say they used "area probability sampling" however, in their footnote No. 13 they make it crystal clear that they have in fact used quota sampling, a method which was discredited in the 1948 public opinion polls, among other places. Finally, it would be perfectly appropriate to do a good study of the non-institutionalized older population, as long as it was absolutely clear that this was the intention and the focus of the research. This was not at all clear here, and again is misleading; indeed the title "A Profile of the Aging: U.S.A." makes it appear to be a study of the general population of older persons, something which it is not.

I hope the above comments make clear what I intend; namely (a) we did not see the paper prior to its presentation at the congress, (b) it is far below the quality expected of a professional researcher, (c) it is totally misleading, and (d) it was discredited by the professional research scientists present at the congress meeting where the paper was presented.

If you should like any further information from me on this matter, I would be happy to be of assistance to your committee to the end of promoting what I believe to be the goal suitable to our society; namely, the formulation of public policy following wherever possible upon sound scientific research findings. I am a professional research sociologist and professor of sociology, and am interested in the furtherance of professional standards of research; if this must be done by occasionally taking to task one of my professional sociological colleagues, then I feel that this must be done. I hope that it is not too late to rectify this matter in the minds of those who must make public policy in the field of the aging.

Very sincerely yours,

LEONARD Z. BREEN,
Associate Professor of Sociology and Coordinator of Research in Gerontology, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the members of the Senate Finance Committee have done a commendable job in handling a difficult and controversial subject. I support the committee's recommendations on medical care. I am sure that no one will consider the bill a perfect bill. Modifications and improvements in the program will undoubtedly be required as experience dictates. However, I sincerely believe that the committee has taken the right approach to handling the medical care problems of the aged.

Before I discuss the medical care features I wish to voice my approval of the provision in the bill increasing the limitation on outside earnings of social security recipients from $1,200 to $1,800 annually. In the last two Congresses I sponsored legislation to remove the earnings test entirely. I have always felt that it is unfair to penalize elderly citizens who have the initiative and desire to work. It is now an accepted fact that one of the most difficult problems facing the elderly, active individual beyond retirement age is the need to have a sense of purpose and accomplishment in his declining years. Continuing to engage in productive employment gives the old person this sense of purpose, but under the existing law he is penalized by reducing his social security benefits if he earns over $1,200 a year. I am pleased that the committee has recognized this problem and has taken a step to alleviate the burden on those who wish to continue to work after reaching eligibility age. I would, of course, have preferred that the limitation be removed entirely. The committee's action will at least help many who are caught in this dilemma.

Mr. President, I should now like to discuss briefly the medical care provisions in the bill. Every Member of this body, I am sure, favors the establishment of a practical plan to provide needed medical services for the Nation's elderly citizens. The problem is not whether we should do it, but how we should do it.

I believe that medical care for the aged is a responsibility of all of the people in this country, and that the cost of a medical care program should be distributed accordingly. The proper approach is that taken in the committee's bill. Medical services should be paid for out of the general revenue rather than by imposition of an additional payroll tax on workers and employers.

Mr. President, the financing of medical care through the social security system is not a sound or an equitable approach to the problem. In 1969 the social security payroll tax will rise to 4½ percent on both workers and employers. Pressures will increase in future years for further liberalization of the program and to finance these improvements it will be necessary to either increase the payroll tax or the earnings base subject to the tax. If medical care is added to the program there will be another increase in the payroll tax of 1 percent which will bring it to 10 percent of payrolls in 1969. There will undoubtedly be demands to improve medical care benefits and lower eligibility requirements in future years, and the payroll tax will go up again. No one can predict accurately where the tax will stop if medical care is added to the system.

We should remember that the cost of medical care will be imposed on those persons least able to pay if it is made a part of the social security program. One-half the burden of financing the program would fall on earnings of $4,800 a year or less. The cost would be imposed on everyone under the system whether they wanted to participate in the health benefits program or not. Under this approach there is no way to give equitable treatment to persons who provide through hospitalization insurance or otherwise for financing their own medical care. In all fairness to those paying into the social security system it would be preferable to distribute the fiscal burden of a medical care program on a broader basis. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] stated in his opening speech on August 15 that 40 percent of the national income would make no contribution to the medical care program if it were financed through a social security tax. Paying for the program out of the general revenues would take into account the inherent advantages of the progressive income tax and would distribute the burden more equitably.

Aside from the method of financing there is a more fundamental issue involved in this subject. That is whether we want to further the trend toward centralization of power with the Federal Government or retain State and local authority over what is properly a State and local problem. If the States are to preserve some degree of authority and prestige under our Federal form of government they must provide those services demanded by the public or else the Federal Government will fill the vacuum created by State inaction. Our citizens are looking more and more to the Federal Government to fill those functions which should be performed by State and local governments. The program for health care which would be established by this bill will enable the States to provide the health care needed by our elderly citizens without furthering the trend toward a national welfare state. To place medical care for the aged under the administration, direction, and control of the Federal Government would

erode even further the authority and responsibilities of the State governments.

If our citizens wish to live under a Federal welfare state with the long arm of the Federal Government reaching into their daily affairs more and more each day, a Federal medical program will certainly hasten that unhappy result. The big brother concept may not be too far away if the Federal Government enters the medical field. We cannot expect to get this type of care through the Federal Government without giving up part of our freedoms and liberty. Correspondingly, for every function of this nature which the Federal Government assumes, the State loses some of its authority.

The medical care program recommended by the Finance Committee provides the individual States with the means to care for the health needs of their aged citizens on a local level. The States would be encouraged to set up programs designed to fit the peculiar needs of their own people. I think it is without question that the State governments are better qualified than the Federal Government to determine the requirements of their own people for medical care. By following the time-tested method of Federal grants we will also prevent any further erosion of the States power and prestige.

Mr. President, Arkansas is one of the States which has a medical program as an integral element in its old-age assistance program. Every person in the State receiving old-age assistance benefits is eligible for medical care. At the present time, there are over 55,000 persons eligible for medical care under the program. Hospitalization, nursing-home care, and drugs are some of the benefits available under the program. There is no doubt that the benefits under the program should be expanded. The improved grant formula authorized by the Senate bill will go a long way toward improving this system.

The existing formula for Federal grants for medical services favors the low-income States and Arkansas qualifies for the highest Federal contribution. In 1959 Arkansas spent more than $3½ million on its medical program. Of this, 65 percent came from the Federal Government and 35 percent was State funds. Under the Senate bill the Federal contribution would be increased to 80 percent. This means that Arkansas could receive approximately $525,000 more in Federal funds without putting up any additional money. If the State puts up more money, it would be matched at the rate of 4 Federal dollars for every State dollar. This new matching formula should enable the State to improve the effectiveness of the program and do a better job of providing for the health needs of those unfortunates on the old-age assistance rolls.

Of even more importance in reaching the long-range goal of providing medical care for all elderly citizens is the new program which would be authorized outside the old-age assistance program. This new program would be financed by 80 percent contributions from the Federal Government and 20 percent from the State government—the same 4-to-1 ratio under the new old-age assistance medical care program. Each State is allowed great latitude in establishing eligibility standards and the scope of benefits in its program. A program established under this authority could include hospitalization, nursing home care, outpatient treatment, drugs, doctor bills, and any other medical services required. The authority given the State in setting up its program is extremely broad and may be implemented in the manner best suited to its own requirements. The important feature is that control and responsibilities remain in the State—where it belongs. This is far superior to a centralized medical care program administered by Washington officials who have no personal knowledge or understanding of local problems.

Mr. President, the underlying issue in this debate is whether the Federal Government or the State governments are best qualified to provide for the health needs of our elderly citizens. The responsibility for health care has traditionally been assumed first by the individual, then by his family, and finally by the State and local governments. I know of no compelling reason why the Federal Government should suddenly assume this responsibility. The State is uniquely qualified to administer to the health needs of its citizens if it is given reasonable financial assistance to do so. The authority provided in this bill will enable the States to provide needed medical services for the aged and it will insure that this essential function remains with the State governments. If we are to preserve some degree of State and local control over human affairs, some means must be found to counteract the trend toward centralization of authority in the Federal Government over affairs which are not properly a subject for Federal responsibility. Once we open the door to Federal control in the field of health care it will be impossible to close it. For every inch the door opens the State will lose an inch of authority. There is no need to rob the States of their authority in this instance. The health care program recommended by the committee is a sound and effective solution to the problem of medical care for the aged, and I hope that the Senate will adopt the committee's recommendations.

INTERNATIONAL Y'S RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF RULE OF LAW IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, delegates to the International Y's Men's Convention in Minneapolis from August 1 to 11, 1960, approved a forthright declaration on the need for the rule of law and order and consequently for strengthening the United Nations to achieve the rule of law in international affairs.

This is a matter as to which I have had great concern. I have introduced appropriate Senate resolutions to strengthen the World Court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL Y'S MEN'S CONVENTION, MINNEAPOLIS, 1960

Whereas this organization is international in scope, dedicated to the principles of brotherly love among all men regardless of race, color, or creed; and

Whereas we believe in the rule of law and order as basic to the establishment of worldwide brotherly love; and

Whereas the United Nations Organization represents the world's best hope for attainment of these goals, we hereby resolve to support and approve the establishment of true world law and order, through a strong United Nations.

We further resolve to support and approve the establishment of a permanent enforcement agency through the United Nations to back up this world law.

Further, we resolve to support and approve worldwide disarmament within the framework of the principles stated.

WORLD COLLEGE STUDENTS CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, within the past few years the Veterans of Foreign Wars successfully sponsored National Loyalty Day. This project was given congressional approval and the date of May 1 is now established as "National Loyalty Day"—a day for free people to rededicate themselves to the principles of democracy. National Loyalty Day is our answer to the May Day parades of the Communists. We are all indebted to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for this constructive, dramatic response to the challenge of the Communists.

It is well known that the Communists seek to influence the young people in every country. Our Nation has failed to comprehend the importance of the so-called student movements throughout the world. We tend to take our freedom for granted. We fail to inspire the youths with the heritage, the traditions and the obligations of freedom.

Recently the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been giving consideration to the establishment of a Free World College Students Congress. It makes good sense. Mr. Albert F. Ceres, Jr., special assistant to the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Louis G. Feldmann, has outlined this proposal in a letter to Commander Feldman on July 19, 1960.

This particular project merits the thoughtful and helpful consideration of every Member of Congress—yes, every citizen. Therefore, I wish to share the details of the proposal for a Free World College Students Congress with the Members of the Congress.

I have sent a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention which is now assembled in Detroit, Mich., urging

that there be consideration of this proposal before the convention assembled. I hope there will be approval.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ceres' letter to the commander in chief of the VFW, Mr. Louis G. Feldman, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JULY 19, 1960.

LOUIS G. FELDMANN,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., Northeastern National Bank Building, Hazleton, Pa.

DEAR COMMANDER IN CHIEF FELDMANN: You asked me to reduce to writing my proposal that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States take the initiative in the unobligated sponsorship of an obviously needed propaganda forum that could be obtained in an annual meeting of anti-Communist college and university students from all free world nations to be held in the United States. The tentative name of the proposed organization is Free World College Student's Congress.

In compliance with your request, the following skeleton outline is submitted for your consideration:

1. The Free World College Student's Congress would be composed of juniors and seniors in colleges and universities.

2. The nucleus for the congress' leadership is available among those college and university students: (a) Who last year visited the Soviet Union while the U.S. exhibit was in Moscow. Some of these students were courageous enough to fearlessly expound in Russian and in English, the virtues of the U.S. Government and the American way of life to groups of Soviet citizens on street corners in Moscow and elsewhere in the Soviet Union, and (b) the American and other nationals among the anti-Communist students who attended the Communist-sponsored Youth Congress at Vienna, Austria, last year and previous years.

3. The congress would meet annually in the United States, preferably in Washington, D.C.

4. Delegates to the annual congress would be known as senators and representatives. They would be elected through democratically conducted elections on their respective campuses.

5. Each nation would have two senators. Representatives would be in proportion to their nation's population arrived at by a mathematical formula liberal enough to bring to the annual congress great numbers of democratically minded youth.

6. Senators would serve 2 years. Representatives would serve 1 year.

7. Immediately after their arrival at the first congress site, the senators and representatives would elect from among their number a president and vice president without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed.

8. The president would serve a 2-year term so as to give continuity to the congress. The vice president would serve 1 year.

9. Election of the president would be held during the second session of the congress and annually thereafter.

10. The power and duties of the president, the vice president, and the senators and representatives would correspond to similar officers of the U.S. Government.

11. The president would appoint a cabinet and justices of the supreme court from among the senators and representatives. A representative would be elected to succeed any senator so appointed and would be of the nationality of the senator.

12. The annual congress would remain in session 1 week.

13. The congress' agenda would be based on the recommendations of the president and the resolutions submitted by the senators and representatives. Voting on these measures would follow the practice in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

14. The powers and duties of the congress would follow those of similar elected and appointed officers of the United States.

15. The U.S. Government would financially support the Free World College Student's Congress. This would include all travel and living expenses to and from their home to the congress; and while in session, the necessary facilities, equipment, and printing to enable the congress to function.

16. The U.S. Goverment would support openly, proudly, and positively the annual congress.

17. The Free World College Student's Congress would become the free world's antidote to the Communist-supported Annual Youth Congress and be clearly known as such.

18. Those who would annually address the congress would be: The President of the United States; the Secretary of State; the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives; the chairman, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; the chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee; the commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; the national commander, the American Legion; the president of the American Federation of Labor and Council of Industrial Organizations, and the president, United Mine Workers of America.

19. The annual congress of the Free World College Student's Congress would close with a dinner addressed by the President of the United States.

20. Prior to any announcement of this proposal the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the national commander of the American Legion would confer with the appropriate U.S. Government officials, including the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives, for assurance of their approval and financial support of the congress and its purposes.

21. Announcement of the establishment of the Free World College Student's Congress would be made at the 1960 convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Detroit, in the presence of the national commander of the American Legion.

22. Motion urging formation of the Free World College Student's Congress would be made by William J. Tepsic, member, national council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and by his opposite number on the executive committee of the American Legion, for the American Legion at the latter's 1960 convention.

23. The first annual congress of the Free World College Student's Congress would be held early in 1961.

24. Organization of the congress, including whatever is required in foreign countries would be under the auspices of the Department of State, with prior permission of the national governments concerned.

25. The alternate plan to a congress following the structure of the U.S. Government, would be an annual convention of free world college and university students presided over by a president or chairman with appropriate committees.

26. The first outline, rather than the alternate plan, will provide the students with experience in the three branches of democratic government that would be absent in the alternate plan.

27. Estimated cost of the annual congress would be less than $1 million annually, which would be offset by the incalculable propaganda value of its proceedings.

Sincerely yours in comradeship,

ALBERT F. CERES, JR.,
Special Assistant to the Commander in Chief.

TWELVE-STATE FARM CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, farmers and political leaders from 12 Midwestern States met at Des Moines, Iowa, on Saturday and Sunday, August 20 and 21, to discuss the problems confronting American agriculture and the future well-being of the family farm and the American economy. The highlight of the 12-State Democratic conference was the joint appearance and participation of the Democratic nominees for President and Vice President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON.]

I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the message of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to the Democratic Farm Conference printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF KENNEDY'S SPEECH BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC FARM CONFERENCE IN DES MOINES

No conference in this campaign is more important than this one. No domestic issue in this election is more important than the farm issue. No part of the American way of life is more important—or in more trouble than the family farm.

The Republicans like to say, over and over again, that the big issue in this campaign is Executive experience. Their candidate, they say, has experience in the executive branch—he has participated in its decisions—he has shared in its responsibilities—he has been educated in its programs.

I will discuss Mr. NIXON'S experience in other fields on other occasions. But when it comes to agriculture, I can only say that disaster has been his experience, and Benson has been his teacher.

I do not use the word disaster lightly. During these last 8 years of Mr. NIXON'S experience in making decisions, farm purchasing power has been cut some 20 percent. During the 8 years he was sharing executive responsibility, hundreds of thousands of farm families gave up the struggle against the cost-price squeeze. During these last 8 years of Benson, Nixon, Dirksen, and Morton, the average farm family was reduced to a net income of less than $50 a week.

RECALLS SPEECH IN MAINE

Here in the Middle West, Mr. NIXON hardly speaks to Mr. Benson. He disowns the man he once called "the best Secretary of Agriculture we ever had." But in Portland, Maine, a week ago, he talked along different lines. The reason Mr. Benson has not been successful, he said, is because the Democratic Congress has never given his program a chance.

To that, the American farmer can only ask: Where would we be without the Democratic Congress? For we have seen enough of Mr. Benson's program in effect to know what it would do. His program is to drive farm prices down. His program is to drive farm families off the farm. Contrary to Mr. NIXON'S statement, the Congress did give

Mr. Benson's program a chance—but Mr. Benson's program never gave the farmer a chance.

Now that an election is near, the Republicans are talking about new slogans, new promises and a new Secretary of Agriculture. But do not be misled. In the Republican platform today, as in any Republican administration of the future, the Benson song may have ended, but his melody lingers on.

SAYS PRICES STAY HIGH

For Republican opposition to farm income protection is not a whim of Mr. Benson. It is a bedrock principle of the Republican Party. It is that party's ironbound obligation to those who stand to profit when farm prices are kept down, when the farmer is without meaningful bargaining power in the marketplace.

I am not talking about the consumer. The Republican farm program has not benefited the consumer. Prices have stayed at a record high level, as every housewife knows, regardless of how hard the farmer is hit.

And I am not talking about the taxpayer. The Republican farm program has not benefited the taxpayer. The total costs and losses on farm price-support operations under Benson and NIXON have amounted in 7 years to more than 7 times as much as the total for 20 years under Roosevelt and Truman. In fact, they have spent several billion dollars more on agriculture than all previous administrations in the history of this country combined.

The Republican policy of collapsing farm income does not benefit farmers, or consumers, or taxpayers. It benefits only those powerful interests who benefit from the farmer's adversity—the same interests who kept Mr. Benson in his job—the same interests that dictated this year's Republican farm platform.

That platform calls for "price supports best fitted to specific commodities." It doesn't say who decides—it doesn't say at what level—and it doesn't say best for whom.

ASSAILS REPUBLICAN RECORD

The Republican leadership has already demonstrated that they don't mean what's best for the farmer.

The Democratic platform, on the other hand, spells out what we will do to reverse the decline in farm income, and to meet our responsibilities to our farmers, our consumers, and our taxpayers, to all America and to a hungry and troubled world.

That platform pledges, in unmistakable language, "positive action to raise farm income to full parity of income levels and to preserve family farming as a way of life."

It means that farmers shall receive returns for their labor, for their managerial skills, and for their investment which are equal to the returns received for comparable human talents and resources in other types of enterprise.

This is the strongest pledge ever given to the farmers of America by any political party in history.

I stand behind that pledge, and I intend to make good on it, beginning next January.

I do not say the job will be easy. There are no new or magical solutions. Mr. NIXON's talk about a "massive land retirement" plan with "indemnity payments" is no different than the 1956 "acreage reserve" plan of Ezra Taft Benson. More empty slogans and wishful thinking will not solve the problem.

A REVOLUTION IN TECHNOLOGY

The first thing to be done is to face up to the problem squarely, to recognize its magnitude. We have a revolution on our hands in agriculture. The headlines are full of revolutions in other parts of the world—but we have one right here on our farms. It is a revolution of technology. More and more food is being produced by fewer and fewer people on less and less land.

It is the result of improved machines and equipment, improved pest and disease control, improved water control, improved breeds and varieties, improved timing in cultivation, improved feeding practices, farm plant layout, and farm management.

LEAVING FARMS FOREVER

Our land grant colleges and private research are producing new miracles every year. Last month it was announced that chlorophyll can now be synthetically produced—that we can do in the laboratory what since the beginning of time we have relied on plants to do in the field—that is, convert sunshine, water, and carbon dioxide into food materials.

Where is this revolution going to lead? A revolution of abundance is better than one of scarcity. But people are being driven out of agriculture at a fantastic rate. The young people leave the farm and never come back.

The families hit by failure, merger or foreclosure move to the city, regardless of whether the city has jobs or homes. Our small towns are being badly hurt—so are their churches and schools and businesses—and so is the whole United States.

It would be nice to believe as the Republicans believe, that migration off the farm will solve the problem of surpluses. But the facts of the matter are that, during these last 8 years when millions have been leaving the farm, our agricultural production has actually increased at a faster rate than our total population.

Mr. Benson has acquired surpluses in storage six times as high as the 1952 level—surpluses which are costly to the taxpayers, frustrating to the world's hungry people and depressing in their effect on farm prices. Instead of population pressing on food supplies, as Malthus and others predicted, food supplies in this country are now pressing on the population.

It would also be nice to believe, as the Republicans believe, that as farm prices fall, consumers will buy more food and eat up the surplus. But it hasn't worked that way. Food prices have not fallen. We are, on the whole, an affluent, well-fed people, our stomachs can expand only so far.

It takes a 20 percent drop in farm prices to move 2 percent more food into consumption. And even then, the surpluses would not be going to where they are really needed—to the underfed, the unemployed, the overlooked—to the families forced to get by on less than $20 a month worth of surplus flour, rice and cornmeal, with some occasional dried eggs, lard and skimmed milk.

At the same time, there are other revolutions going on around the world—populations growing faster than food supplies—new nations in need of assistance—underdeveloped nations in need of food for capital. These are fast-changing, fast-moving times. The Republican Party is, as it always has been, the party of the status quo—and today in agriculture there can be no status quo.

NO TIME FOR TIMIDITY

In short, timid and temporary measures will not do. The Benson-Nixon-Dirksen philosophy will not do. Four more years of decline and disaster will not do.

We must harness these revolutions. We must ride these waves of change. We must learn to manage our abundance—to bring the great productive capacity of American agriculture into balance with total needs at home and abroad, at prices that will yield to our farmers a fair return on their capital and labor.

That is not a radical goal—or an impossible one. Nor does it treat the farmer any differently from anyone else. It may take hard work—it may mean a difficult transition—it may require tough decisions and many complaints. But the job can be done—and I pledge every effort of mind and heart to do it.

WILL NOT SATISFY EVERYONE

I would rather be accused of breaking precedents—than breaking promises.

I am here today to learn. It is my intention to spell out programs throughout this fall. They will offer no special privileges.

They will help no segment of the American economy at the expense of another. They will not satisfy everyone—they will not reflect the wishes of any one group—but they will reflect what I think is right. And they will live up to the strongest farm platform in American political history.

That farm program will not be based on cold statistics. It will not be based on economics textbooks, on academic theories or remote trends.

It will be a program for the individual farmer and his family—the man who has done more for America and received less for it than possibly any other group in our Nation—the man who fights year after year to do a good job, to use his soil and water wisely, to cooperate with Government policies, to maintain a decent home for his family, only to see his crop price go down and down as the cost of his equipment and his utilities and his family's clothes and doctor bills go up and up.

FOUR MAJOR AIMS GIVEN

That program must contain four basic objectives:

First, a positive policy of supply management to raise farm prices and incomes to parity levels—and that will require a sympathetic Secretary of Agriculture using a whole arsenal of tools—marketing quotas, sales quotas, land retirement, soil conservation, commodity purchases and loans, marketing orders and agreements, and many others, on a commodity-by-commodity basis—in cooperation with decisions made on the local level by local farmers themselves.

Second, a positive food and nutrition policy for all Americans, with better diets and distribution to our schoolchildren, our unemployed and our unfortunate, and a security reserve against the hazards of modern war, expanding existing programs and using the new ones a timid administration has been unwilling to test.

Third, a dynamic food and fiber policy for worldwide use, emphasizing above all a "peace reserve" aiding all nations in distress, and to which each farmer would be proud to contribute, instead of being constantly shamed in public on the ground that he is piling up wasteful surpluses.

Fourth, a long-range program for low-income farms, credit, research, and new rural industries.

PEACE THE BASIC GOAL

Both parties describe one phase of their policy as "food for peace." But I would give that name to our entire program. For peace is man's greatest aspiration—a just peace, a secure peace, without appeasement. We will not accept the peace of foreign domination—we do not seek the peace of the grave. We want more than this so-called peace that is merely an interval between wars.

There will be no farm program—there will be no farm boys or farms—if we cannot get off this deadly collision course on which we are presently headed. It's time for real leadership again in foreign affairs—fresh, firm leadership for peace, and in that mighty effort, we shall depend again—as we have in all our history—on our food, our farms and our loyal, tireless farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Saturday, August 20, hundreds of farmers gathered to give their views to a panel of experts in the field of agriculture and

agricultural economics. The summary of their views was prepared by the Governor of Iowa, Herschel C. Loveless, and presented to the conference. I ask unanimous consent that the summary of views and suggestions from the farmer hearing be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TWELVE-STATE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE AND RALLY, DES MOINES, IOWA

SUMMARY OF VIEWS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM FARMER HEARING

The voice of farmers speaking out in their own behalf was heard in an impressive array yesterday. It is clear that the plight of American agriculture offers a challenge that must be heeded if democracy is to fulfill its promise of equal justice for all.

It was a serious day of thought-provoking discussion. Farm people from North Dakota to Texas, from Colorado to Massachusetts, came together with a deep sense of common purpose and urgency. Testimony of 65 witnesses was heard—corngrowers, wheatgrowers, livestock feeders, rice growers, dairymen, cotton producers, and general farmers. They came from 16 States. They ranged from individual family farmers speaking for themselves and their neighbors to officers and spokesmen for State and national farm organizations. Together they represented a vast wealth of personal experience in farm management, farm marketing, farm living, farm program development, farm program participation, and administration.

Perhaps seldom in 1 long day has there been assembled and offered to public officials and policy advisers a more representative presentation of farm thinking from throughout a vast area in the heartlands of the Nation.

They came as Democrats, determined to see that the party of their choice wiped out the years of Republican neglect to farm people. To a man they indicated faith in a brighter future for agriculture under Democratic leadership they see ahead. They repeatedly called for the kind of leadership that really cares about farm people.

They brought forth an array of constructive ideas, suggested approaches, and alternative techniques for achieving the objectives set forth in the farm plank of the Democratic platform. They differed sometimes on means to that end but concurred wholeheartedly on the ultimate objectives.

They came up with such a wealth of helpful suggestions deserving serious study that this summation can at best be only a partial review of general conclusions. The forum-reporting committee recommends more detailed analysis and review later of all the testimony as beneficial guidance to the next Secretary of Agriculture.

Some conclusions, however, were inescapable, running repeatedly and unchallenged throughout the testimony.

The seriousness of the farm income situation—the challenge to the Democratic Party to take positive action to raise farm income—was foremost in farmer testimony.

Higher farm income must become the first, and major, objective. As one witness declared, no farm legislation that fails to raise farm income is worthy of being called farm legislation. There was evidenced a determination that farm income could and would be raised under a new Democratic administration, and a willingness to make use of a variety of economic tools to achieve that aim.

Farmers want and will insist upon a sympathetic Secretary of Agriculture—one who really cares about farm people, who understands them and their needs, and is willing to work with them, instead of against them; one who will champion farmers, instead of lecturing and criticizing them.

Farmers want and will insist upon greater farmer voice and farmer participation in both development and administration of farm programs. Witnesses made it clear they want to see revitalized the farmer-elected committee system of grassroots democracy in handling farm programs. They want to see encouraged the development of individual commodity programs by farmers themselves such as, for example, wheat producers and dairymen have been endeavoring to achieve.

Farmer after farmer indicated their willingness to accept their share of the responsibility in adjusting supplies to demand at fair prices, suggested measures varying from use of bushelage quotas on wheat to conservation-oriented land use adjustment in the corn-hog areas. Livestock producers indicated their conviction that better prices could best be achieved for themselves by bolstering feed grain prices through reduced grain output declaring that cheap feed has most often meant cheap livestock. Dairy spokesmen, too, urged a national plan to keep dairy supplies in line with demand as the way to better prices and higher income. There was general accord that price and income protection should be contingent on farmer participation in necessary production adjustments.

From every spokesman came insistence that the new Democratic administration must gear its policies to preserve and protect the family-owned and family-operated farm system of agricultural production and combat the spread of corporate farming and agri-business dominated vertical integration. Farmers agreed survival of America's traditional family farm system depended upon maintenance of fair prices and income, strengthening of farm bargaining power through cooperatives, provision of adequate credit at reasonable interest rates and better protection against growth of monopoly power.

Farmers made clear, however, they want to see maximum utilization of America's productive potential for humanity.

With our blessing of food abundance, witnesses emphasized, we must see that all Americans enjoy good and nutritious diets. Emphasis was placed on use of food stamp programs and expanded school lunch programs toward that objective.

Much emphasis was placed on the "Food for Peace"—with farmers urging expanded use of our food abundance to combat hunger and to support and finance economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

From witness after witness also came an appeal for finding ways to better tell the farmers' side of the story to the rest of the American public—to stimulate better consumer understanding of the farmers' role in assuring the Nation of an adequate food supply.

Emphasis was also placed on the need to press ahead with our efforts to develop new outlets and new uses for agricultural commodities, industrial and otherwise.

From midwest dairymen came an appeal for acceptance of uniform national sanitation standards on milk to help eliminate barriers to interstate trade.

The need was also emphasized, throughout the long day, for assuring farmers of adequate credit at fair interest rates.

Perhaps the best answer to those who decry any Government intervention to improve and stabilize the farm economy came in the one-sentence remark of one witness who said: "Farmers aren't as worried about losing their freedom as they are about losing their farms."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of the program as well as the excerpts from the 1960 Democratic platform and the platform plank on agriculture be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TWELVE-STATE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE AND RALLY AT DES MOINES, IOWA, AUGUST 20–21

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20

(Grand Ballroom, Hotel Fort Des Moines, 10th and Walnut)

At 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.: Public hearings by Governor Loveless and other national Democratic farm leaders to receive farm situation reports and program recommendations from farmers and farmer organizations.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 21

(Hotel Fort Des Moines)

At 12 noon: Family style Sunday dinner to be attended by Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Governor Loveless, and National and State Democratic leaders. The dinner will be on a Dutch treat basis and it is anticipated that a limited number of admission tickets at $5 each will be available for purchase by interested individuals.

At 1:30 p.m.: Work conference chaired by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, and participated in by Senators Kennedy and Johnson, Governor Loveless and a panel of leaders representing the 12 farm States heading the conference. At this session, a report will be made on the Saturday hearings and on the progress and plans for the national organization of Farmers for KENNEDY and JOHNSON. Suggestions and questions will be solicited from the floor and general discussion encouraged. Admission to the conference will be by official pass.

At 3 p.m.: Senator Kennedy and Senator Johnson and Governor Loveless will meet privately with State chairmen and Democratic committeemen and committeewomen of the 12 participating States and later with congressional candidates and leaders.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 21

(Veterans Memorial Auditorium, Fifth and Center Streets, Des Moines, Iowa)

At 3:30 p.m.: Doors open at the auditorium: General admission will be without charge to farmers and the general public. Seats will be on a first come—first served basis. (A limited number of reserved seats have been made available for purchase through the Iowa State Democratic organization at $5 each.)

At 4 p.m.: Press conference by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON on the stage of the Veterans Memorial Auditorium.

At 4:30 p.m.: National Anthem. Invocation: Rabbi Edward Zerin, Temple B'Nai Jeshurun, Des Moines. Welcome by Gov. Herschel C. Loveless, national chairman of Farmers for KENNEDY and JOHNSON.

SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, to introduce Senator JOHNSON.

Address by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic nominee for Vice President of the United States.

Remarks by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, to introduce Senator KENNEDY.

Address by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democratic nominee for President of the United States.

Benediction: Dr. Robert S. Michaelsen, Methodist minister, director of the School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

EXCERPTS FROM THE 1960 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM INCLUDING THE FULL TEXT OF THE PLANK ON AGRICULTURE

"THE RIGHTS OF MAN"

In 1796, in America's first contested national election, our party, under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, campaigned on the principles of "the rights of man."

Ever since, these four words have underscored our identity with the plain people of America and the world.

In periods of national crisis, we Democrats have returned to these words for renewed strength. We return to them today.

In 1960, "the rights of man" are still the issue.

It is our continuing responsibility to provide an effective instrument of political action for every American who seeks to strengthen these rights—everywhere here in America, and everywhere in our 20th-century world.

Agriculture

We shall take positive action to raise farm income to full parity levels and to preserve family farming as a way of life.

We shall put behind us once and for all the timidity with which our Government has viewed our abundance of food and fiber.

We will set new high levels of food consumption both at home and abroad.

As long as many Americans and hundreds of millions of people in other countries remain underfed, we shall regard these agricultural riches, and the family farmers who produce them, not as a liability but as a national asset.

Using Our Abundance

The Democratic administration will inaugurate a national food and fiber policy for expanded use of our agricultural abundance. We will no longer view food stockpiles with alarm but will use them as powerful instruments for peace and plenty.

We will increase consumption at home. A vigorous expanding economy will enable many American families to eat more and better food.

We will use the food stamp programs authorized to feed needy children, aged, and unemployed. We will expand and improve the school lunch and milk programs.

We will establish and maintain a food reserve for national defense purposes near important population centers to preserve lives in event of national disaster, operated so as not to depress farm prices. We will expand research into new industrial uses of agricultural products.

We will increase consumption abroad. The Democratic Party believes our Nation's capacity to produce food and fiber is one of the great weapons for waging war against hunger and want throughout the world. With wise management of our food abundance we will expand trade between nations, support economic and human development programs and combat famine.

Unimaginative, outmoded Republican policies which fail to use these productive capacities of our farms have been immensely costly to our Nation. They can and will be changed.

Achieving income parity

While farmers have raised their productive efficiency to record levels, Republican farm policies forced their income to drop by 30 percent over the past 8 years.

Tens of thousands of farm families have been bankrupted and forced off the land. And this despite the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has spent more on farm programs than all previous Secretaries in history combined.

Farmers acting individually or in small groups are helpless to protect their incomes from sharp declines. Their only recourse is to produce more, throwing production still further out of balance with demand and driving prices down further.

This disastrous downward cycle can be stopped only by effective farm programs sympathetically administered with the assistance of democratically elected farmer committees.

The Democratic administration will work to bring about full parity income for farmers in all segments of agriculture by helping them to balance farm production with the expanding needs of the Nation and the world.

The Democratic Party affirms the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

Measures to this end include production and marketing quotas measured in terms of barrels, bushels, and bales, loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity, production payments, commodity purchases, and marketing orders and agreements.

We repudiate the Republican administration of the soil bank program which has emphasized the retirement of whole farm units and pledge an orderly land retirement and conservation program.

We are convinced that a successful combination of these approaches will cost considerably less than present Republican programs which have failed.

We will encourage agricultural cooperatives by expanding and liberalizing existing credit facilities and developing new facilities if necessary to assist them in extending their marketing and purchasing activities, and we will protect cooperatives from punitive taxation.

The Democratic administration will improve the marketing practices of the family-type dairy farm to reduce risk of loss.

To protect farmers' incomes in times of natural disaster, the Federal crop insurance program, created and developed experimentally under Democratic administrations, should be invigorated and expanded nationwide.

Improving working and living on farms

Farm families have been among those victimized most severely by Republican tight-money policies.

Young people have been barred from entering agriculture. Giant corporations and other nonfarmers, with readier access to credit and through vertical integration methods, have supplanted hundreds of farm families and caused the bankruptcy of many others.

The Democratic Party is committed by tradition and conviction to preservation of family agriculture.

To this end, we will expand and liberalize farm credit facilities, especially to meet the needs of family-farm agriculture and to assist beginning farmers.

Many families in America's rural counties are still living in poverty because of inadequate resources and opportunity. This blight and personal desperation should have received national priority attention long ago.

The new Democratic administration will begin at once to eradicate long-neglected rural blight. We will help people help themselves with extended and supervised credit for farm improvement, local industrial development, improved vocational training and other assistance to those wishing to change to nonfarm employment, and the fullest development of commercial recreational possibilities. This is one of the major objectives of the area redevelopment program, twice vetoed by the Republican President.

The rural electric cooperatives celebrate this year the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Democratic Congress has successfully fought the efforts of the Republican administration to cut off REA loans and force its high interest rate policies on this great rural enterprise.

We will maintain interest rates for REA co-ops and public power districts at the levels provided in present law.

We deplore administration failure to provide the dynamic leadership necessary to encourage loans to rural users for generation of power where necessary.

We promise the co-ops active support in meeting the ever-growing demand for electric power and telephone service to be filled on a complete area-coverage basis, without requiring benefits for special interest power groups.

In every way we will seek to help the men, women, and children whose livelihood comes from the soil to achieve better housing, education, health, and decent earnings and working conditions.

All these goals demand the leadership of a Secretary of Agriculture who is not only conversant with the technological and economic aspects of farm problems, but who is sympathetic with the objectives of effective farm legislation not only for farmers but for the best interest of the Nation as a whole.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580), the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the pending business, which is the matter of health care for the aged.

One of the pressing issues before us during these final weeks of the 86th Congress is the urgent necessity to find a sound, workable system of providing adequate health care for America's elderly citizens.

I have been concerned about this subject as long as I have been in public life—first, as the mayor of the great city of Minneapolis, when I presided as chairman of the board of public welfare, which board, of course, had to do with the health care of our people. One of my first acts as a Member of the Senate was to join with the great Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], in presenting to Congress a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for hospitalization for those who were eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits under social security. So I can say with frankness that I am not a Johnny-come-lately to the subject of interest in and concern and plans for the medical care of our senior citizens. This is a subject of continuing interest to me.

In more recent Congresses I have presented bills along the lines of the social security principle to include under the confines of the social security program hospitalization and nursing homes, diagnostic treatment, and care under the social security program for our elderly people.

We must protect our aged and elderly citizens against the crushing, catastrophic financial burden of serious illness and health care.

We must free these fine Americans from nagging anxiety, from demoralizing fear that even brief illness may wipe

out the savings of a lifetime overnight, leaving behind poverty, destitution, and hopeless dependence on public relief after the illness is past.

All of us know how well the social security mechanism works in financing retirement pensions, in helping widows and disabled people. No reasonable person would suggest that we repeal or even cut back the highly successful OASDI social insurance program.

It is equally reasonable and proper, I believe, that we pay for major health costs of the elderly through this same effective social insurance program. Health benefits can, and should, be included with social security benefits, not as an act of charity but as an earned right, just as social security pensions are an earned right, earned by a lifetime of contributions during the working years. Who would deny that unmet health needs exist among our senior citizens? Retirement years do indeed bring leisure time but these are also years of drastically reduced income, just when health problems become more serious and more frequent.

I am rather surprised to hear argument over the health needs of our senior citizens. We do not need a great national survey. I ask any Senator to go to his own community or to visit the community hospitals in any county in the United States. One of the privileges of public life is to be able to identify one's self with the needs of the community or the people.

When I travel in my home State of Minnesota, I frequently stop at a hospital in a small community just to say "hello" to some people who have not had a visitor for a long time. I like to visit these fine hospitals that have been built through the sacrifice of civic-minded people and the generosity of citizens and effective community organizations. I like to see what has been done under the Hill-Burton plan of hospital construction. I have had my eyes opened as to the health needs of our people.

I have a daughter who studied nursing and who has worked in hospitals for several years. I am a pharmacist myself.

I believe that I have more than a mere layman's interest in hospital care and medical treatment. It is shocking to me to hear anyone argue over the needs of our elderly people in terms of medical care. I say shocking in the sense that the need exists. The only question is: How shall we provide for it? I happen to believe that it is sounder and more constructive—in a sense it is really more conservative—to provide for health and medical care or hospital care through the social insurance system.

The average social security retirement payment is less than $75 a month, and four out of every five Americans over 65 years of age have incomes less than $2,000 a year. I do not think such incomes will provide very much in the way of health care after a retired person has paid for food and shelter.

I am pleased to note that the Finance Committee has given favorable consideration and has taken favorable action on raising the amount of permissible earned income for those who are receiving social security insurance payments. The amount has been raised from $1,200 to $1,800 by the action of the Senate Finance Committee. I have advocated this increase for some time. I submitted an amendment or a bill, which was referred to the Senate Finance Committee, on this particular item. It seems rather foolish to me to have any limitation at all. Those limitations were expressed in the law during days of depression when social security was looked upon as a means of providing sustenance for individuals so they would not have to seek a job in the labor market.

I look upon social security as a system of benefits earned, on the sound principle of insurance. But I am grateful for the action of the committee, and commend it for raising the income level from $1,200 to $1,800. The increase means that the recipient of a social security benefit will be able to receive the full benefit without any deductions or any adjustments, and at the same time will be able to add to income some $1,800 a year, which will indeed provide a better standard of living for those who are under social security.

Wonderful advances in medical science promise eventual conquest of crippling and killing diseases such as arthritis and heart ailments, but this progress will be wasted if it is beyond the limited means of our elderly Americans.

If medical research continues as successfully as it has in the past 10 years, we may have 30 or 40 million Americans over 65 instead of the 20 million now expected in 1970.

Therefore, it is clear that the health care needs of our older people in the next decade will present a challenge and a tremendous opportunity for constructive action.

A program to provide effective medical care for our senior citizens cannot be left to chance—or to election year gimmicks. For years I have called for a program administered through our existing, time-tested social security system and prudently financed through modest increases in social security payments.

Such a program was proposed in the 85th Congress and again last year by Representative AIME FORAND in the House, and by myself in the Senate. My own proposal was similar to the Forand bill in providing hospitalization and nursing home services but my bill omitted surgical fees.

Earlier this year I joined the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] in supporting an even more comprehensive bill to provide medical care for all retired people.

The McNamara proposal is the best proposal of them all, because it gets to the root of the problem, and its coverage would affect all people 65 years of age or over.

On June 30, I joined the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in sponsoring an amendment to H.R. 12580 to add health benefits to the OASDI system, and I have again joined Senator ANDERSON in sponsoring this revised and improved version, amendment 8-17-60—A.

That is the amendment which is now pending before the Senate. The revised amendment represents the thinking of a number of us in the Senate who wish at least to get at a beginning of medical care for our elderly people under the social security system.

All these measures would function through the time-tested system of social security, and a person would obtain medical benefits as a matter of right, not as a recipient of charity.

I believe it is vitally important that this Congress put health care for the elderly into our social insurance program, and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the revised Anderson amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of the revised amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is the amendment which is cosponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and myself.

The amendment represents a solid and sound basis for a beginning for medical care under the social security system.

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

SUMMARY

Eligibility: 9 million men and women aged 68 or more who are eligible for OASDI benefits, or about 3 out of 5 persons over age 65.

Benefits: Up to 120 days of hospital service, with the patient paying the first $75 each year.

Up to 240 days of skilled nursing home care.

Up to 365 home health visits.

Diagnostic outpatient hospital services, including X-ray and laboratory services.

Costs and financing: Long-range cost of one-half of 1 percent of taxable payrolls to be covered completely by increases of one-fourth of 1 percent in contribution of employers and employees and three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed.

Administration: Any qualified provider of services could participate and patients would have free choice. The Secretary of HEW has no supervision or control of the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided, or over the administration of participating institutions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, any kind of degrading means test, any program which stigmatizes a person as a pauper or an indigent person, any program which provides benefits as a charity handout injures the dignity and self-respect of the recipient.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to finish my statement. Then I shall be happy to yield.

That is why I favor this kind of medical care program financed through the social security system, with contributions made during a person's working

years so that benefits received in the retirement years are an earned right, acquired under a sound social insurance program.

Must we force elderly American citizens into overcrowded charity wards in hospitals and nursing homes when the savings of a lifetime are wiped out by unexpected sickness or hospitalization?

I say this is disgraceful and unjustified in our rich, productive country. The conscience of our rich society must face up to the needs of our senior citizens—people who need more health care just when their income is sharply reduced.

I would like to point out that the Anderson amendment has built-in protections against overutilization and abuse. A person who goes into a hospital must pay the first $75 of hospital costs each year. Furthermore, a patient can get nursing home service only after transfer from a hospital and certification by a physician, and a patient at home can get home health services only as prescribed by a physician.

Also, units of hospital service, nursing home service, and home health care are rated on a scale to encourage use of the less expensive services. Thus, a patient would have an incentive to choose the less costly services so he could get health benefits over a longer period of time. I think this is a wise and reasonable arrangement.

I would also like to point out that the revised Anderson amendment specifically states that a patient is to have free choice in selecting his physician, hospital, nursing home, diagnostic services, or home health services.

Our amendment also specifically forbids the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from any supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the administration of any hospital, nursing home, visiting nurse agency, or homemaker service agency.

One of the real tests of the conscience of any society is how it treats its aged and elderly people. Do they have dignity, status, and security? Or are they shunted aside into shabby surroundings, forced to exist without adequate health care, often without adequate food and shelter?

There are some people who say this problem does not concern them. They say, "It's every individual for himself." They say every person has total responsibility to plan for his own retirement.

I agree that we should all plan on an individual basis to provide for our future needs. But the best plans and the best preparations of all men can be crushed by forces beyond their control. Disease, business conditions, and just plain bad luck can make a mockery of even the wisest investments and preparations.

We are now in the 25th year of social security, a program which has paid tremendous dividends in human welfare and human dignity for American citizens by making many welfare benefits a matter of earned right, not a matter of charity.

The voices of fear and foreboding in 1935 have been proved wrong. Our social security system works, and it works well. We have learned to use the wonderful tool of social insurance to finance retirement benefits for Americans.

It is only reasonable commonsense to use our proven social security mechanism to deal with the heavy financial burdens of health care for elderly people.

Health care today is just about in the same degree of urgency for our elderly people as social security was in 1935, in terms of old-age insurance and pensions. It is a matter of priority importance.

Only a person who deliberately blinds himself to the accomplishments of the last 25 years of experience with social security would say, "The program does not work. We should repeal it."

There are few people now who would attack social security, but the voices of fear and foreboding are still with us. They have not yet learned the lesson of American history, that a free people can increase and enhance individual security and dignity and still maintain the freedoms we cherish.

Mr. President, I wish my remarks to be clearly understood in their proper relationship to the whole matter of our care for needy people. Indeed, we cannot provide under the amendment I have spoken on, the Anderson-Kennedy-Humphrey amendment, medical care for all the elderly people. Therefore, we will need the programs of the local governments and State governments on old-age assistance, and we will need the help of the voluntary agencies which do so much to provide health care.

However, I believe that the social security insurance principle will in the long run work not only to the benefit of the people it affects, namely, our elderly citizens, but also to the benefit of the entire American community.

Today one of the heaviest costs in local and State government rests in medical care for the elderly. It is one of the great costs in State government in every State of the Union.

That cost is generally paid out of property taxes, which themselves are inequitable taxes. I propose that we finance the program on a much more sound basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, urging action on the pending Anderson-Kennedy-Humphrey amendment, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On behalf of over 13 million American workers and their families, I urge you to support the Anderson-Kennedy amendment which will be offered as an addition to the Finance Committee social security bill. In the matter of health care for the aged this bill is limited to some slight improvements in the present public assistance program and the creation of a new "medically indigent" class. It would provide medical services only as a public charity and only on proof of poverty, and then only in States that agree to participate, and only if matching funds from the Federal Treasury are appropriated by the Congress.

The Anderson-Kennedy amendment would provide health benefits as a matter of earned right under the tried and tested social security system which requires no funds from the Federal Treasury or from the States. With this addition to the committee bill, we would be providing health care both for those in the social security system and for those who do not presently qualify. By adding such a social security provision, we would reduce the number of people who would have to look to public assistance for medical care, with its hateful means test.

This is one of the most vital issues ever to come before the U.S. Senate. We can take a small step forward, or we can take significant action and bring real security with dignity to the lives of our senior citizens.

We have just celebrated the first 25 years of social security in America. The most fitting tribute we can pay to the foresight of the Congress 25 years ago is to build now upon our sound system of social insurance. The Anderson-Kennedy amendment is the way to do it.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am seeking recognition in my own right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the floor.

WHOSE BILLS SHALL WE PAY?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, much has been said about a needs test, and it has been said that it is degrading for some persons to apply for medical care on the basis that it is needed and that that person would have difficulty in paying a medical bill.

As one who supported provisions which are in the committee bill, as one who has a great interest in the care of the needy and aged and, in fact, as one who has proposed more frequently than others amendments to increase aid to the aged in many different categories, the junior Senator from Louisiana finds it difficult to agree with the arguments being made to downgrade the care which the committee bill proposes for the aged of this country.

For example, the present amendment, offered as a substitute, is being justified on a needs basis; on the basis that old people need help; that it should be provided because they need it, and that we should pay for it. That is what the committee bill proposes to provide for the care of those who need additional assistance to care for their medical bills, assistance which is not at present available.

The State of Louisiana is probably in as good a position to provide for the medical care of its aged as is any other State in the Union. We have a very extensive hospital system in addition to our public welfare program. The last time I compared it, if we leave out veterans' hospitals, I should say that more than half the hospital days in the State are spent in State hospitals, and some of those hospitals are better equipped than private hospitals, and have the same kind of

medical care available as is provided for those who are cared for in private hospitals.

A person in Louisiana does not have to be the recipient of old-age assistance—even though we have the most liberal program in the United States—in order to receive care in those hospitals. Fifty-seven percent of the old people receive old-age assistance payments.

In its old-age assistance program, pensioner dispenses with the relative responsibility requirement in the case of a person who might have a relative who could help support him. In some States such a person is required to certify that the relative cannot help him. Louisiana dispenses with the property lien requirement, under which it is suggested that property should be seized and sold under the sheriff's hammer to get back some of the State's investment in providing for the needs of the aged person after he dies and that he must sign the lien when he applies for assistance.

The program which is proposed in the committee bill goes beyond anything we have in terms of public assistance. It proposes to say that if a person is drawing a social security payment of $100 a month, and is drawing $1,800 a year in terms of additional income, which the bill would permit without any reduction of his social security payment—between the two, an income of $3,000 a year—and the person owns his own home and has relatives who could help if necessary, such a person would still be in the position under the plan we could set up—and which I believe Louisiana will set up—to receive assistance to pay his medical bill. He simply would state that, in his judgment, he is eligible to receive assistance.

What difference is there between that and the program for our veterans today, who are admitted to veterans' hospitals for non-service-connected sickness or disability? I have helped a great number of veterans to get into veterans' hospitals in Louisiana and elsewhere around the Nation, because they felt they could get good care in such hospitals.

They wanted to get into the modern veterans' hospitals to be cared for. But in applying for this care, a veteran must make some showing that he is in such a financial position that he is not able to pay, if he had to pay for it with his own income.

I find no shame in saying that I have helped relatives of my family to get into veterans' hospitals. They have felt not the least bit of shame about getting into veterans' hospitals on non-service-connected disabilities when there was some showing that the person was not in a position to meet the financial requirements of paying for the medical care which would be necessary otherwise.

If we are to undertake to provide health benefits, even for a person who can well afford to pay or not, whether he has all the resources and income necessary to provide the best of care for himself, it will tremendously increase the cost of the program we wish to undertake.

The Senator from Minnesota, very logically made a suggestion that he would like us to eliminate any income restriction whatever for eligibility for social security retirement benefits. I should like to eliminate that requirement too. I should like to have it provided that at age 65 anyone could make as much money as that person was capable of making and still receive full retirement benefits. But what would it cost? It would cost about $1,600 million a year to do it.

Among various ways in which we could spend revenues to the benefit of retired persons, there are quite a number of other things I would propose be done before we eliminate the proposal that a person would have his social security retirement income reduced if he were drawing more than $1,800 a year in other income. Let us keep in mind that if a person were making $1,800 a year and were drawing $100 a month, or if he were married and drawing $150 a month in social security income, that person would have net income well over $3,000. As a practical matter, he would be paying no income taxes on this income because of his high exemptions with regard to his outside income, his retirement income, other than social security, and because he would pay no tax under social security.

No one regards it as being downgrading or a shameful needs test if a person certifies that he is eligible to draw social security benefits, although he is drawing an additional $1,800 a year in addition to social security benefits. There is no shame about that. It is simply that he is eligible; and, if he had more income than that, he would not be eligible for the full amount of the benefits.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I think there is more distinction than that. Eligibility is the test, and the test is eligibility. What is the test under the bill, as stated in the bill and in the report? One must be unable, and must certify his inability, to pay for his medical care.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am reading from page 195, line 21, paragraph (b):

(b) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish medical assistance on behalf of aged individuals who are not recipients of old-age assistance—

What does that mean in Louisiana? It means that one is not in the 57 percent which are drawing public assistance under the old age assistance program. It means that a person is certifying that, for the purpose of drawing any type of assistance from our State welfare department, he cannot be classified as needy.

The langu..ge continues:

but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services.

Mr. GORE. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How has this program been justified? The Gore proposal would take 1 percent of the payroll. The Anderson proposal would take one-half of 1 percent of the payroll. The Anderson proposal would cost, eventually, as much as the Gore proposal, because the cost of doctors would be included in the total amount, and in short order the program will be liberalized.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me answer the Senator's point. These proposals have been justified on the basis of providing medical care for those who need it, because those who need it are not in a position to pay. They do not have to certify that they are needy beyond that point. Persons can own their own homes. They can have relatives who are well able to pay the bills. They are in a position to have substantial income; and if the State will set up a plan, as we propose to do, they will be in a position to have medical care merely by stating that their income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical service. Does anyone regard the same requirement in veterans' legislation as being downgrading, as robbing the veterans of their pride and their self-respect? Not at all. Veterans are not embarrassed to come in and ask for such assistance, and they get it.

Here we say only that if the income and resources are not sufficient to meet the cost of the necessary medical service, a person is eligible under this program.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has eloquently made a point which has not heretofore been made in the debate, and one which I wish to emphasize. Before doing so, let me say that I regard the committee bill as entirely inadequate, for two reasons: First, it depends upon State matching. Second, it requires a means test. However liberal that test may be, it is required.

The Senator from Louisiana has said that so far as the means test is concerned, it is not restrictive; that in his State and in others, all one need do is sign a little certificate stating that his resources are not enough to pay his hospital bill.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has criticized the bill I introduced, and he has criticized the Anderson amendment also, because it would cost, so he says, a vast amount of money. If the Senator will be so kind as to yield, let me say that in colloquy within the next few minutes I wish to demonstrate that if all States met the maximum requirements and if each State had a director of such a program who was, let us say, of the turn of mind of the late Harry Hopkins, and if the Federal administrator took the same view, there would be virtually no limits to the cost of the committee bill.

I ask the Senator whether in the committee bill there is any limit to the number of days in the hospital a year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. GORE. But the Anderson amendment has such a limit.

In the committee bill is there any limit in regard to the number of days for which the Federal Government would be

required to pay up to 80 percent of the cost when a person over 65 years of age was in a hospital?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Permit me to answer that question with a few more words than those I used in answering the last one. There is no such requirement. But there is this difference: The bill being introduced by the Senator from Tennessee and also by the Senator from New Mexico provides, in effect, "No matter how much money you have, we shall provide for the most regressive taxation a person could think of, whereby the tax would be levied only on the first $4,800. In other words, we shall provide for the kind of tax that hits the poor man the hardest and hits the rich man the least; and we shall provide for payment for the entire hospital bill for a certain number of days, regardless of whether the patient needs to have the Government pay his bill or not."

Consider how much this proposal would cost. By 1969—9 years from the present time—our existing benefits will cost 4½ percent for the employer and 4½ percent for the employee; and the Senator knows as well as I do that the social security tax will work like a hidden sales tax; for the most part, it will be passed on to the consumer. That will amount to 9 percent tax on the payrolls, stopping at the $4,800 a year level. In addition, the Anderson proposal would add one-half of 1 percent; and with the modifications of it—which certainly will follow like those the Senator is suggesting—it would wind up costing at least 1 percent of payroll. With time, as the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Minnesota has suggested from time to time, and as I myself have suggested on occasion—the requirement that such a person cannot receive the full benefits if his annual income is more than $1,800, and the elimination of that requirement would add almost another 1 percent of payroll to the cost. In the meantime we would provide that the cost of providing such care for the aged who are not now covered by social security should be included, and that would add another one-third of 1 percent of income.

So if we agree that the Federal Government will provide this medical care for the aged, we previously had reached the point where a 9-percent tax on payroll would be imposed on the workingman. Even if he paid only half of it directly, inasmuch as it would operate in the same fashion as a hidden sales tax on every article he buys, to that extent he would pay the entire 9 percent, as a consumer.

So, as I said, under the Gore proposal, 1 percent would be added—it would be ½ percent under the Anderson proposal, to begin with; but by the time the doctors and the others were included, and the age limit were reduced to age 65, it would cost 1 percent.

In addition, elimination of the requirement in regard to retirement age would add three-fourths of 1 percent of payroll to the cost; and to provide for the care—out of general revenues—of those aged persons not now covered by the Social Security Act—as the Senators from Michigan and Tennessee have suggested and will suggest—would amount to another one-half of 1 percent to be derived from general revenues.

That represents a total of 11¼ percent of payroll.

Furthermore, in committee, as the Senator well knows, Senators said it makes no sense to provide such care for a man 65 years of age who still can work and still can help himself, if no provision is made to take care of a man 59 years of age who is totally and permanently disabled.

The bill already contains provisions for the payment of benefits to those who have retired, even if they are below age 60. So once we adopt this principle, we shall soon have to take care of all those who are retired or disabled. Then there will be the drive to provide medical care for everyone, it will follow. The medical costs for the Gore bill benefits extended to everyone will cost 4 percent of payroll.

Consider how unbearable would be the total bill for such medical care. The total social security tax would be 15 percent by 1970—if other equally logical extensions of the program were voted it would cost 20 percent, or one-fifth of the average worker's entire income, so far as the workingman was concerned.

If we provide for the same benefits on the basis of providing such care for those who need it, and providing it on a liberal basis, with the States matching the cost, we shall be providing care for those who need it but not by the most regressive type of taxation. I refer to the most regressive type which hits hardest at the poor man, but says that a rich man who makes $100,000 a year will not have to pay any social security tax on any part of his income which exceeds $4,800 annually. If a rich man were writing the tax bill, such a tax would be exactly the kind he would like to have included in the bill—but on the other hand, if we use the approach that general revenue will be used to pay for the medical care of those who need it, we shall have a much fairer way of approaching the problem, and the cost will be paid very much more in accordance with the ability to pay, and we shall be providing such care for those who really need it, instead of providing very costly medical care to persons who are well able to pay those costs themselves.

Furthermore, if the Federal Government or the State government is put in the position of paying the entire medical bill, the cost will be upward of 50 percent greater; and I can prove that by means of the experience in Louisiana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I was hoping the Senator from Louisiana would finally reach a point where we could discuss the committee bill.

This afternoon the Anderson amendment has been beaten all over the Senate floor; and just now the Senator from Louisiana made the statement that if the Government pays all the medical bills of all the American people over 65 years of age, the cost will be astronomical.

At this point I should like to read from page 6 of the committee report, where the committee bill is described. I shall begin to read with the last paragraph on that page, although the previous paragraph is very enlightening:

A State may, if it wishes, disregard, in whole or part, the existence of any income or resources, of an individual for medical assistance.

If a State may disregard in whole or in part the existence of any income or resources, then, if we examine the top of page 7, we find this sentence:

The State has wide latitude to establish the standard of need for medical assistance as long as it is a reasonable standard consistent with the objectives of this title.

Now I should like to read from the report which describes the Anderson amendment:

The cost of four important types of health service is covered, subject to certain limits within 1 year:

(a) Hospital inpatient services, for up to 120 days.

Is there any such limitation in the committee bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is not. Of course the States may, if they care to, impose such a limitation. But in the committee bill there is no such requirement.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

I continue to read from the report on the Anderson amendment:

The individual pays the first $75 each year.

Is there any such requirement as that in the committee proposal?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

I read further from the report on the Anderson amendment:

(b) Skilled nursing home recuperative care, up to 240 days.

Is there in the committee bill any limit such as one of 240 days on the skilled recuperative care in nursing homes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, there is not, so far as I know.

Mr. GORE. I proceed:

Home health services by a nonprofit or public agency up to 365 visits.

That is one visit a day. How many visits a day can be made under the committee bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no limit.

Mr. GORE. I continue:

Diagnostic out-patient hospital services, including X-ray and laboratory services.

Is there any limit on that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not in the bill.

Mr. GORE. Now I should like to read the scope of the benefits under the committee bill, which, as the Senator has said, are without limits, except that the States must match. That is a very important exception, but, anyway, I will read:

(1) In-patient hospital services;
(2) Skilled nursing-home services;
(3) Physicians' services;

(4) Out-patient hospital services;
(5) Home health care services;
(6) Private duty nursing services;
(7) Physical therapy and related services;
(8) Dental services;
(9) Laboratory and X-ray services;
(10) Prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices;
(11) Diagnostic, screening, and preventive services—

All of these things without limit, plus:

(12) Any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.

The Anderson amendment has been pummeled and criticized as being irresponsible and extravagant. On the contrary, the Anderson amendment provides specific benefits, limited in scope, limited in application, limited in definition, spelled out in the amendment; and the amendment provides for an additional tax to raise the revenue.

Here, strange as it may seem, the advocates of the Anderson amendment are being condemned and banished into outer darkness as being fiscally irresponsible when we have a bill which, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, is without limit, except that the States must provide a part of it. This is a remarkable situation, and I am delighted that this point has finally been brought out in debate.

I hasten to add that I think, whether we have a Democratic administration—which I anticipate—or whether we have another Republican administration—which I would abhor—I believe that we will have a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who will place reasonable limits in this program. But no reasonable limits are stated in the bill.

I think my State would be unable to meet them. I am happy that the State of Louisiana is able to meet them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to have the floor back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The Chair will recognize that the Senator from Louisiana has the floor and that he is most graciously yielding to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's courtesy has caused me to forget what I was about to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is one of the advantages of courtesy.

Mr. GORE. So I will desist.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To the best of my knowledge, I believe our program in Louisiana will compare favorably with that of any State that is going to have a program under the proposal brought forth.

As to how long one stays in a State hospital, he stays there until a doctor says there is nothing more he can do, or until the person is cured. Patients stay about 50 percent longer than they stay in private hospitals. That is the point I am getting at.

The big difference is that if a man goes into a private hospital for an operation, the minute the doctor tells him he can go home, he is going home, because the expense of that hospital bill is something that is concerning that man. He wants to be back at work as soon as he can go back, and he wants to go back to his home and be under the care of his family as soon as he can, because he knows that hospital bill is very substantial. That man is going to go home as soon as he can.

On the other hand, if he is in a State hospital, with the prospect of relieving his wife of the burden of caring for him as well as look after the children, and with the State paying the expense, he will be inclined to stay where he is and urge the doctors to permit him to stay.

The human factor of knowing that one's bill is paid completely at State expense, standing alone, even though the pressure is on the State to try to keep its costs in line with the costs of private hospital treatment, means that the cost of treatment in a State hospital will exceed the cost of treatment in a private hospital, based only on the number of hospital days, and nothing else.

Let us talk about the aged for a moment. The same thing is true with respect to sending an aged person back to a home. Many of the diseases and illnesses that are associated with old age are incurable. There is a limit to what hospitals can do. At that point, they have done all they can do for a while. If the family is in a position to urge a person to stay where he is, or there is less of a tendency on the part of a family to accept a person back into the home, there is a natural tendency for that person to stay in the hospital longer, so he can eat good meals, and have good care. Therefore, the cost is much greater than for private medical care.

The proposal may be limited to 120 days, but people will use those 120 days if the old folks feel they would be burdens on their families for a short period of time after they return. But there is a difference in providing a program under which we propose to provide all the medical care necessary to anyone who is not in a position to provide for the cost. One factor that will help reduce the cost is that, from the point of view of the State, the State having to pay between 20 percent and 50 percent of the cost, there is pressure on the State administrators to help keep costs down. On the other hand, if we are providing funds at the Federal level, and all we have to do is provide additional incentives to try to provide higher benefits under the social security system, I am sure that in short order we will provide hospitalization for those below 60 who are disabled, and, in short order, for those who are below 60 who are not disabled, and after a while we will be providing hospitalization for people at any age.

Starting with the premise of the Anderson amendment that the Government pays for it whether the person is needy or not, and a person has it available to him whether he would want the program or not, even persons in the high income bracket would have the cost paid for by the most regressive kind of program.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It does not make too much sense to me, Mr. President, when we can hold down the cost to a great extent by providing care when it is needed. The committee bill would provide, in every State, that the State would be in a position immediately upon the passage of the bill to increase care for the aged by at least 100 percent. It could be increased without any additional State appropriation the minute the bill became law. Medical care could be increased as much as 400 percent in some States, compared to the medical care which is being made available in the States already.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MCNAMARA. The Senator from Tennessee read from page 7 of the report the "scope of benefits" under the committee bill. Has the Senator estimated the cost if all States provided all these services to all the people who would be eligible for them under the terms of the bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I notice that the cost is estimated to be $12.9 million in Louisiana. My guess is that the amount may be more money than we will need to provide for the medical care aged we have in our State, if the State continues its present rate of expenditures.

Mr. MCNAMARA. For all of those qualified?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I presume we could provide for between 80 and 85 percent of the aged in the State for a lesser amount of Federal funds than is hereby proposed, unless the State should reduce its expenditures.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I am advised that if all States provided all the services listed under section 3, "scope of benefits," the cost would be $2.5 billion. The $2.5 billion would be the cost to be split half among the States and half to be paid by the Federal Government. It is fantastic. The listing in the report is simply window dressing, as to physicians' services and all those things. This is fantastic. Nobody is going to provide $2.5 billion. If all the States should take all these services, the estimated amount required would be $2.5 billion. Of course, the Anderson amendment is limited.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The figure of $2½ billion the Senator uses assumes that the State will pay for all medical services.

Mr. MCNAMARA. For everyone who would be eligible under the terms of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It assumes the person pays nothing under the bill.

Mr. MCNAMARA. That is correct. They would pay nothing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In every State there would be some limitation as to who would be eligible to receive the benefits. That is fundamental to the bill reported by the committee.

In Louisiana probably 85 percent of the people would be eligible. Perhaps more would be eligible. I hope that the State of Tennessee, so ably represented by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who has a keen interest in the aged of his State and

other States, would certainly undertake vastly to liberalize the program, so that an equally high percentage of persons would be eligible for the care they need to receive.

When we consider the administration of this program, we should get it closer to the people, for the people are in a better position to get away from arbitrary standards and to look more at what a person actually needs. If the program is to be administered from Washington, D.C., it is easier to have someone say there should be an arbitrary number of days of hospital care than it is when the people who are paying for it have an interest in what they are paying for to medical care. That is a practical thing which would help reduce the cost.

We tend to reduce the cost of the program by having the States take a careful look to determine whether the expenditure of the money is necessary, because the States have to pay between 20 and 50 percent of the cost of the program. We also tend to get a better administration of the program when we get it closer to the people who are paying for it, for there is more of a desire not to provide service when the service is not needed—when the person, under proper standards, should not be eligible to receive it.

The committee bill represents a tremendous increase in the hospitalization available, as I have mentioned. It represents anywhere from a 100-percent increase to a 400-percent increase, based upon what the States are presently doing.

I wish to make another point, Mr. President. The social security program cannot indefinitely stand these 1-percent increases in the social security tax. It is true that this is a hidden tax. Most men have their social security taxes deducted from their pay before they ever see their paychecks. One of these days, however, they are going to have to start thinking in terms of how much they can afford. We are compelled to think in those terms, when we ask, "Can we afford to eliminate the $1,800-a-year earned-income limitation?" If we eliminate the $1,800 earned-income limitation, it will mean a 1-percent additional hidden sales tax on every family in America.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is it not a fact that the people who will have to pay the increase in the social security tax are the ones who are advocating the social security approach?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what the Senator said, and I heard him say it, but I do not agree.

Mr. McNAMARA. I traveled from coast to coast, and even held hearings in Washington, D.C. We have reams of testimony to show that these people asked for it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have yet to have a single workingman, be he a member of an organized union or not, other than the union leaders themselves, suggest to me that he wished to have the social security tax increased by 1 percent.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is not 1 percent; it would be one-fourth of 1 percent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One-fourth of 1 percent for the employee, and one-fourth of 1 percent for the employer, or a total of one-half of 1 percent. However, this is only the beginning.

Mr. McNAMARA. The consumer pays for both. The Senator knows that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. The manufacturer of the product or the producer of whatever service is provided will add that amount to the cost of the goods or to the cost of providing the service. The consumer pays for that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And the consumer is the employee.

Mr. McNAMARA. The people, generally speaking, pay for it, but they wish to have this approach.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So he is getting it at both ends. There are many workingmen who are consumers.

Mr. McNAMARA. And they wish to have this program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Oh, no.

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes; they do. They would like to have it as much as they wish to have the present social security law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am in a position to tell a workingman in my State, "My friend, we can do one of two things for you. We are considering one bill which will cost, in the first year, $200 million. That is the estimated first year cost. I can vote for that bill, which will not result in any increase in the tax on you. There is another bill which we are considering. The estimated cost for the first year is a billion dollars. I could vote for that bill. If that bill should be passed, it would mean that in short order you would have to pay an additional hidden sales tax of 1 percent on every dollar you make."

My guess is that the average man I know in my State—and I suspect this is true in the Senator's State also—would say, "Just a minute. If it is a difference of five to one, if it means a difference of paying five times as much, or an extra 1 percent hidden sales tax, I would rather settle for the proposal whereby I pay only one-fourth as much.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator says this is a regressive tax. Is that what the Senator called it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is as regressive as taxes can be.

Mr. McNAMARA. Very well.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is nonprogressive. The richer a person is the less he pays, proportionately. The poorer a person is the heavier the tax is on him.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This tax applies against the man who cannot even afford to pay income taxes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Very well.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He gets no consideration at all. He does not get even a deduction for a wife or child.

Mr. McNAMARA. Would the Senator advocate that our whole social security system go under the general fund? The same argument prevails as to the present system for social security payments as it does for the additional one-fourth of 1 percent. Would the Senator advocate changing the whole structure of our social security system, so that everything would be paid out of the general revenues? If the Senator would not, then he should not desire to do that with regard to this one-fourth of 1 percent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What did the Senator advocate for persons not covered under social security?

Mr. McNAMARA. My bill included them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. The Senator himself provided that payment for care of those not presently covered by social security should come from the general revenues. At least, he was thinking with the junior Senator from Louisiana at that time.

He said that people who are not presently under the social security program and who are not presently retired ought to have their health care provided for, but he did not wish to tax the workingman to provide that service. Instead, he preferred to take the money from the general revenues.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are going to take care of those who are already retired, but who have not paid anything into the fund for medical care purposes. The Senator was starting from a beginning point by saying, "How can this care be provided?" By starting to provide first for those most needy out of the general revenues, and then for those not quite so needy, in my judgment eventually he would arrive at the conclusion that the general fund ought to provide benefits for those who never paid initially, because he would wish to see the millionaire pay his share.

I know the Senator would not ordinarily wish to have a tax imposed to care for the needy or even to care for those who are under social security, when the rich man making a million dollars a year would get a deduction for everything over $4,800.

Mr. McNAMARA. We have this program under the social security law. If the law is a bad law, let us change it. If the law is not a bad law, let us operate this program that way.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is advocating the change. He seeks to provide medical care for people who do not need it, for people who are in a position to take care of themselves. He wishes to take care of a millionaire, even though the millionaire is not interested in being cared for.

Mr. McNAMARA. We do so now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then the Senator proposes to pay for all these benefits by means of a plan which exempts the millionaire from taxes on everything over $4,800?

Mr. McNAMARA. We fought over that subject 25 years ago.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a hidden sales tax.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator asks for an answer to this question: What would be the responsibilities of the State under the committee proposal for medical care costs? What percentage of the cost would the State be required to pay under the terms of the committee bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are talking only about people who are over 65.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In Louisiana the cost would be around 30 percent. I can determine what the cost would be in Minnesota.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would be about one-third.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore the State would have to pay 41 percent, approximately.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would that cost be additional cost?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a practical matter, the Federal Government would first be required to match what Minnesota is now paying.

The Senator from Minnesota said that he had visited hospitals in Minnesota at which the State is providing care for many of the aged. The Federal Government would be required to pay 60 percent of the total cost. The State would be paying 40 percent. So the State could immediately experience an increase in Minnesota of approximately, let us say, 150 percent over and above what the State is presently providing, even if the State did not put up an extra 5 cents.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How does the State of Louisiana finance its medical care program? What kind of tax does it impose for that purpose?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Our public welfare program has a vendor payment scheme to it, which is only a small portion of the medical care that we provide in Louisiana. That is paid from a sales tax. We have also an income tax.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a regressive tax, is it not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is not as regressive as is the social security tax.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator say that a sales tax was a progressive tax?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a regressive tax.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then there are degrees of progression and regression, is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct, but consider the difference. When we imposed a sales tax to provide for welfare, we provided as much care as we could for those who needed it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I compliment the State of the Senator from Louisiana for its fine program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is true that while the needy and the aged in Louisiana do pay some of the sales tax, that money, together with everything a rich person pays in that tax, goes to match funds of the Federal Government in an overall program to provide for the care of the needy persons. With regard to our hospital program, which is the major part of our health care in Louisiana, is derived from almost all taxes, whether they be the State income tax, taxes imposed on corporations, or taxes on oil and gas severance. The money comes from the general fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would those taxes include the sales tax?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Actually the sales tax, for all practical purposes, is pretty much devoted to our welfare program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does that program include health?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some of it does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point I am trying to make is this: I wish to say, first, that the Senator from Louisiana has made some good arguments. Let me assure him again, as I have before, I believe, that the record of the State of Louisiana in the field of welfare is primarily due to the great influence of the Senator, his father, and those who have supported him in his political program. I think it is one of the best programs in the country, and it surely is something which will stand as a living memorial to the Senator's late father and to himself. I say that most respectfully.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My uncle also had much to do with that program. You did not mention him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I wish to add that the former Governor, Earl Long, contributed also.

Many of the States do not have State income taxes. Frequently State revenues are acquired from excise taxes, which are indirect sales taxes, or acquired from sales taxes or from property taxes; and of all the problems that face local and State governments today, none is more crucial or more difficult than local financing. I have wondered where the States would get the additional money that they require.

In my State we have a State income tax; and every business interest in the State, with few exceptions, has said that it drives business from Minnesota. It does not, by the way, but those who feel that way like to talk about it. If we did not have a State income tax, we would have to get the funds from a sales tax or from increased property taxes. Property is now taxed to the hilt, because the increases in State and local government expenditures have been fantastic since the war.

The other day our Governor testified before a committee of Congress. He is a member of the Governors' conference that meets once a year. I believe State and local government costs have increased something like 300 percent since the end of World War II, which is a great increase. Indebtedness has risen fantastically in State and local government. The burden of governmental cost, State and local government, is very heavy. The worst feature and the most inequitable part of that burden is that while the financing of State and local governments is not in every instance, unfair or unjust, in many instances it is on a very unjust and unfair basis, relying upon the property tax, upon excise taxes, and upon State sales taxes.

As I recall, in Louisiana there are exemptions made in the sales tax for rent, food, and medical care.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There are some exemptions. They are not as broad as they once were.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is inevitable that as new requirements come upon the States which have a limited taxing jurisdiction, they must impose heavier and heavier levies through existing types of taxes.

State and local governments will have a very difficult time paying their fair share under the committee bill, but the committee bill, of course, does provide assistance to States, and very valued assistance in terms of the Federal contribution.

The Senator makes a very persuasive argument when he points out that there is not much wrong with financing out of the general revenues. There is merit to his argument. I must say that one of the limitations of the Anderson amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, is that it does not cover those who may need medical care, and surely are as deserving of it as elderly citizens who are not under social security. There is in a sense a need in part for what the committee bill offers, at least in some portions of it, plus the provisions of the Anderson amendment, which contains the social security provisions.

We in Congress must face the fact that if we are to have additional services for our people, we must pay for them. The point is that the working people of America are heavily taxed. I think they are disproportionately heavily taxed because they get it coming and going. They pay excise taxes, sales taxes, or a tax which is charged back into the cost of an item of service they purchase. Most often such people can least afford to pay those taxes. But we must face up to it. If we want these extra services, the bill must be paid, and that means that revenues must be raised.

We cannot have more defense, a greater education program, and a public health program unless we are willing to pay the bill, and it becomes fiscal irresponsibility if we are not willing to pay the bill.

I believe the Senator from Michigan made a very good argument. There are good arguments throughout this debate. The Senator from Michigan asked if we are unwilling to apply the social security principle to health care because it seems to be a regressive tax, as the Senator from Louisiana said, why apply the social security principle to old-age and survivors insurance itself? That decision was made a quarter of a century ago. I sincerely believe it was a proper decision, particularly as we have expanded coverage and, may I add, as we have increased the base upon which the tax has been levied. At one time the social security tax was levied upon income tax much lower than $4,800. Now it has risen to the $4,800 level, and there are those who have recommended that that level be raised in order to give the fund a greater amount of money and a greater degree of solvency.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we depart completely from a standard eligibility entitling a person to have his bills paid because he finds that his income is not sufficient to meet those needs, the cost is going to be very much greater. We will pay these bills even though we provide—as Louisiana provides and will continue to do so—that we will not call upon his relatives, will not seize his home, will not seize his property, and will make no effort to obtain reimbursement from the modest income that he has been drawing either prior to or after his stay in the hospital. When we take the position that we will pay for these hospital costs, whether the person is in the position to take care of them himself, the cost is going to be very much greater. When we do that, we eliminate one of the greatest means of keeping down hospital costs, specifically the desire of the patient himself to keep them down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The argument which the Senator made while I was temporarily occupying the position of the Presiding Officer applies to either the Anderson amendment or the committee bill. It is a factor with which we are confronted in connection with public payments, namely, that some supervision is needed to see to it that the service is not abused.

I have observed what is done in veterans' hospitals. I have seen extraordinarily good medical care, which is an argument in behalf of the Senator's position. However, I have seen doctors in Veterans' Administration hospitals, by good professional treatment and care, expedite the discharge of the patient from the hospital, without, of course, jeopardizing his health in any way.

We have seen, for example, in the case of mental patients, new medical care and procedures making it possible for mental patients to be released from the hospital months sooner than was the case several years ago.

The same situation is true with respect to other ailments. It is due to modern medicine and modern medical treatment and modern drugs.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that there are very few people under social security who are millionaires, and that few people have extra money. One of the reasons for the social security principle is that if one is compelled to go to a hospital for medical treatment, it is for the purpose of not forcing him to utilize on medical care what limited funds he may have saved, and forcing him later to accept public assistance.

In other words, this is preventive insurance. The purpose is to see to it that if he has a house or some money in a Federal savings and loan institution or in a local bank, he will not have to spend all that money on hospital or medical care, and that he will be given the advantage of some insurance protection when he needs it, at a time when his earning capacity is lowest. The record shows that four out of five people aged 65 or over have an income of under $2,000 a year. That is four out of five. About one-third of our people aged 65 and over have an income of under $1,100 a year. Those are the people who are entitled to some kind of insurance protection.

Of course, if the insurance protection runs out—and that can happen under the Anderson amendment, because there are limitations as to the duration of the stay in the hospital that is allowed, or the care in the nursing home that is allowed—we would have to come back to the principle of public assistance.

I do not want my argument to be interpreted quite so strictly as my words might seem to indicate.

I do not believe that we should get ourselves in the position where we would say that public assistance, per se, is bad, because it is not. Many areas have been able to reduce the so-called requirements or the criteria for public assistance, so that there really is not a great deal of difficulty in that regard. The Senator has pointed out that in some areas there is practically no means test. Therefore, it would be a disservice to the cause of public welfare for anyone to interpret my argument as being aimed against the principle of public assistance.

I consider social security a better way of providing for the needs of our people. At the same time I also recognize the fact that there are limitations to social security. The Senator from Louisiana has pointed out some of them in the committee bill. Therefore, the public assistance concept may be supplementary. I thank the Senator for his generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I might give the Senator a practical illustration of the difference between the cost of the proposal that is being offered as the Anderson amendment and the other proposals. The Anderson proposal would provide medical services whether a person was in need. Consider the case of a person who has a fairly modest hospital bill to pay. That is the case in the majority of situations in which a person has a small medical bill. In a great many cases employers let the employee stay on the payroll. He is drawing some income, and he is able to pay the bill.

That person, of course, would pay his medical bill. He would be the greatest ally in keeping the medical bill down. He would not be pressing the doctor to let him stay in the hospital. He would be eager to get out of the hospital and get back to work and get back to doing something productive, particularly if he had a job that he wanted to get back to.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is referring to people who have jobs. Not many persons 65 years and over have jobs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A great many of them do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, but a larger number do not. The Senator is quite right if he is talking about a person who is 55 or 45 or even 60.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was talking about a man who had a job. That was my starting point. The average person does not retire until age 68, the way the situation is now. In other words, most people prefer to work after they are 65. It is a fine thing if people can retire when they want to, but a majority do not, because they can make a great deal more money by continuing to work. There must be something to it. Perhaps most of them enjoy the conditions of work, to which they have become accustomed all their lives, and they would rather work than make the adjustment to being nonproductive. Such a person would be the greatest ally in seeing to it that the medical services were kept at at the lowest practicable, sensible, and logical level. There is the additional fact that his family would be the greatest cooperator, by taking over where the hospital left off. They would be desirous to receive him back into the home. That has been the experience in Louisiana, with the same type of case taking much longer in a State hospital than in a private hospital.

Let us take the case of a person who has some assets. I would very much like to see the Louisiana plan permit a person to have as much as a thousand dollars in liquid assets such as cash in a bank, or Government bonds or various stocks, in addition to his social security entitlement. But if that person has more than that, and if it is well understood that if he spends some of his own resources no one is going to seize his home or take his automobile, or some small amount of cash in the bank, so long as he is looking to himself to make the payments, he will be the greatest ally in seeing to it that medical expenses are kept low.

The medical expenses become large when a person has no responsibility to keep them down. I very much feel that if we depart completely from the concept that we will pay the medical bills of those who need help, as contrasted with those who may not need it, the cost will be very great.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana makes a powerful argument against the committee bill. The committee bill has no limitations on how long a person can be in the hospital. The Anderson amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, has limitations. It has, first of all, a provision that the first $75 one pays by himself. It has limitations as to the time one may be in a hospital or how much time he may be in a nursing home. There are cutoff dates. There are limitations. Furthermore, the Anderson amendment is not relief; it is social security. It is "prudential life insurance." After all, I suppose that when one takes out an insurance policy with a private company, it is really an unfair trick to die early; he does not pay in much. If he is to be real fair about it, he ought to live a long time. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know who we think will pay for these benefits if it is not the workingman. The Senator has insisted that he will have to pay for it, whether the person getting the benefits needs them or not. A person who is sick will be inclined to stay in the hospital longer than necessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If a man goes to a hospital under the social security program, the question will not be whether he needs a payment or not; he will be entitled to it. When he gets well, he may have what he has saved up; he can go on and live life again.

There are two different concepts. One is the concept of public assistance, under which a man is down and out, or if not down and out, has very limited, meager resources. Out of sheer compassion, a desire to do social justice, and out of a sense of decency, organized government says: "This man is entitled to medical care on the basis of need."

The other concept is the social security principle, under which a man pays in one-quarter of 1 percent of his income.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Oh, no; he does not pay it; someone else pays it. The man who gets the immediate benefit is not the one who does the paying.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is actuarially sound.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is actuarially sound, so far as we tax the workingman to pay for benefits that he is not receiving.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But if the same workingman, at his age, needs medical care, he gets it. It is like the man who does not have an automobile accident. He drives 5 years and never has an accident. He is paying for the fellow who is constantly nipping fenders.

This program is all worked out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is going to make the workingman find himself taxed an extra 1 percent. It is like a hidden sales tax of an extra 1 percent of his income.

Suppose he does not have any old folks in his family, and his children are sick. Suppose he has a child who has been run over by an automobile, and he has a $4,000 medical bill staring him in the face. It will certainly do him little good to know that while he is signing a mortgage for $4,000 on his house, it is actuarially sound for him to pay 1 percent of his income for some aged person to receive some medical care, even though that person is well able to pay for his own medical care.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's plan—the committee bill—is not exactly a gift from heaven. This is not manna which falls down to those in need. Somebody has to pay the bill. When it is paid, it will be taken out of the property taxes on homes, it will be taken out of sales taxes, it will be taken out of excise taxes.

Who does the Senator think will pay for the State portions in States where there is no State corporation income tax? There are plenty of States like that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the Senator talks about the poor little man paying a tax on his humble home, he is, of course, speaking of Minnesota. We do not have that situation in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that. Louisiana has no property taxes on homes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We have what are homestead exemptions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Louisiana has the homestead exemptions; but every home is not a homestead. The Senator knows that assessors look over the property each time to see whether it qualifies as such.

The Senator is a wise and prudent man. He knows much about local government and State government. He knows all about the inequitable tax structures in this Nation. Many of them are to be found in local and State governments. Why? Because of charter restrictions and constitutional restrictions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not one of those provisions is as inequitable or as regressive in the raising of revenue for general purposes as is the social security tax.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the social security tax does not raise revenue for general purposes; it raises revenue for specific commitments; and the people who are brought into it know it. They pay into a fund which is assigned and relegated to a specific purpose.

The interesting part of the Senator's argument is that people like social security; they do not believe the Senator's argument, because the Senator's argument does not make sense to people in our country who are self-reliant and want to take care of themselves.

What the social security program does is to provide a larger group whence to derive revenues for a broader coverage for the individual and public good. It provides a system which is economically sound and is feasible and workable. It works. The Senator knows it works.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Minnesota has made two proposals, one of which we are debating, the other of which I should like to see done if we could afford it. I am talking about the removal of the income limitation on earned income. Between those two proposals, there is a probable additional cost of 2 percent of payroll, a hidden sales tax on every workingman and his family in the United States. Within 9 years, that man and his family will be paying this hidden tax at 9 percent plus the 2 percent. The Senator from Minnesota knows the social security tax is based on such a tax, because such a tax becomes a tax on the consumer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator makes that generalization. I suppose we might say that every tax is a tax on the consumer. I might ask the Senator to name for me anyone who is not a consumer. The only ones who are not consuming are the dead.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It cannot be said that every tax is a tax on the consumer. The personal income tax is one example. It happens to be the principal source of revenue for the Government. It is a tax that not every person pays.

On the other hand, when a general tax is put on industry, such as a tax of a certain percentage of the payroll, industry will add that tax to the cost of its product. If industry cannot make a profit over and above that point, it will simply not produce any more of that product.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On that basis, we ought to eliminate the corporation tax, because corporations obviously will try to pass that tax along to the consumer. We could talk the tax argument down the road of absurdity. Of course, there will be some reflection of the tax cost in the service or the product which will be passed along to the consumer. But the same man who pays it is also a producer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator show me how the personal income tax is passed along to the general consumer? The Senator has not argued that in the 12 years I have been in the Senate with him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The most fair tax is the personal income tax, provided it is not riddled with loopholes and a few other things. It is the most equitable tax.

But when we speak of property taxes, when a landlord rents a place, he includes the property tax in the rent. If the property tax is raised, he passes the increase right along to the person who rents the apartment. If any kind of excise tax is imposed, that tax is passed along.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is not quite so easy, and I shall show the Senator why it is not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's taxes are passed along, but mine are not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If a man is in a position to buy his own home at so much a month, he looks at the amount of the payments, the deferred cost to buy that home, in comparison to what it would cost to rent a home or rent an apartment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The landlord is compelled to make his rent competitive with what it costs to buy a home. That is one reason why I have been against all the proposed increases in interest rates. When the cost of interest is increased for a man buying a home, the landlord is put in a position to pass along the increase in higher rent. But when we make it less expensive for a person to buy his own home, we also tend to make it easier for him to pay the rent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana makes a good argument. One of the most disturbing parts of the debate over medical care is that we find the Senator from Louisiana on the side of the majority of the committee. In the main, the economics of the Senator from Louisiana is the kind of economics with which I find myself in agreement. The Senator from Louisiana is a considerate man. He is a just man. He has deep concern for the welfare of those who are or who have been mistreated or who are in need of justice.

I find some of his argument relating to the committee bill very persuasive. I only hope that by the time we are through we shall be able to have the better features of the committee bill, to which the Senator from Louisiana has applied his conscientious and skilled hand, and that we shall be able to have the Anderson amendment, which starts

to apply the social security principle at age 68, with the limitations we have written in; and that we can come away from here with the beginnings—and I think the Senator is right about this, I may say—of medical care. It is not the omega; it is the alpha, so to speak, of this structure. I hope we can have the Senator from Louisiana with us. He is a powerful advocate. He knows his business and does good work.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, permit me to say that we are facing the prospect of a social security tax of between 15 and 20 percent of income by the end of 1969. It is that point which causes me to feel that we make a better approach by means of the committee bill, although we begin with a large and extremely costly program, regardless of which approach is taken.

The approach of the committee bill will result in a $240 million cost to the Federal Government the first year, and the cost will rapidly grow thereafter. If that approach is taken, the cost under the committee bill within 5 or 6 years from now may well amount to $1 billion.

On the other hand, if we use the approach of including all those over 65 years of age, regardless of whether they need such assistance, we begin with an increased cost of $1 billion; and then we shall have to apply the same approach to those who are disabled, even though they are below 65 years of age, if they feel that they need medical care; and such provisions will tremendously increase the cost.

So, merely as regards medical care, if we went the rest of the way, the cost would be approximately 4 percent of payroll, which would be a tax on the workingman and his family—a tax twice as great as the entire social security program cost only 4 years ago. But that would not be the end. Just today we have heard three very able and effective Senators—one from the Midwest, one from the South, and also one on the other side of the aisle—say, today, that the Senate should remove the income limitation in connection with the receipt of social security income. If that were done there would be an additional cost of 1 percent of payroll, or more.

So we are moving in the direction of making the social security tax 15 to 20 percent; and even that would not be the end, under all the proposals, because at least half the Members of the Senate have some suggestions in regard to how they would like to see the social security program further liberalized.

Mr. President, there is no need for us to take such action for the benefit of those who at the present time are well able to pay their own hospital bills. In that respect, certainly the Anderson bill would go too far.

In addition, this program, which is going to be enormously costly, is one which could better be approached gradually, rather than to try to go all the way at one time.

Furthermore, I am not at all sure that any bill at all will be enacted, if the bill is made as costly as is advocated by some. If the bill ever passed the House, the President might veto it; and we have some indication that result would obtain if some of the proposed substitutes were accepted.

I make the point—which I began to make at the beginning of my remarks—that every State which has some program of medical care for the aged will be in a position, under the committee bill, to increase that care at least 100 percent, without any additional cost at all to the State, merely by means of the requirement that the Federal Government match what the States are now doing. Some States will then be in a position to increase by 400 percent the medical care they now are providing, without placing any additional tax or anything of the sort on the workingman or his family.

So far as concerns those who are not presently receiving any such assistance, this bill proposes, as a standard, that those who are not now regarded as needy, for any purpose, in a State—neither for purposes of public welfare nor for any other purpose—can simply certify—and here I read that part of the bill—"that their income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services."

Mr. President, I have represented relatives of my family and others who have had to discuss this matter with their doctors time and time again. They have had to ask, "What are we going to do about the medical bill, which is going to be very large? This relative is not in a position to pay the entire cost. So you will not please reduce the bill or else allow a longer time in which to pay it?" That often is asked in regard to a doctor's bill or a hospital bill. On many occasions I have made that sort of representation on behalf of someone to whom I was related or on behalf of someone in whom I was interested; and the person concerned never was embarrassed by having to explain to the doctor that he did not have enough money with which to pay all of the bill at once, and that it would be necessary for the doctor to allow him a considerable length of time in which to pay the bill.

But this provision is to the effect that the Federal Government will pay from 50 percent to 80 percent of the cost, merely on the person's statement that his income or other resources do not enable him to meet the costs of his medical care.

This entire program is being "sold" on a need basis. But I do not know of anyone who is fully able to meet his medical-care bills who is asking the Government to take care of his medical-care expenses.

On the other hand, based on my experience, one who actually needs help in connection with the payment of his medical bills will not have a false sense of pride in that connection. For example, when a veteran goes to a veterans' hospital when he has some nonservice connected disability, he does the same thing, and he does not have any sense of shame about it. As a matter of fact, he feels somewhat proud that, as a veteran, he is eligible for such assistance.

Therefore, this is not a program for the indigent. The change called for by the committee's approach has little to do with the indigent. Under the committee bill, those who are in no sense qualified to receive old age assistance can simply state that their resources are insufficient to enable them to meet the costs of such medical-care expenses or services; and when they make that report, they will be in a position to have their medical-care bills paid.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard with great interest the most enlightening presentation by my friend the Senator from Louisiana. I did not interrupt his remarks, because I thought the debate was very heavily concentrated upon the committee bill versus the Anderson amendment; and earlier in the day I had spent a considerable amount of time debating my own substitute for the Anderson amendment and also answering many questions by Senators who feel strongly about the Anderson amendment. Interestingly enough, many of those questions were of the same general character.

I hope that, overnight, Senators will read with special care the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana about the matter of the strange change which has taken place—with Republican Senators who support my amendment advocating the idea of a general revenue plan; and with Democratic Senators, who generally wish to equalize these burdens by charging them to the whole of the taxpaying capability of the country, concentrating on the part of the taxpaying capability—I think the Senator made that point very clear—which is much more in the nature of a sales-tax approach than we would normally expect to have advocated by Senators on that side.

I very much appreciate the presentation made by the Senator from Louisiana and the details he has submitted on that point; and his presentation will be helpful to all of us, regardless of how we vote on these amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from New York will forgive me for not understanding his plan. Let me point out that three or four plans were before the committee, and the bill itself is not the shortest or least complicated bill I have ever seen. In fact, it runs to 184 pages of legislative language.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Mr. President, it is now my purpose to read into the RECORD a statement issued today by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The statement deals with my proposal which will be voted on at 2 o'clock tomorrow. I think the statement I shall read is very important, because today we have had a great deal of debate about what measure the President will be willing to sign or what measure he will not sign, and about the terrible frustration of voting for something which we know in advance the President will not sign.

So the light which is reflected on that subject by the statement issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare and also the questioning undertaken of him at his press conference are most important.

The statement reads as follows:

I have not yet discussed in full detail with the President the proposal for medical care for the aged which was introduced in the Senate on Saturday by Senator JAVITS on behalf of himself and eight other Senators. The proposal, however, is consistent with the basic principles which the administration has stated should be found in any program for medical care for the aged.

I should like to repeat that statement, because it is so important:

The proposal, however, is consistent with the basic principles which the administration has stated should be found in any program for medical care for the aged. The proposal sets forth a program that meets these four key requirements.

It would be voluntary.

It would provide for financial participation by the individual.

It provides for a Federal-State partnership in dealing with this very important problem.

It would be financed from general revenues.

These are the criteria which we know very well and which have been established by the administration in its testimony on its own plan.

I should like to conclude my part of the debate for tonight with the following points: In the program I have proposed, we would be able to give our older citizens a group of benefits in medical care of extraordinary coverage, including, very importantly, the preventive care which all the figures show 90 percent of them need far more than they need long-term hospitalization, and without encouraging the breakdown of hospital facilities, which will be encouraged by providing in the Anderson plan, long periods of hospitalization, with a whole range of facilities, when 90 percent do not need it, but will be invited to use those facilities because they are free, except for home care and nursing home care, which in many cases would be inapplicable, and to extend their hospital stay.

It seems to me the amendment which I have proposed is the really practical alternative before us, because it meets the criteria of the administration and has the best chance of becoming law.

Again, we cannot overlook what happened in the other body. Notwithstanding the procedure, as it was developed between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself today, which normally ensues when a rule is presented to the House on a bill coming from the Ways and Means Committee, it is a fact that the House voted heavily to support the rule without endeavoring to undo it. Therefore, I think we have a right to assume that the House has, for all practical purposes in this session, no expectation of voting on a social security bill like the Forand bill which was before it.

I believe those who support the Anderson amendment must take cognizance of the fact, if they want to do something toward getting a law passed in this field here and now, I have presented an alternative, with substantial benefits provided, especially preventive care, which will do the job, and is the only alternative which will do it.

I commend it to Senators supporting the amendment, who I know are sincere.

Mr. President, I know one of our colleagues has something to present to the Senate, so I shall suggest the absence of a quorum; but before I do so, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the statement by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on this subject.

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

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I have not yet discussed in full detail with the President the proposal for medical care for the aged which was introduced in the Senate on Saturday by Senator JAVITS on behalf of himself and eight other Senators. The proposal, however, is consistent with the basic principles which the administration has stated should be found in any program for medical care for the aged. The proposal sets forth a program that meets these four key requirements.

It would be voluntary. The individual would have the opportunity of deciding for himself whether or not he desires to be a participant in the program.

It would provide for financial participation by the individual. Persons who elect to come under the program would be required to make financial contributions toward its cost.

It provides for a Federal-State partnership in dealing with this very important problem.

It would be financed from general revenues. The Federal portion of the cost would be paid from general funds of the Treasury, not by a special tax.

The bill to amend the Social Security Act which was reported by the Senate Finance Committee would provide medical care benefits to the needy aged and represents an improvement and expansion of the existing medical care program now in operation under the Federal-State public assistance program. The bill also makes provision for Federal-State sharing of the costs of medical care for older persons who, while otherwise self-sufficient, need help in meeting their health care costs.

Under the program proposed by Senator JAVITS, participating States would offer the individual his choice of three benefit plans:

1. Diagnostic and short-term illness benefit plan. This plan would provide (1) 21 days of hospitalization (or equivalent skilled nursing home services); (2) 12 physicians' visits in the home or office; (3) diagnostic laboratory and X-ray services up to $100; and (4) organized home health care services up to 24 days.

2. Long-term illness benefit plan. This plan would provide, after a deductible of $250, 80 percent of the costs of (1) 120 days of hospitalization; (2) up to a year of skilled nursing home services; (3) surgical services; and (4) organized home health care services.

3. Optional private insurance benefit plan. This plan would provide reimbursement of 50 percent of the premium cost of private health insurance up to a maximum reimbursement of $60.

4. If the participating States decided to improve the first two benefit plans, the Federal Government would share in the cost of these improvements up to a cost of $128 per individual participating in the plans. The minimum plans as outlined would cost approximately $90 per individual participating in the plans.

Under the Javits proposal, all persons 65 or over who did not pay a Federal income tax in the preceding year or whose income in the preceding year was $3,000 or less ($4,500 for a couple) could participate in the program.

Approximately 11 million persons would be eligible, of whom it has been estimated 8.2 million might participate. This estimate does not include the approximately 2,400,000 persons who are recipients of old-age assistance.

The bill provides for an enrollment fee for each participant which would be fixed by the State according to the participant's income. It would be 10 percent or more of the estimated cost of the medical benefit plans provided by the State.

The Federal and State governments would share the total cost of the three benefit plans, less the enrollment fees collected. The Federal share would range among States from 66⅔ percent, in the poorest State, to 33⅓ percent, in the richest State, with an average of 50 percent in all States. State administrative expenses would be shared 50–50 by the Federal Government and States.

Mr. JAVITS. 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. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, our efforts in the field of medical research and in the development of new techniques in medical care must be vigorous and ceaseless if we are to succeed in unraveling the mystery which still surrounds the causes and the possibility of cure of some of the more deadly maladies which daily snuff out the lives of thousands of human beings.

Much progress has already been made. Particularly in the last few decades, medicinal science has made giant strides in the constant battle against diseases and ailments which have plagued mankind through the years.

These advances in medicinal science, together with a more nutritional diet, better recreation and hygiene which have accompanied a rising standard of living, have, ironically, made more acute the problem with which the Senate is now called upon to deal. We are blessed with a steadily lengthening life span. This has resulted in an increasing percentage of our population within those age brackets in which physical infirmity is more prevalent, with consequent increased need for medical care.

Improvements in the quality of medicinal care have been more than matched by increases in its cost. Simply stated, more and more elderly people need more and more money to defray the cost of more and better medical care at a time beyond the income-producing period of their lives. This is a big, costly order.

Our society, I think, has reached the stage at which we should take steps to insure that adequate medical care is available to all our retired citizens. It

must be available in a manner which will sustain the individual pride and dignity of all old people and all citizens.

I am concerned that this individual pride and dignity be preserved and sustained. I am not one of those who is willing to say that the larger a percentage of a State's population which is on old age assistance the better social security program or medical care program it has. In my way of thinking, this erodes the pride of our people. Instead of eroding it, we should nurture it, sustain it, and preserve it and encourage it.

How should the cost be defrayed? Upon whom should the burden rest? I regard it as significant, and happily so, that no responsible organization or organized political group familiar with the facts now takes the position that no medical care program is needed or that action by the Congress is inappropriate. With substantial agreement on the need for some kind of program, it behooves the Congress to enact legislation which is adequate to meet that need and which lies within the framework of responsible and proven principles of governmental action.

At this point, Mr. President, and before discussing the alternate legislative approaches to this problem from which the Senate will choose, I should like to note the fact that, whatever type of program of medical care for the aged may be enacted, we shall not have solved a problem which constitutes a fundamental obstacle to the provision of adequate medical service, not only for the elderly but also for all our people.

It is important to insure that no person shall go without medical care for lack of funds with which to pay for it. It is futile to undertake to do so, however, unless we take steps to insure that trained persons are available in adequate numbers to render the service.

Neither expert knowledge nor special research is required to support the statement that we do not today have as many physicians as we should have, as are needed. Moreover, a geographic distribution of physicians is such that there is great disparity among States in the ratio of physicians to population. For example, in 1959 in the United States there were 141 physicians for each 100,000 people. This compares with 142 per 100,000 in 1940, and 143 in 1949. Within individual States the ratio varies from a low of 69 to a high of 188.

Let us suppose that a State has only 69 doctors for every 100,000 people and the State implements the pending bill to the fullest. Would there be sufficient doctors to extend the medical services to the beneficiaries?

In September 1959 the Public Health Service published a special report of the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Medical Education. I commend this report to the attention of all who are interested in adequate medical service for our people. In summary, the report states that to maintain the present average ratio of physicians to population, which we already observe is inadequate, even without the enactment of the program now under consideration, we must, by 1975, increase by approximately 50 percent the number of annual graduates of medical schools.

Specifically, in 1959 our medical schools turned out about 7,400 graduates. To maintain the present inadequate ratio we must increase the annual output to 11,000 by 1975. I quote from the report as follows:

> Of the 3,600 needed additional graduates, existing and planned schools will provide 500 by 1965. With adequate financing and construction aid, present schools could add about 1,000 graduates. New 2-year programs could add up to 800 first-year places for students who could then go to existing clinical places in 4-year schools. The balance of 1,000–1,500 graduates would need to come from new 4-year medical schools. This increase is equivalent to the output of 20–24 new 2-year and 4-year schools.
>
> An increase in graduates sufficient to maintain the present ratio of physicians to population is a minimum essential to protect the health of the people of the United States.

I digress from the report to say that the recommendation in the report is made on the basis of maintaining the present ratio of physicians to population. The present ratio is grossly inadequate, even without the enactment of the pending bill, which, of course, would greatly increase the demand and a source of funds to pay for medical services.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. It certainly would increase the ability of the people to make a call upon those services, would it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes, if the plan is implemented. If only the committee bill is adopted, however, unless States act, the proposed legislation may be only a glittering promise to our old people.

I should like to continue to read from the report:

> The Consultant Group is convinced that the problem is of such magnitude and concern that immediate concerted action by the Nation as a whole is imperative. Delay will serve only to increase the seriousness of the situation.

If we are to achieve the goal which the Public Health Service describes as a minimum, we must begin promptly a program to expand the capacity of existing medical schools and to build new ones. The report specifically recommends the appropriation of funds by the Federal Government on a matching basis to meet the construction needs of medical education. We already have a program to assist in the construction of research facilities and in the construction of hospitals. There is presently no such Federal program to accelerate the construction of teaching facilities, the essential base for training more medical doctors.

I point out that we have the Hill-Burton program to construct more hospitals. We have under consideration on the floor of the Senate tonight a bill to aid old people in obtaining medical services. However, we have no program really to increase the number of qualified people to extend this service and to serve as doctors in the hospitals which we hope will be constructed.

The lack of physicians in adequate numbers in the Southern States was highlighted in an editorial in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., on August 15. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

MORE DOCTORS NEEDED

There is a limited reason for pride in Tennessee because of comparison with other Southern States in educating more doctors.

Figures from the Southern Regional Education Board show this State is outstanding for the number of first-year medical students in proportion to personal income of the State's residents. This "degree of effort in providing medical education" is 2½ times as much as the southern average. It is three times as great as the national average of effort.

The South in general has been making a substantial effort to catch up in training its own doctors. During the most recent 12 years medical school enrollment has increased by 36 percent, while in the remainder of the Nation it was going up 28 percent.

There have been several changes for the better, notably new schools of medicine for the University of Florida, the University of Kentucky, and the University of Miami, and expansion of 2-year schools to 4-year courses by State universities of Mississippi, North Carolina, and West Virginia.

But there remains a substantial difference between the South and the Nation in the number of doctors compared with population. Leaving out doctors on the Federal payrolls, there was a ratio of 101 doctors per 100,000 population in the South and 129 in the Nation last year. The Tennessee figure of 106.1 was well below the national average, even though it compares with 96.5 in Arkansas and 78.3 in Mississippi.

It is very well to hope that shifting attention from cures to prevention will decrease the need for doctors, or to assume that narrowing the gap between southern income and the national average income will be followed by more southern medical education.

But the situation in the present and for several years ahead is one of shortage of doctors in the South, especially too few doctors to serve rural areas and the mentally ill.

Educating a doctor is very expensive for both student and university but the South must find ways to pay for more of it.

Mr. GORE. In addition to providing adequate school facilities, steps must be taken to increase the number of qualified applicants for admission to medical school. According to the administration report to which I have referred, the number of medical students per 1,000 persons in the age 20 population bracket declined from 10 in 1950 to 6.6 in 1958. The apparent decline in interest in acquiring a medical education is attributed to several factors, not the least of which is the high cost of medical education and the lack of adequate financial resources on the part of many who would otherwise wish to enter. Forty percent of our medical students come from the 8 percent of our families having incomes in excess of $10,000.

Unquestionably the financial deterent is preventing many qualified students from entering medical school. The National Defense Education Act is not well adapted to the provision of loan scholarships in medical schools and little use

has been made of it for that purpose. The Administration report specifically recommends the establishment of a Federal scholarship program to assist on the basis of merit and need those qualified persons who wish to enter medical school.

The administration's attitude on this problem appears somewhat inconsistent. Both the need for and the use of medical facilities have increased markedly during recent years and can be expected to increase to an even greater degree in the future. The administration has now endorsed the enactment of some kind of medical care program for the aged. I would assume that its recommendation in this regard is based upon its expectation that its program would be effective. If so, it would increase the demand on all kinds of medical facilities and on those who render medical service. If, on the other hand, an amendment of which I am cosponsor is adopted the demand would be increased even more.

Yet the administration has not acted to increase the availability of facilities to train personnel. It has dragged its feet on the Hill-Burton program for the construction of hospital facilities. Although its report on the shortage of doctors was published almost a year ago, it did not until June 16 of this year present a bill to do anything about increasing facilities for physician training. This bill, presented too late for realistic opportunity of enactment during this session of Congress, authorized funds in amount that is grossly inadequate to accomplish the minimum goals set forth in the administration's report. This tardiness on the part of the administration does not excuse the Congress from an effort to solve the problem.

I have today introduced a bill (S. 3875) providing for a realistic grant-in-aid program to assist in the construction of new medical schools and in the construction of expanded facilities in existing medical schools. My bill would also establish a student loan program to encourage and assist qualified persons to enter the medical profession. By presenting it, I hope to bring into sharp focus the overall problem of adequate medical care. Unless my bill is acted upon now, which I do not expect under the circumstances, I will urge prompt action by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and by the Senate early next year.

I shall urge the new administration, whether it be under the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] or Vice President NIXON, to recommend and support action to meet this vital need.

With further reference to the bill now before the Senate, I repeat that the need for a program to provide medical care for the aged is generally recognized.

The Senate must choose between a program by which most all of our people would purchase by their own tax contributions, and those of their employers a paid up policy to provide medical care during their retirement years, or a program which discourages individual contributions to old-age security in favor of complete reliance upon Government handouts to those who are willing, either reluctantly or enthusiastically, to plead pauperism.

There are some things about the opposition to an adequate medical program within the framework of the Social Security System which I find it difficult to understand.

Some groups, of which the American Medical Association is perhaps the most vocal, oppose the social security method on the asserted basis that it constitutes socialized medicine, or a step in that direction. Yet the AMA, so I understand, supports the type of program contained in the House bill. I can find no logical basis whatever for such a position, and surely a great many doctors disagree with the AMA.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator speaks about pleading pauperism in order to obtain assistance for medical expenses. Does the Senator feel that a person is pleading pauperism if at age 65 he applies for social security benefits and certifies his eligibility on the basis that he is making less than $1,800 a year, in addition to his social security retirement payments?

Mr. GORE. No; I do not at all. The purpose of the social security program is to provide for security in retirement. A person is not entitled to social security annuities until he retires from employment which provides earned income, under the present law, of $1,200 a year or more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under the bill he would be allowed $1,800 a year.

Mr. GORE. Yes. The bill proposes an amendment, which I have supported, to raise to $1,800 the level of earned income which may be received without loss of social security benefits.

Let us assume that a business has an employee whose salary is $6,000 a year. He is fast approaching the age of 65. His employer recognizes that the employee is no longer physically able to perform fully the duties of the position he holds.

Under the social security program, to which the employee and his employer have contributed through the years, the employee may retire and his salary stops completely. In consequence of the social security program the employee does not have to assert his pauperism. So far as the law is concerned, he might have a million dollars in Government bonds in the bank. However, when he retires from remunerative employment at age 65, he is entitled by law to the social security annuity in an amount in proportion to the contributions which he has made to the fund.

Mr. LONG of Lousiana. He is not entitled to it if he is drawing $3,000 a year of income from some other source.

Mr. GORE. From earned income. I will come to that. Let us assume a different situation. Let us assume that the employee at age 65 is still in robust health, and he wishes to continue to work. So he keeps the job at $6,000 a year. He is not entitled to draw benefits. So long as he continues in the remunerative job, his entitlement is not vested. At the time the social security law was enacted we had a vast amount of unemployment in the country. I recall it was considered socially advisable to encourage people to retire. Indeed, one of the arguments for the passage of a congressional pension bill was that it would encourage Senators to retire when they reached a certain age.

To come to the point the Senator has raised, if the employee who retires from a job at $6,000 a year, or $10,000 a year, desires to take some part-time employment, to write an article, or to make some speeches, or occasionally to substitute on his old job, he is still entitled to his annuity, provided under the law his earned income does not exceed $1,200 a year or, as the bill would provide, if enacted, $1,800 a year.

In neither of those circumstances do I consider that the man is asserting his pauperism. Indeed, he asserts nothing of the sort. He merely asserts the right to his annuity—that he has retired and that he is entitled, in consequence of this social insurance policy, the purpose of which is to provide security in retirement, to the benefits of the program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator certainly does not mean that a man would retire because he is making $100 a month. He could continue to work and draw his retirement. Under the bill he could continue to draw $150 a month for 12 months and still draw the retirement benefits without actually retiring. The point I have in mind is that he is either eligible to draw benefits or he is not, and the eligibility depends on whether he has presently $1,200 of earned income, or, in the future, $1,800, if the bill becomes law.

My question is, When the man certifies that he is not drawing that much income and therefore is eligible, does the Senator feel that he is asserting his pauperism under the social security program?

Mr. GORE. There is no test of resources, no test of wealth, no test for certifying ability or inability to pay living expenses, under the social security program.

It was not so conceived, and I would certainly resist the enactment of any such test. The eligibility to which the Senator refers is, in the case of the social security program, compliance with the law, which gives a legal entitlement under which rights are vested without respect to whether he owns a home or has $100,000 in bonds, or what not. In the case of the old age assistance program, which the committee bill would greatly broaden, one must certify his poverty in order to establish eligibility. To me that is vastly different. From what I have heard the distinguished Senator say today and on other occasions, he seems to minimize the difference, but to me there is a vast difference. I am not one who thinks that the greater the number of old age citizens who have certified their poverty the better and greater the State's social security program.

Indeed, I might even go further in the other direction. I think the larger the percentage of our population who can

in pride, dignity, and right draw an annuity for their security and their medical care, the sounder will be the program and the more uplifting, inspiring, and sustaining will be its effect upon our population.

On that point, apparently, the Senator from Louisiana and I disagree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator does not seem to feel that a man is certifying his poverty when he certifies he is not making $100 a month, and therefore is entitled to draw a social security payment. He can be drawing a social security payment and, in addition, get $100 a month. This brings his income up to $2,000 or $2,500 a year, and he can then proceed to say that he is not able, because he does not have the resources and the income, to meet the high medical bills which he incurs.

Why should that be a matter of certifying his poverty, a matter of degrading him, as the Senator from Tennessee seems to feel it would be? The Senator seems to be content with the situation that existed for a number of years, when a person certified he did not have more than $100 a month income.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that the $1,200 a year to which he refers is earned income. That can come from odd jobs. It can come from part-time employment. It can come from the retired employee going back to his old job for 1 day a week, or perhaps a few weeks, to permit other employees to take vacations. There are many circumstances in which a retired person can earn small amounts without being employed full time in the main stream of our economic life.

I think the committee is wise to raise that amount to $1,800. However, I suggest again to the Senator that that is a test and a measure based on the amount of earned income. No certification is required as to dividends, rental income, interest income or income from any source of invested property; it is strictly earned income.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So the Senator feels that he is making a valid distinction; that the person might be drawing much more income than he actually is, in that there is a difference between earned income and other income, which would not affect eligibility.

The man says, "I am eligible. I do not regard myself as being indigent, or anything of that sort. I am simply eligible to draw these benefits"; and after age 72 he can have income in any amount and still be eligible. After all, it is the matter of eligibility which entitles him to this additional assistance. He is entitled to it; therefore, he is eligible, and he can so certify. Then he will receive the assistance. Certainly in the case of the great majority of those who will retire, they do not own any stock, and most of them do not own any bonds; they simply make it clear that they have no more than $100 a month earned income; therefore they are eligible. It can be $150 of earned income in the future.

Mr. GORE. They are eligible under the social security program as a matter of right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator feel that veterans with non-service-connected disabilities who apply for admittance to veterans' hospitals take a pauper's oath when they apply for treatment?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe that the law, if I recall it correctly, requires the execution of a pauper's oath. I think it requires the certification of economic inability to obtain the medical care needed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What is the difference?

Mr. GORE. It is the same principle.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If medical care is to be provided for those who have not paid for it in the past, why should it be provided for persons who are well able to provide for it themselves, and at the expense of others who are less able to pay for it?

Mr. GORE. The last condition does not obtain. The amendment which the junior Senator from New Mexico and other Senators including myself, have offered would add to the social security program an additional category of benefits, namely, medical care and hospitalization, for which the employee who is under covered employment in the social security program would make contributions along with his employer, and under which, upon the attainment of age 68, each person under the social security program would be entitled by right to the limited benefits spelled out in the bill.

Those benefits are not without limit, as I said to the Senator early in the debate; they are very specific. The bill is carefully drawn. We have certification that it is actuarially sound. That is, the additional revenue which would be raised by reason of the enactment of the proposal would be sufficient to make payments out of the fund to pay for medical care for those who might become beneficiaries. That does not mean that everyone will become a beneficiary. I have paid fire insurance premiums on buildings for 30 years. I have never had a fire. I hope I never will have. However, I am still buying fire insurance. It may be that before morning my home or my business will burn. I hope not. They never have.

Of course, it would be nice to have the insurance companies refund me all the premiums I have paid in the past 30 years. But insurance does not operate like that. Neither does the Social Security program. It was never envisioned that every person who pays a small percentage of his salary to the social security program would receive a benefit. I pay every year on self-employment. I never expect to draw a social security annuity. Nevertheless, I am perfectly willing to contribute my small share in order to provide insurance for those who may need that benefit—and, who knows, things being so uncertain, I might need it. [Laughter.] If I do, I shall be entitled to it by right. The right will be vested. I will not have to go, hat in hand, to certify to some welfare officer that I am poverty stricken and, therefore, need my old-age assistance check. I would not wish to be put in that position. I think there are literally millions of old people in this country who do not wish to be put in that position. They want to participate in a program, and the young people want to participate in a program, which will provide for them, when they are old, rights which are vested, and not require them to be dependent upon a program which is essentially, in character, public charity.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us take an extreme case, the case of a retired lawyer, having assets of more than $1 million. Suppose he becomes ill. He has never paid toward a medical program and has never asked that the Government pay his medical bills. Let us assume he has invested his funds in tax-exempt bonds or in other ways which enable him to keep from paying any tax at all. Why should a working man, whose wife and children may be sick and may need these benefits, have to pay for benefits for that millionaire, who never expected to receive the benefits and never paid for them?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that is like asking me whether it was a great mistake for the Congress ever to pass the Social Security Act; or it is tantamount to asking me whether we should repeal this program which is financed by a small tax on both employees and employers.

I say to the Senator from Louisiana that the social security program is a social insurance program. The taxes levied on the individual are small. The benefits going to those who may need them may be very precious and out of all proportion to the contributions the individual makes into the fund.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did not we find out, in the inauguration of the social security system, that there were many more poor people, on the average, than there were millionaire lawyers, about whom the Senator from Louisiana has been talking? And when we established the social security system, were not we more concerned with the millions of needy people than we were with the relatively small number of millionaires?

Mr. GORE. Of course.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the system the Senator is discussing, is it not?

Mr. GORE. I am talking for the mass of the people, some of whom will need this program. In order to provide these benefits for those who may need them—and, incidentally, let me say that even one who today may be a millionaire may need these benefits a few years from now.

Mr. ANDERSON. Recently there was sent to the penitentiary, by the Federal court in New Mexico, a man who a few years ago inherited tens of millions of dollars. But he found himself in great difficulty in the courts, and today is penniless, and has been sent to the penitentiary. No one ever knows whether on the last day of his life he will wind up being rich or poor.

Mr. GORE. And many of us have confidence that we shall never be rich.

I dare say that the junior Senator from New Mexico never expects or hopes to receive any benefits from the social security program.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from Tennessee that that is correct. But I am very happy to add to the fund contributions which may be of use to someone who is in need. In fact, eventually I, myself, might be in need.

Mr. GORE. And if the Senator does not need it, he will be the happier for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Under the Senator's program or plan, is it provided that no one need apply for the assistance that is offered, but that it will be automatically offered to him?

Mr. GORE. He will be eligible to receive social security benefits; he will be eligible as a matter of right.

Mr. FREAR. But that is not the question. Will he receive these benefits automatically?

Mr. GORE. If the Senator means that if my house burns down, whether I have to advise the insurance company that my house has burned down and that I am entitled to be paid the insurance, I would say yes—both as regards social security and as regards private insurance.

Mr. FREAR. Then the Senator from Tennessee could have said "yes," in the first place, and would have saved the expense of printing all those additional words in the RECORD. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Very well; the answer is yes.

Mr. FREAR. Very well.

Mr. GORE. But the manner in which he would apply would be different from the manner in which he would apply under a program which has the characteristic of charity.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the social security program went into effect, there were many persons who could well have used the social security retirement income. But they did not get it until they had paid for a certain length of time into the social security fund. When the fund first went into effect, I believe payments for at least 1½ years were necessary, even for the most aged person. For instance, for a man age 65 or 70, regardless of his health—before he could come under the program and could receive the benefits he had to work and pay the tax for 18 months.

Today, we have approximately 10 million aged persons, most of whom are retired and no longer are contributing to the fund.

The Senator from Tennessee is proposing that the Senate vote that the cost of providing medical care for all those people be placed on the presently laboring man and his wife and children. I am willing to vote that the medical cost be borne by the people of the country if such persons need those benefits and do not have sufficient resources with which to pay those bills.

But on the other hand, I ask the Senator again, why should we vote to impose this additional expense in order to provide for the extreme case, which I admit is extreme—in other words, to provide medical care for a millionaire lawyer, at the expense of the working man who is earning $100 or $150 a month and is trying to support his wife and his children.

Mind you, this program will eventually place a 4 percent tax on everyone, regardless of need or regardless of the assistance that may be required. Why should we vote to have that tax placed on people who would have to pay it but would not receive the benefits for many years, inasmuch as a great many of those who would receive the aid are much better able to pay their doctors' bills than is the working man who would be paying this tax?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Tennessee agree with me that the claim that this will amount to a 4-percent tax is a little extravagant, inasmuch as the Social Security Board says one-fourth of 1 percent is enough? I did believe a little bit in the sound-money policy; but 16 to 1 went out with Bryan and McKinley. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me point out how the 4 percent would be reached.

Mr. GORE. First, let me answer the inquiry of my able friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana. But, Mr. President, before doing so, let me now acknowledge my admiration of the very able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is mutual. So let us dispense with any more of that, and get on with the debate on the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to dispense with it right now, because upon an overwhelming proportion of the issues, he and I vote alike; and most of the time, in regard to causes on which he is making a battle or causes on which I am making a battle, we are in agreement.

So it is with regret that I find that the Senator from Louisiana is not in agreement with me on the soundness of the social security program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Just a minute, Mr. President; let me point out that we are not talking about the soundness of the social security program. The Senator from Tennessee and I are talking about the soundness of something the Senator from Tennessee wishes to add to the social security program.

Mr. GORE. But the Senator's question is really a challenge to the soundness of the social security program—to the base on which it rests, to the theory on which it has proven so successful. The Senator from Louisiana asked, essentially, why we should tax the workingman, in order to pay benefits to go to someone else, inasmuch as some may be well fixed financially.

Mr. President, one might ask why we should tax the workingman now, in order to provide retirement benefits for persons who may be well fixed financially. The same question would apply to the present social security program, the 25th anniversary of which we celebrated a week ago Sunday. The program has proved successful. It has been actuarially sound. True, under that program persons may receive benefits disproportionate to the payments they made into the fund. Those who began early to receive benefits, after making payments in the amount of a small percentage of their wages, and after making those payments for only 2 years, for instance, received benefits disproportionate to their personal contributions.

Every beneficiary who receives full benefits to which he is entitled would possibly receive benefits larger than the total of his own individual contributions. But that is the basis on which social insurance rests. All will pay a small amount which, added up in gross sum to a fund, is adequate to provide benefits to those who become entitled to benefits under the law. That is what it is.

So when the Senator asks me why we should do it with respect to an added category, he is asking me, Why do it for social security at all?

I fought here on the floor with the junior Senator from Louisiana to make it possible for one who was totally and permanently disabled to draw his benefits at age 50 or more. I am supporting an amendment now, which I am sure the junior Senator from Louisiana likewise supports, to allow that employee, at any age, upon becoming permanently and totally disabled, to start receiving the benefits to which he is entitled by reason of the contributions he has made, even though those contributions be small, indeed. That is the theory; that is the basis. It is a sound theory and a sound basis.

For 25 years the fund has been sound. It is actuarially sound today, and we propose an amendment that would keep it actuarially sound.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It can always be actuarially sound if enough taxes are piled on the working man to pay for what is being paid out. It can always be kept actuarially sound if the taxes are high enough to maintain the fund. But the question is basically the desirability of providing the payment of medical bills of persons who have made no contribution to the fund and who are well in position to pay their own expenses.

I was one who fought—and I was delighted to have the Senator from Tennessee with me—to provide benefits to those totally and permanently disabled. I was fighting to help a disabled man who had an earned income of no more than $100, or $150. I was not fighting to have the Social Security pay retirement benefits to persons who had a substantial income. A man who was receiving an income of $300 or $400 a month would not have received those benefits. I did not think it desirable, if he had a substantial income, that others should be taxed to pay for his expenses, when he could afford to pay them himself.

In my judgment, it does not make too much sense for us to raise social security taxes on persons who are working at this time.

The question was raised as to how I get the amount up to 4 percent. I am relying on the same calculations and the same calculator upon which other Senators are relying.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will not again go into the extrapolation of payroll taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Anderson proposal is not one-fourth percent; it is one-half percent. It is a tax of one-fourth percent of payroll to be matched by another one-fourth percent, all of which is going to be passed on as a hidden sales tax to the consumer.

It is estimated that if the same proposal is extended to everybody in the country under social security, be they above or below age 65, it would require 4 percent of the payroll—which is about what the whole social security program was costing in 1954, after I had been in the Senate for 6 years. Of course, the amendment here provides only for those 68 and over. That is one way to keep the costs down. If it becomes law, next year we shall cut the age limit to 65 and include all disabled people.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I started to say, some groups, of which the American Medical Association is perhaps the most vocal, oppose the social security method on the asserted basis that it constitutes socialized medicine, or a step in that direction. Yet the AMA supports the type of program contained in the House bill. I can find no logical basis whatever for such a position, and, surely, a great many individual doctors disagree with the AMA.

In either case the patient will select his physician. In either case the physician will be paid by the Government. In either case the physician must establish the reasonableness of his charge in accordance with regulations established by the administering Government agency. On these points there is no difference at all in the two plans. The major difference, aside from the method of determining who would be beneficiaries, is in the source of the fund from which payment is to be made. Under the social security approach the fund will be derived from the premiums paid by the beneficiaries and their employers. Under the public assistance approach, the fund is derived from the general revenues of the Federal Government and of the States, and payment constitutes an outright subsidy to those who are, or may successfully claim to be, poverty stricken.

The AMA has the right to believe, if it so chooses, that the social security method is socialistic. But if it does, in fact, so believe, I do not understand how it clothes the handout approach with enough of the attributes of private enterprise to justify its endorsement. There is not that much difference.

I say it is difficult to understand the logic of the AMA's position. It would only make sense in the event the AMA remains, in reality, opposed to any program at all, but endorses the House bill because it would be less effective and would benefit fewer people. Such a position, I am confident, would not represent the sentiments and views of many individual doctors. It could be that the AMA is no more representative of rank-and-file doctors on this issue than on inclusion of doctors in the social security program.

That reminds me, Mr. President. As an indication of whether or not working people desired to contribute small amounts to the social security program, and thereby gain this social insurance for themselves, consider the various groups who have petitioned the Congress to include them. Dentists, lawyers, ministers, employees of local, State, and municipal governments, and many groups that were not originally covered into the program have voluntarily sought inclusion. They have not fought this program, which levies a small tax on their income now to provide benefits for those who are eligible and have a right to benefits now, but which would also entitle them to similar benefits later. Instead of thinking this was so onerous and regressive, they have petitioned the Congress to lay its heavy hand upon them, but to give them legal entitlement to benefits later.

Similarly, Mr. President, I have difficulty in understanding the logic of the administration's position. On other matters, such as our highway improvement program, it makes a fetish of what it describes as fiscal responsibility. Specifically, President Eisenhower, in his public pronouncements has warned against the reckless spenders. He has made it clear that if the Congress enacts any new programs it had better provide new revenue to meet the costs. Yet his administration rejects a program which would provide additional revenue in favor of one which would not.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very much interested in the "reckless spending" suggestion. Am I wrong in believing that the Senator from Tennessee has raised some question as to the limits which might exist with reference to the committee bill? Did the Senator raise such a question?

Mr. GORE. I raised the question. Before going into that question, I wish to say, as the Senator knows, that I offered a substitute for these provisions. In our meeting of Senators who wished to add social security benefits, after the bill had been reported—perhaps I am talking secrets out of school—I was one who thought we still should offer a substitute of an adequate social security program, but a majority of the group felt we should offer an amendment adding social security benefits to the bill, accepting, though we regard it as of questionable soundness, the committee bill, in the hope of laying a firm foundation which can later be improved upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy to confirm in public what the Senator from Tennessee has stated about his part in this circumstance. I congratulate the Senator for sticking courageously to his ideals.

The Senator from Tennessee is familiar with the fact that matters which go into a report, particularly a report of the majority, tend to become legislative history. I should like to read a few items from page 6 of the committee report.

Mr. GORE. This will describe the committee bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. This will describe the committee bill.

Mr. GORE. Which is supported by those who describe the junior Senator from New Mexico as the "captain of the spenders"?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. This is what those prudent people would do. They say that the bill which they present would cover all medically needy aged 65 or over.

Mr. GORE. This is the report on the committee bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Word for word.

Mr. GORE. Approved by all the Republicans on the committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And by six Democrats on the committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And supported by the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. ANDERSON. I now understand that the President is going to support something else, but at the time it was before our committee we understood it had the blessing of the administration.

Mr. GORE. Was it not described with a hyphen? I shall not use names.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was described.

Mr. GORE. The name Eisenhower, though, was attached to the proposal; was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, along with certain Democratic names.

Mr. GORE. Orally?

Mr. ANDERSON. Orally. It was said:

> It would cover all medically needy aged 65 or over; it would cover every such person including those under the social security system.

It has been represented that this would cost only $130 million, but when we single out only a portion of it, the social security system, the cost for that would be $1 million. Does the Senator understand that the whole is usually the sum of its parts?

Mr. GORE. I was taught that. I am not sure it always applies in Washington, D.C.

Mr. ANDERSON. Those rules are repealed now and then. We never know when it happens. If the social security part will cost a billion dollars, how could the whole of it cost $130 million? Does the Senator know?

Mr. GORE. I do not know. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I asked my question first.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the author of the amendment if the benefits provided by his amendment are limited?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I was going to invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to that fact. He is completely correct.

The "scope of benefits" is listed on page 7 of the report. This is not imagination. This is the wording of the official report.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is referring to the "scope of benefits" of the committee bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, the committee bill.

Mr. GORE. Without the Anderson amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, without the Anderson amendment.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator read that?

Mr. ANDERSON. The first item, according to the legislative history, is "inpatient hospital services."

Mr. GORE. Is there any limit?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no, there is no limit.

Mr. GORE. Is there any limit as to the days in a year in which those services could be obtained?

Mr. ANDERSON. 365 days out of the year is perfectly all right.

Mr. GORE. How many years.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. It could be 50 years, if a person could live that long. It could be 20 years, if the person could not live as long as 50 years.

Mr. GORE. We might have a Methuselah. Is there any limit as to the number of years?

Mr. ANDERSON. None whatsoever that I can find.

Mr. GORE. Is there any limit as to the number of days? Is there any limit to the number of months?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the amendment to which the Senator from Tennessee and I inscribed our names it is provided that someone will have to pay the first $75, which will tend to keep people out of the hospitals. I see no limit provided in the bill, or any previous payment.

Mr. GORE. Is there any provision for any payment whatsoever by the beneficiary?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. GORE. Of any kind?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. GORE. To anybody?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not to anybody until we get down to a later provision. For "hospital services," it is absolutely unlimited.

I invite attention specifically to the fact that it is made a part of the legislative history that the bill covers "all medically needy aged 65 or over; it would cover every such person including those under the social security system, railroad retirement system, civil service system, or any other public or private retirement system whether such person is retired or still working, subject only to the participation in the program by the State of which they are resident."

It would cover widows.

The report goes on to list long categories. Since it is wide open, the "hospital services" are wide open.

Next we have the "skilled nursing-home services." There is a limitation in the amendment which the Senator and I have offered. I ask the Senator from Tennessee, who first called my attention to this situation, if he has as yet found any limit on the "skilled nursing-home services" available under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. GORE. The bill provides no specific limitation to any benefit.

Mr. ANDERSON. The third item is "physicians' services."

Mr. GORE. Oh, the Senator is about to refer to socialism.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will tell the Senator now——

Mr. GORE. Wait a minute. If the social security program pays a doctor's fee, it is socialized medicine. I cite the AMA.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. GORE. But the Senator's amendment is now called socialized medicine, though it is the committee bill which proposes to pay doctors' fees.

Mr. ANDERSON. The payments are unlimited. Perhaps that is why the physicians like it. [Laughter.]

The bill is completely unlimited. Any price could be paid. There is no limit whatsoever. However, in the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee and I and others have offered, there is no provision for a physician to be paid for his service at all.

We are accused of sponsoring socialized medicine, and the people who leave the provision absolutely open and unlimited are washed white as snow.

Mr. GORE. Not quite.

Mr. ANDERSON. Nearly. Is it not strange that people who worry greatly about nonessential Federal expenditures do not worry at all about this program? This expense can be listed at $130 million, and everybody takes the figure for granted and says, "That is all it will be, because the States will not put up any more money."

Let us suppose that the States have a surprise party and do put up some more money. Has the Senator any idea what this might cost us if the States were really liberal with the program?

Mr. GORE. The staff members of the subcommittee which investigated the problems of the aged and the aging have estimated that if the States should provide matching funds in accordance with the provisions of the committee bill, and if the Federal Government were to appropriate the funds to meet its legal obligations, the total would amount to $2½ billion the first year.

Mr. ANDERSON. I find confirming evidence. I checked this point rather carefully. In 1957 the Health Information Foundation sponsored a study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, a reliable polling group at the University of Chicago. They found that the per capita expenses for all health care for 65 and older population was $177, and based upon the increase in medical costs since 1957 and other factors, admitting the 1957 figure of $177, the medical economists now estimate the 1960 figure to be $250. If we accept what was pointed out in the hearings, which the Senator from Tennessee heard as well as I, I am sure there might be 10 million people who would be available for the benefits under this bill. The figure was repeated by the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] only a few days ago. Ten million people at $250 a head is $2½ billion. There is the Senator's figure and the staff figure. If one figures that 80 percent of the maximum available would receive the benefits, that might bring the total to $2 billion. If one figures a 65-percent minimum who would receive the benefits, it would bring the figure to $1.7 billion.

Yet the Senator from Tennessee and I are criticized for being fiscally irresponsible when we propose a system that would not cost the Treasury of the United States anything, but would meet the cost by a tax upon the workers, which, according to the record, they are happy to assume.

Mr. GORE. I find it perplexing that statements should be made by some that the committee bill would extend benefits to 10 million people. Is that what I am to understand the Senator from New Mexico to say?

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement was made that there were 10 million people who would be eligible and possible customers of this special category of medically indigent, but it was expected that only 500,000 to a million of such people would apply each year, although there was no way of knowing that to be true. I have the figure of 10 million only because that was the figure that was used in our committee meetings, in executive sessions, and again on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. On the other hand, we received an estimate that the plan would cost only $135 million a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. There are 9 million people who are covered under the social security system. We are told that the plan which would embrace that system would cost $1 billion a year. I think that it is one of the great marvels of this system that a group of 9 million people could account for a cost of $1 billion a year, and yet service to a group of 10 million or 12 million people would cost only $130 million. Again the whole is smaller than one of its parts.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will turn to page 11, perhaps he will see the basis on which this low estimate of cost is based. Does the Senator see the table on page 11?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will look at the figures for the State of New Mexico, he will find that all the benefits which are described in the report as being available without limit will be extended, according to this estimate, to the people in New Mexico at a cost to the Federal Government of only $9,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the biggest bargain we have had in a long time. I hope that it holds out. I think they probably got that figure by figuring the State could not afford to contribute any more money because the budget increased in the last 2-year period by $17 million. That increased amount is not much in a large State, but it was large in a small State.

Mr. GORE. That is the catch in this bonanza. This low estimate of cost is based upon the estimate of the Social Security officials and the officials of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. It is estimated that the States will not or cannot provide the matching

funds to make these benefits actually available to bring them within reach of the old people.

Mr. ANDERSON. From my standpoint the figure which the Senator read means that 52 people in New Mexico will take advantage of this plan—one a week. I greatly fear that more of the aged in New Mexico will need help than that. It may be the State will not be able to contribute more money than that, but that is the measure of our failure to take care of our people.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when we used the figures on the social security brackets and tried to estimate where the $1 million was coming from, we had a much higher figure for New Mexico, and I think a more realistic figure, if I know the State in which I live. That is why I appreciate the fact that the able Senator from Tennessee put his finger on the point when he asked, "Is it true that we will get all of these things at a bargain price?"

I have heard of cutrate stores, but I have never heard of a cutrate store that could sell $1 billion worth of medical aid for the aged for $130 million.

Mr. GORE. A few minutes ago the Senator started to read, but he did not quite finish the 12 benefits shown on page 7. Will the Senator be so kind as to read those 12 benefits, the 12 being all inclusive?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was about to read the eighth one. The eighth one is dental services. It has been pointed out that the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee and the junior Senator from New Mexico and others is deficient because it does not take care of all dental services. It is true that we did not take care of physicians' services and dental services. But if these are to be added, does the Senator from Tennessee figure that the costs will go down or go up?

Mr. GORE. The cost is bound to go up if any benefits are extended, but how will this be done on $9,000 in New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. The State will not be able to do more, probably.

Then we come to physiotherapy and related services. We come next to laboratory and X-ray services. We come to prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, and dentures.

Then we come to the last item, "Any other medical or remedial service authorized under State law"—in case anything was left out.

Mr. GORE. Permit me to read a sentence:

> A State may, if it wishes, disregard in whole or in part the existence of any income or resources of an individual for medical assistance.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was written to overcome some of the objections of people who were worried about the means test. This is to show that while the means test was written into the law, we do not mean what we mean when we say it is a means test.

Mr. GORE. This all adds up to the fact that some States which have the means to do so will provide matching funds and will make available these benefits, the Federal Government paying up to 80 percent of the cost, while other States will be unable to do so, and the older people in those States will be denied the benefits. On the other hand, the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico has offered will provide a uniform system of benefits for those who are entitled to them, and they will be entitled to them without State matching funds, without considering the vagaries of State legislatures, and they will be entitled to the benefits as a matter of right, vested under the law, and without a show of poverty.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I say that I am much more interested in one more sentence? It reads:

> The Federal Government will not participate as to services rendered in mental and tuberculosis hospitals.

It may be all right to leave out the tuberculosis hospitals because we have developed some very excellent drugs. But we ought to include mental hospitals, because if the case aides must start to determine who among the 10 million people are needy and who are not, and who are medically indigent, or have no means, we would have a fresh crop in the mental institutions of the United States.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, the arguments against a social security medical insurance program, in my view, gives the appearance but not the substance of effective action.

It may be that the major advantage of the committee bill, in the eyes of some, is that few people would actually be covered by it. There are many obstacles in the path of full participation. Not the least of these is the fact that individual action by the States would be required. The legislatures of various States would first have to decide that participation would be desirable. Then, each State would have to devise and approve a plan for implementation and obtain approval of its plan by the Federal Government.

Finally, each State would have to find the money to pay its share of the cost. The action taken by the Nation's Governors at the annual Governor's conference this summer illustrates that solution of the problems involved, insofar as the States are concerned, will range from near impossible to very difficult.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that the logic cannot work both ways; it cannot be that the cost will be astronomical in providing the benefits under the committee bill, on the one hand, and that the States will not use it, on the other.

Mr. GORE. I believe the logic works not only both ways, but in any way in which a logical conclusion can be reached.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator was suggesting that both things were going to happen, and that the cost of the committee bill would be greater than the cost of the Anderson amendment. He is also suggesting that the States would not do anything about it. It seems to me that those answers cannot both be correct. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. GORE. They are two answers that cannot both be logically reached: First, that all the people will receive these vast benefits; and, second, it is not going to cost very much. Those are two conclusions which cannot be logically reached.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us agree upon the last statement. With regard to a State's ability to pay, the Senator knows, does he not, that most States are providing a program, and in many States it is a very substantial program, for medical care of the aged and others?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I know that. I also know that there are several States, including my own, which are not now matching all the funds already available under present law. Just what benefit we would confer upon the old people in a State in which the State government has not found it advisable or possible to match even the present old-age assistance and medical-care program I leave for the Senator to suggest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In Tennessee it is estimated that the Federal Government would increase its contribution by $1,934,000, compared with the present State program, which apparently is producing only about $7,000 a year with respect to the care for the aged.

I am surprised that the program in Tennessee is so modest, and almost nonexistent. That would mean an increase of very great proportions when compared with what the State is doing now.

Mr. GORE. Let me say this about my State. I have not been in the State government for a long time. Before I came to Congress I was in the cabinet of the State government. I feel that the State of Tennessee could possibly find ways to do more. However, under our constitution an income tax cannot be levied. We do not have gushing oil wells on which we can levy severance taxes. We do have a 3-percent sales tax. We do have a very heavy State tax burden to bear. It is so heavy that the State legislature has not seen fit to raise the matching funds necessary to take full advantage of the Federal old-age assistance funds already available under present law.

What are my people offered by the committee bill? More Federal funds, provided the State will raise even larger State matching funds, even though it has been unable to provide the matching funds necessary, as I have said, to take advantage of the benefits already available.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the estimate is that Tennessee would receive almost $2 million to assist in a program which is extremely meager in Tennessee, and that it would exceed very greatly what the State is presently contributing. I had hoped that the

people of Tennessee and the Legislature of Tennessee would take the attitude that the junior Senator from Tennessee takes on this subject, and show a willingness to tax themselves to provide for the care which the Senator feels is essential, and which I believe is essential in those cases where a person is not able to pay for it himself.

Mr. GORE. If the bill becomes law, I shall be glad to suggest that the State Legislature of Tennessee invite the junior Senator from Louisiana to come down and address them upon the subject of increasing State taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have advocated some of these same things to the Legislature of Louisiana and I have addressed myself to the committees of the legislature urging taxes to pay for the proposals before I came here.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. One of the reasons why we have some difficulty with the committee bill is that the House bill came to us with a limit on its medical benefits, as follows:

A State plan for medical services for the aged must—

* * * * *

provide that benefits under the plan shall not be greater in amount, duration, or scope than the assistance furnished under a plan of such State approved under section 2.

The Senate committee took out that language and left it wide open. I believe that is why the Senator from Tennessee and I find ourselves worried about what might happen under an open-end plan.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I should like to conclude now with my prepared statement, if I may.

Under the committee bill, even in those states electing to participate, with the exception of those beneficiaries who are eligible by virtue of being recipients of old-age assistance payments, eligibility will be dependent on varying standards of "need," and benefits will vary according to the condition of state finances and differing views of state planners in the several States.

Should all these obstacles be overcome, there remains the necessity for a potential beneficiary to plead and prove to the satisfaction of the welfare agent his inability to pay the cost of whatever catastrophe may have befallen him.

The means test may present little problem for some of those wholly indigent in an economic sense. But what of the large group of the elderly who have managed to save a modest amount which, added to their social security payments, permits a moderately comfortable existence? Are we to require them first to spend all they have before they qualify? If so, they, too, will become economically indigent, not only during the course of an unfortunate illness, but thereafter as well.

Regrettably, a substantial number of the aged now require public assistance. For this group, grant-in-aid medical care of the type proposed in the committee bill is the only solution. Let me make it clear that I support the expansion of title I so as to increase the medical care available to old-age recipients, because I have been unable to secure the adoption of a program which I regard sounder.

But, Mr. President, we should endeavor to reduce the number of persons in need of this type of assistance.

That is the purpose of the Anderson amendment. Indeed, that was, and is, the purpose of the Social Security Act, and it has been most effective in that regard. The provisions of the committee bill relating to medical care go in the opposite direction. Should the committee bill prevail, without the Anderson amendment, we will have more, rather than fewer, people on the welfare rolls.

Much is made of the "voluntary" aspects of the provisions of the committee bill. But in what way they are more voluntary is not readily apparent. Taxes are no more voluntary when paid into the general fund or to a State than when paid into the social security fund.

I do not know of any taxes which are voluntary; to me, they all seem to be a bit compulsory. Perhaps the committee bill is voluntary in the sense that taxpayers in all States will pay for a program that will operate only in some of them. Perhaps there is some moral value in inducing citizens to volunteer a claim to poverty, but, if so, I am unable to perceive it.

The real question, Mr. President, is whether we shall have a broadly based program which will make available to the great mass of the aged the assurance of adequate medical care, a program in which individuals can participate without loss of dignity and self-respect. If this objective is to be met, we must enact a measure providing benefits to which the individual may become entitled as a matter of right, without the necessity of submitting to the humiliation of a means test.

I urge the Senate to approve the amendment which the junior Senator from New Mexico and others, including the junior Senator from Tennessee, have offered.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, and Mr. SCHENCK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 23, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 22, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Amos 5: 14: *"Seek good, and the Lord shall be with you."*

O Thou ever-gracious God, who art far beyond the reach of our finite minds and yet within the heart of the humble and lowly, bless and sanctify all our worthy plans and desires with which we have entered this Chamber.

Grant that in the stress and strain of life we may be kind and considerate toward one another, remembering that each is often engaged in a tremendous struggle and frequently walks a lonely way.

Give wisdom to our minds, strength to our wills, and peace to our hearts as we incline ourselves to hear and heed the accents of our Master's voice calling us to establish the spirit of reconciliation and good will among all men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 19, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7263. An act for the relief of Edward Ketchum; and

H.R. 8860. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments

in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 270. An act to amend title 38, United States Code to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5068. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent foreign freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 511. An act for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster;

S. 2917. An act to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat;

S. 3855. An act to increase the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes; and

S. 3861. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 61–1.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 183]

Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Murray
Ashley	Hébert	Norrell
Baumhart	Hess	O'Hara, Mich.
Berry	Holifield	Preston
Bolling	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Chamberlain	King, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Collier	McSween	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	Magnuson	Taylor, N.Y.
Dawson	Metcalf	Teague, Tex.
Durham	Miller, George, P.	Withrow
Gallagher	Mitchell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11666) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY, SIKES, CANNON, BOW, and TABER.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, KIRWAN, JENSEN, and TABER.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR THE SESSION, AS OF AUGUST 22, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of final stages of consideration of the remaining appropriation bills of the session, I include for information of the membership down-to-date comparison of the totals of the bills with the President's budget requests.

Necessary upward revision of the defense bill in some particulars following Khrushchev's wrecking of the summit conference is the principal reason the total of the 14 bills enacted thus far is only nominally below the President's requests. As the following table discloses, they are below the budget estimates of appropriations by $4,330,575.

But the remaining bills afford opportunity to make substantial savings. Characteristically, the other body has hiked them far above the House totals. They ought to be drastically reduced from their present improvident peak. One simple but shocking statistic alone justifies the statement and dictates the direction: This morning's Treasury statement shows that the Federal public debt has increased more than $20 billion in the last 7 years, most of it resulting from spending above income for nondefense items.

The tabulation follows; it does not include any "back door" appropriation measures:

Status of the appropriation bills for the 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 22, 1960

	Bills compared with House	Bills compared with budget estimates
Net total for the 14 session bills enacted		−$4,330,575
Loan authorizations		(+211,400,000)
Pending:		
1. Labor-HEW, as passed by the Senate	+$301,766,200	+465,566,950
2. State-Justice-Judiciary, as passed by the Senate	+41,704,340	−14,761,248
3. Public works, as passed by the Senate	+115,211,620	+25,869,425
Subtotal	+458,682,160	+472,344,552
4. Mutual security, as reported by Senate committee	+399,304,000	−292,650,000
As the bills now stand	+857,986,160	+179,694,552
Loan authorizations		(+211,400,000)

NOTE.—Supplemental bill is yet to come.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

AUGUST 15, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on August 1, 1960, and said to contain the 41st Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations for the year ending December 31, 1959.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk,
U.S. House of Representatives.

LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1959—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 429)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 29, 1960.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 41st Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations for the calendar year 1959.

During the year under review, collections and credits on lend-lease accounts amounted to $32,581,446.31. In addition, 804,000 fine troy ounces of lend-lease silver were returned to the United States. (This figure does not include shipments reported to contain 4,587,687 fine troy ounces which had not been assayed by the close of 1959.)

During the final part of the year, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accepted the United States proposal to resume negotiations on a settlement for some of the lend-lease aid received from the United States prior to V–J Day. Discussions began on January 11, 1960, and were discontinued on January 27, 1960, because agreement could not be reached on a common ground for continuing.

More details on this and other lend-lease items are contained in the report.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

(Enclosure: 41st Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 447)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the fourth annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program, pursuant to section 350(e)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1960.*

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, U.S. OPERATIONS IN THE UNITED NATIONS DURING 1959—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 378)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 14th annual report, covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during the year 1959.

Once again in 1959 the United Nations demonstrated its value in promoting the goals of peace which the people of the United States hold in common with the great majority of the peoples of the world. Especially significant were United Nations actions in response to a request for help from Laos; in promoting cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space; in furthering the economic and social welfare of peoples in rapidly or newly developing nations; and in guiding and assisting the rapid, historic evolution of dependent peoples toward self-government or independence.

1. When the Kingdom of Laos asked the help of the Security Council in preserving its freedom and independence, the Council dealt with the situation swiftly and effectively. Its decision to send a subcommittee to Laos provided a tranquilizing influence and was followed by further important steps.

The crisis developed from attempts by the Communist bloc to subvert the independence of Laos. Rebel forces within the country were receiving active support from the Communists in north Vietnam. Communist propaganda emanating simultaneously from Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow sought to confuse world opinion.

In these circumstances, the Lao Government appealed to the United Nations for assistance. Over Soviet opposition the Security Council adopted a resolution introduced by the United States establishing a fact-finding subcommittee consisting of Argentina, Italy, Japan, and Tunisia.

This subcommittee visited Laos to obtain the facts of the situation at first hand. Its presence there immediately had a quieting effect. Fighting abated, and the threat to the nation's independence was reduced.

After completing its inquiry the subcommittee issued a report on its findings which helped the Security Council and world opinion to understand better the danger confronting Laos.

In November Secretary-General Hammarskjold visited Laos. He reached the conclusion that one way to speed the return of stability to Laos was to provide international aid and guidance in economic development. He later sent a personal representative, Mr. Sakari Tuomioja, a former Prime Minister of Finland and Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe, to consider how the United Nations could best assist Laos in this field. Before the end of the year Mr. Tuomioja completed a report recommending a broad economic and technical assistance program for the development of the country.

The Security Council's action on Laos also opened up new possibilities for action in the Security Council free of the veto. In establishing a subcommittee in spite of an attempted Soviet veto, the Council showed that it would not allow the use of the so-called double veto to prevent it from taking a step which was clearly procedural under the Charter.

2. Peaceful cooperation in the realm of outer space took an important step forward in December 1959 when a new United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was established by the General Assembly. This step resulted from extensive discussions at the United Nations among representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other interested states. Thereby new possibilities have been opened for cooperation in a field which, like that of atomic energy, promises widespread benefits to mankind.

The basis for this forward step was laid when the original Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was set up by the General Assembly in December 1958. This Committee met in May and June. It prepared a valuable report which described existing international interests in this field, suggested technical areas where international cooperation could immediately contribute to progress, and identified potential legal problems.

However, the Committee had to conduct its work without the participation of the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Poland, who refused to accept the General Assembly's decision on composition of the Committee. India and the United Arab Republic thereupon also declined to attend. Nevertheless, the Committee under the able chairmanship of Japan was able to perform much useful exploratory work, and its report provided a sound basis for further consideration of the peaceful uses of outer space during the 14th session.

In December, after long negotiations at the 14th session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union decided to participate in a new Outer Space Committee of 24 members. The General Assembly thereupon established this new group and asked it to study outer space programs which might appropriately be undertaken under United Nations auspices and the nature of legal problems that might arise in outer space.

The General Assembly also assigned to the Outer Space Committee responsibility for working out proposals for an international scientific conference of members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies on the peaceful uses of outer space, to be held in 1960 or 1961. The Soviet Union's suggestion of such a conference was immediately welcomed by the United States. It can bring about an important exchange of knowledge in both the science and the technology of outer space.

3. Again in 1959 the General Assembly gave expression to the widespread desire for a sound and workable system of controlled disarmament, and showed its interest in the efforts of the powers principally involved to work out such a system.

In August 1959 the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union agreed to set up outside of the United Nations framework a new 10-nation Committee to explore possible avenues by which progress might be made in the disarmament field. In addition to these four states its membership includes Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland, and Rumania. It first convened at Geneva in March 1960.

In announcing the formation of this group, the four countries emphasized that the establishment of this Committee "in no way diminishes or encroaches upon the United Nations responsibilities in this field." They also made clear their intention to keep the United Nations Disarmament Commission informed of the progress of the deliberations and to submit reports to it regularly.

Disarmament took up a major part of the debates of the 14th General Assembly. Altogether, the Assembly heard the views of the 65 member states, including those of the United States, United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union. A resolution was unanimously adopted which expressed the hope that "measures leading toward the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" would be agreed upon in the shortest possible time. The resolution also transmitted various disarmament proposals, including those

of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, to the new 10-nation group for its consideration. Also submitted to this group was an Irish proposal calling for study of the problem of further dissemination of nuclear weapons.

Two resolutions were passed relating to nuclear weapons tests. The first, addressed to the three powers negotiating in Geneva for an end to such tests, urged them to continue their efforts to reach an agreement "including an appropriate international control system," and meanwhile to continue their present voluntary discontinuance of nuclear testing. The other resolution requested France not to hold its scheduled tests in the Sahara.

4. The tragedy of Communist China's actions in Tibet confronted the United Nations with a serious challenge.

In early March world opinion was shocked by the brutal actions of the Chinese Communists in their efforts to impose communism on Tibet by force. Later the Dalai Lama, the spiritual and temporal leader of the Tibetan people, was forced to flee. From his asylum in India he appealed to the United Nations to consider the plight of his countrymen.

The situation in Tibet was of direct concern to the General Assembly in fulfilling its charter responsibility to promote universal respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms. Over the opposition of the Soviet Union the Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by Malaya and Ireland in which it expressed its grave concern over the situation in Tibet and called for respect for the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people and for their distinctive cultural and religious life.

5. The United Nations once again gave attention to the continuing repression of the people of Hungary.

Both the Soviet Union and the Hungarian regime have consistently refused to permit the United Nations special representative on Hungary, Sir Leslie Munro, to enter Hungary on behalf of the United Nations. In spite of this intransigent attitude, he compiled an impressive report on current conditions in Hungary which, among other matters, noted that Hungarian patriots of 1956 were still being put to death.

On the initiative of the United Nations special representative and the United States, the General Assembly again placed the question of Hungary on its agenda. The Soviet delegate strongly opposed inscription of an item on Hungary, claiming that it would be contrary to what he called the spirit of Camp David—a theme which the Soviet Union sought to exploit throughout the session.

Ambassador Lodge immediately and correctly replied that nothing took place during discussions at Camp David with Premier Khrushchev which would require the United Nations to ignore or condone what was happening in Hungary. He emphasized that if the Soviet Union wished to live up to the spirit of Camp David it should abide by the United Nations resolutions on Hungary and cooperate with Sir Leslie Munro in his efforts to carry out his mandate.

The United States, together with 23 other nations, introduced a resolution deploring the disregard of the Assembly's resolutions by the Soviet and Hungarian authorities and calling upon them to cooperate with the United Nations representative. This resolution was adopted by a large majority. In addition, the Assembly once again refused to accept the credentials of the representatives of the Hungarian regime. Together, these actions demonstrated the world community's indignation over the continued Soviet-inspired repression in Hungary.

6. The problem of the future of approximately 1 million Arab refugees from Palestine, most of whom are now in Jordan, the Gaza strip, and Lebanon, has been a matter of concern to the United Nations since 1949.

This problem required thorough reexamination by the General Assembly in 1959 because the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees was due to expire June 30, 1960. The United States has continued its substantial support for this major United Nations activity in the interest of the well-being of the refugees and the stability of the area. UNRWA has done an effective job in providing relief to the refugees at a low per capita cost.

The Assembly took several constructive steps in an effort to better the present situation and to find a solution to this pressing problem. It unanimously extended UNRWA's mandate for 3 years with provision for a review at the end of 2 years. It urged the acceleration of programs to make more of the refugees self-supporting. It asked that irregularities in the distribution of relief rations be stopped. Finally, it requested the Palestine Conciliation Commission to make further efforts to secure the implementation of the Assembly's decision in 1948 that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and to live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so and that compensation should be paid for property left behind by those not choosing to return.

The United States stressed during the debate that a fundamental solution of the problem must be sought by all available means.

7. The Assembly made a further significant contribution to stability in the Middle East by voting continued support for the United Nations Emergency Force.

UNEF consists of about 5,000 soldiers from seven countries, patrolling the armistice demarcation lines between the Egyptian part of the United Arab Republic and Israel. It is a remarkable demonstration of what international cooperation can do to help keep the peace.

The cost of maintaining UNEF is the collective responsibility of all member nations who are assessed for its upkeep on the basis of their contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations. However, the Soviet Union has refused to pay any of its share. A number of member states have found difficulty in paying even small amounts. In an effort to reduce the burden on these countries, the United States and a few other countries have made voluntary contributions over and above their regular shares during the past few years.

At its last session the Assembly adopted a resolution under which the voluntary contributions amounting to about $3.5 million will be applied to reduce by 50 percent the assessments of members beginning with those with the smallest assessments.

For our part, the United States will continue to support UNEF because we firmly believe it constitutes a major bulwark of peace in the Middle East.

8. The review and possible revision of the United Nations Charter continue to attract considerable interest.

With the full support of the United States, the General Assembly decided again at its 14th session to continue its Committee on Arrangements for a Charter Review Conference and asked the Committee to report again no later than the 16th session of the Assembly. The United States continues to favor the holding of a review conference whenever a substantial majority of the member states believe that the international climate is conducive to constructive review.

9. As at the 13th and earlier sessions, the Assembly, once again by a sizable majority, decided not to consider the question of Chinese representation. As a result, the position of the Government of the Republic of China in the United Nations was maintained.

10. The General Assembly also once again reaffirmed its desire, against Soviet opposition, to bring about the unification of Korea on the basis of genuinely free elections under United Nations supervision.

11. The United Nations contributed further in 1959 to progress for dependent peoples toward the charter goal of self-government or independence. In recognition of the rapid progress they have made, the General Assembly acted to terminate United Nations trusteeship in three trust territories in Africa—Cameroun, Togoland, and Somalia—as well as in Western Samoa in the Pacific. The first to achieve independence was Cameroun. A distinguished U.S. delegation headed by Ambassador Lodge attended the Cameroun inaugural ceremonies on January 1, 1960.

In six other trust territories the United Nations trusteeship system continues to encourage progress in advancing the people toward self-government or independence.

12. It is especially gratifying for Americans that the General Assembly, in reviewing the progress of dependent territories throughout the world, commended the United States for bringing about full statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. On July 4, 1959, the new 49-star American flag was raised at the United Nations, and the 50-star flag replaced it this July.

13. Multilateral action for economic advancement of underdeveloped countries was given added impetus in 1959 as a result of a series of developments in which the United States took an active and leading role.

The financial resources of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development were doubled and the capital of the International Monetary Fund was increased by 50 percent. The United States, pursuant to congressional action, has increased its subscriptions to these two international financing institutions.

The Board of Governors of the World Bank approved the U.S. proposal to establish an International Development Association as an affiliate of the Bank. We hope that this institution, which is designed to assist the underdeveloped countries by financing long-term, low-interest projects which cannot be considered by the Bank under its charter, will become operational in the latter part of 1960.

The United Nations Special Fund, which resulted from the initiative of the United States, began its operations on January 1, 1959, with pledges totaling about $25.8 million, of which the U.S. contribution amounted to about $10.3 million. Pledges for 1960, including the U.S. share, will total an estimated $38.8 million—half again as much as in the first year.

The Special Fund added significantly to the effective work of the United Nations technical assistance program which conducted its activities in 1959 with financial resources amounting to about $29.7 million. The United States contributed about $11.9 million of this amount.

The United Nations is a growing organization—growing both in membership and in maturity. Each year it has been confronted with new issues and, in meeting them, has demonstrated anew what great value it has, for man in his quest for peace with justice. Given our sustained and vigorous support, it will continue to advance the interests of the American people and of free nations everywhere.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 16, 1960.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, FISCAL YEAR 1959—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 15, 1960.*

REPORT ON PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 448)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fifth report to the Congress covering activities through June 30, 1960, in furtherance of the purposes of the joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East. This report supplements earlier reports forwarded to the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 15, 1960.*

TWELFTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 449)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 12th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period January 1 through June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1960.*

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

(For President's message, see Senate proceedings of August 8, 1960, pp. 15912–15913.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

AUGUST 17, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plan involved is: State, Texas; watershed, Plum Creek, Executive Communication No. 2395; committee approval, June 30, 1960 (subject to approval by Bureau of the Budget, which was given on August 15, 1960).

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

PERSIMMON AND BURNT CORN CREEK WATERSHED, MISS., ET AL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 5, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on June 24, 1960, considered the work plan transmitted to you by Executive Communication 2182 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved the work plan for Persimmon and Burnt Corn Creek watershed, Mississippi.

On July 1, 1960, the Committee on Agriculture considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication 2306 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and unanimously approved the work plans for East Keechi Creek watershed, Texas, and French Lick Creek watershed, Indiana.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

IN RE ELECTION OF HON. ROY A. TAYLOR (H. DOC. 450)

The SPEAKER. The Chair laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

AUGUST 18, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the returned Member, the Honorable ROY A. TAYLOR, the Clerk has received a communication in which certain questions are raised with reference to an attempt to contest his election as a Member of the House of Representatives at a special election held on June 25, 1960, in the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina.

Questions here raised relate to the laws governing contested election cases in the House of Representatives. Since the House alone may determine the matter here presented, this communication is transmitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk,
U.S. House of Representatives.

THE LATE HONORABLE USHER L. BURDICK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have been saddened to learn that a former Member of Congress from North Dakota, the Honorable Usher L. Burdick passed away at Sibley Memorial Hospital here in Washington last Friday evening after a brief illness. I know that many of the Members of the House have counted Usher Burdick as a close friend over the past 25 years.

Mr. Burdick was married to Emma C. Rasmussen in 1901, and from this union

three children were born, who are now all distinguished citizens. QUENTIN, our former colleague, and now a U.S. Senator, Eugene, a prominent Williston, N. Dak., attorney and district judge, and Eileen, now Mrs. Robert Levering, of Mount Vernon, Ohio. Mr. Burdick is also survived by his wife of the past 2 years, Mrs. Jean Rogers Burdick.

Usher Burdick, as many of you who knew him well know, was truly an unusual individual. Possessed of a brilliant mind and an unusually ready wit, he was known far and wide for his stories of the West in the early days, and he became nationally recognized as an authority on Indian history.

Usher L. Burdick was born near Owatonna, Minn., on February 21, 1879, and moved with his parents to a farming community near the Fort Totten Indian Reservation in North Dakota in 1882. It was here that Mr. Burdick's first knowledge of and interest in the American Indians began. This interest was to continue during his entire life.

Mr. Burdick's unusual abilities began to evidence themselves during his student days at the University of Minnesota. In 1903 and 1904 he was a star end on the University of Minnesota football team which during those years was the Big Ten champion.

After his graduation from the University of Minnesota in 1904, Usher Burdick returned to Munich, N. Dak., and set up a law practice. His political career began in 1907 when he was elected to the North Dakota State House of Representatives. He was reelected in 1909 and demonstrated again his unusual character and ability by being elected speaker of the house. That year, at the age of 27, he had the distinction of being the youngest speaker in the United States. He was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Dakota in 1911. He practiced law and operated a ranch near Williston, N. Dak., until 1934, when he was elected to Congress and served there continually, with the exception of the 79th and 80th Congresses, until his retirement in 1958.

It is most interesting to note here that Usher Burdick was succeeded in Congress in 1958 by his son QUENTIN, our former colleague, and now a U.S. Senator from North Dakota. In this same election, Mr. Burdick's son-in-law, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ROBERT LEVERING, of Ohio, husband of Eileen Burdick, was elected to Congress. I have not checked the record, but it has not often happened certainly that a former Member of Congress had a son and a son-in-law elected to Congress in the same year.

Former Congressman Burdick was one of the last of the old school farm State Members of Congress. Always a member of the nonpartisan league wing of the Republican Party in North Dakota, he was a stanch supporter of agriculture and the farmer. A host of friends in North Dakota and throughout the entire country will be saddened at the passing of this genial, likable, unusual individual who has for so many years played such an important part in the North Dakota political scene.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life of Usher Burdick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of my valued friend, and our former colleague, Usher L. Burdick, takes from our midst one of our Nation's most dynamic and colorful figures.

His life was one of the most interesting and inspiring of anyone I have ever met.

Usher Burdick connected America of modern days with America of the transitory period of the opening and development of the western part of our country.

Student, author, lawyer, a man of the soil, dedicated public official, and in this great body, "a people's Congressman," Usher Burdick was always an independent and a constructive figure.

In committee, or in addressing the House, he always commanded attention and deep respect.

Usher Burdick was a good man, imbued with a deep love of mankind.

Usher Burdick was a great American, as he evidenced on so many occasions throughout his long and honorable career.

His imprint on the pages of legislative history of our country will always be a memory to his service in this body.

While Usher Burdick has left us, his noble spirit will always live.

To the people of North Dakota in particular, he will always remain in their memories as one of their outstanding sons.

In the passing of Usher Burdick, I have lost one of my closest and most valued friends. Usher Burdick and I became very close to each other during our years of service in this body.

I shall miss him very much.

To his loved ones left behind, I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join those paying tribute to the late Usher Burdick. I had the privilege of sitting next to him on the Judiciary Committee during the 83d Congress. I enjoyed my association with him there, as well as other associations with him as a colleague in the House of Representatives.

I notice the gentleman mentioned that Usher Burdick was a football player for the University of Minnesota in 1903 and 1904. I remember having lunch with him one day and he told me that he started from North Dakota to join the famous point-a-minute football team of the University of Michigan headed by Willie Heston and Shorty Longman, but when he got as far as Minneapolis he ran out of money and went to Minnesota instead.

I am sure we all remember the great contribution he made in the House of Representatives with his humor, his wit, his understanding of human beings, and his stalwart championship of the principles in which he believed.

I wish to join in extending condolences to Usher Burdick's family.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, some men are respected for their character; others are admired for their talent; or feared because of their power; but only the rare few are loved for their outgoing humanness.

Raised in North Dakota, where a man had to be self-reliant to survive the challenges of the frontier, and where human contacts were few and precious, Usher L. Burdick learned the saving grace of humor that won the affection and confidence of people, even when he first arrived in the crowded and sophisticated environment of Washington, more than 25 years ago.

He was roughhewn yet kind; and in his genial philosophy we sensed a wisdom that transcends the trials and tribulations of this life. He made friends without conscious effort, and he kept them. We relaxed in the company of our good colleague who had the knack of simplifying the knottiest problems with his down-to-earth observations and his homespun sense of humor.

Usher's ancestors were among the first settlers of Rhode Island, and the independent, pioneering urge was strong in them. Later generations of the family moved westward to the Dakota Territory where Usher grew up close to the Sioux Indian Reservation. He knew the breadth of our Nation and its eager search for new horizons.

He was elected to Congress in the depths of the depression, and during the many years that he served in the National House of Representatives he inspired us with his immortal faith in freedom and in the humanitarian purposes and goals of the United States.

He lived a long and useful life, but he never grew old. At 81, he was young in mind and in spirit, restless to move forward and participate in the unfolding greatness of our Nation that would be realized tomorrow.

Our friend of many years and our former colleague passed away on August 19, but memories of his radiant spirit will accompany us as long as we live. For Usher Burdick, with confidence in his fellow human beings, and in the prospects of a happier world that can be created through mutual trust and cooperation, represented the best qualities of his neighbors—the American people.

To his widow, Jean, and to his family, including Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, we send our sincere condolences. As time eases the burden of their sorrow, we know that they will be comforted and strengthened by proud memories of Usher L. Burdick, and the life he devoted to the service of the public.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved when I read of the passing of Usher Burdick. He was one of my dearest friends. When he retired from the Congress I felt that his leaving marked the end of an era. It was an era of towering individuals who spoke the language and who championed the causes of little people and of big people whenever they were the causes of right that met the measure of the democratic concept. While Usher Burdick was elected as a Republican there were few times in the 81st Congress, the first Congress to which I, as a Democrat, was elected, that the vote of the gentleman from North Dakota and the vote of the gentleman from Illinois was not identical. He was in every sense a great American. His influence in this Chamber will be felt for many years to come. His name will stand as a synonym for old-fashioned Americanism in its finest quality and in its highest expression.

His service to his country and to his fellow man had a recognition that has been given to few in the history of the Congress. The year that he retired both his son and his son-in-law were elected to seats in the Chamber in which so long he had been a vibrant force. Just a few days before he died he was in the other Chamber, a witness to the swearing in of his son as a Senator of the United States of America. His cup of joy must have been overflowing, and I am certain that as the breath of life was leaving him, he knew that all was well with his beloved country and that the things for which he had stood and fought would continue to have in those of his blood the same kind of championing that in his life he had given. I have lost a close and beloved friend. America and the world have lost one they could ill afford to lose. My warmest sympathy I extend to the members of his family.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the political sages of the pioneer days of our country's political calendar are fading into the life shadows of the past. Our friend Usher Lloyd Burdick, brilliant legislator, lawyer and humanitarian has passed to his immortal destiny.

As a two-fisted protagonist he leveled his opposition both on the football field and in the political arena. He climbed the political ladder in true American fashion. College trained at the University of Minnesota Law, 1904, he taught school, practiced law and served as a State legislator in North Dakota 1907–11; serving as speaker 1909; Lieutenant Governor 1911–13; State's attorney of Williams County 1913–15; assistant U.S. district attorney 1929–32. Elected to 74th Congress through the 78th; 81st through the 85th; and retired.

He was an independent in politics. His early life among the Sioux—lived in a farming community bordering the Sioux Reservation at Fort Totten—gave him a political impetus in his political life that sustained his growing pluralities. He was a kindly person and did much to alleviate the sufferings and deprivations practiced upon them by selfish men in the agencies. We have lost a great American and a true patriot. The great love of this great man is reflected by the loyalties of his constituency to his distinguished son, QUENTIN, who succeeded him in the Congress and was recently elected to the Senate. We, of the delegation from Illinois, extend to his distinguished family, Attorney Eugene Allen and Mrs. Eileen Levering—wife of Congressman Robert W. Levering, of Ohio—and to his wife, Jean Rogers Burdick, our heartfelt condolences in their sadness.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] and other colleagues in their tribute to one of the ablest and most colorful Members who ever served in this body. A big man—big in body, heart, and mind—Usher Burdick represented all of the best in human character found in those who tamed the West. He was my friend, and I admired him as I have admired few men. To his children—one of whom is a distinguished Member of the Senate and until recently a distinguished Member of the House and another the wife of the distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mrs. Robert Levering—and to his widow I extend my deepest sympathy in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Usher Burdick, a former Member of this House, the country has lost one of the most remarkable men it has ever been my privilege to know. He was a rugged and fearless man. He served well his day and generation and promoted his country's welfare. He was bold; he was intelligent; he had character of the highest type. I always enjoyed sitting in the chair and listening to his remarks from the floor. He was a big man in physical stature and a big man in brain, a pair. He knew how to be a friend and he was my friend, and I was his. To his two sons and his daughter, I express my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Usher L. Burdick will always merit a special chapter in the history of our Nation. Indeed, the history of the Nation itself is not the same as it would have been had Usher Burdick not played so large a part in shaping it.

By the normal rules of calculation, we consider that a man who has lived a span of 81 years, and lived them to the fullest, as Usher Burdick did, has not died prematurely. But when we lose a man of Usher Burdick's rare greatness, our loss is necessarily premature. The work of such a man is never done, and there are all too few with the capacity to follow in the giant strides of such a man.

I shall always know that one of the great good fortunes in my life has been to know Usher Burdick. I have known him and admired him since he first came to Congress in 1934. To know him was to admire him and to love him. Even those among us who were at opposite poles with Usher Burdick's social and economic views have deeply admired him for the scope of his intellect, the complete independence of his mind, the stoutness of his heart, and most of all, for his capacity never to lose sight of the cause of justice.

Usher Burdick always liked to think of himself as a country boy. In truth, he was highly sophisticated in his knowledge of the ways of the world. With his tremendous intellect and his great capacity for work, he became the master of many technical subjects. What made him a country boy was that he used this knowledge always for the same purpose which drove him to acquire knowledge, which was to fight the cause of the everyday people he was here to represent. I have never known a man whose mind and heart were at all times more completely identified with the people who elected him to public office. It was this devotion to his people, I think, that was the source of his simplicity, his humility, his strength—indeed, his rare greatness.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, no more fitting eulogy could be spoken for our friend and colleague, Representative Usher L. Burdick, than the words of his son, Senator BURDICK, who said, "A great man has just died."

His death is a deep personal loss to all who knew him as a friend of great heart and a lawmaker of great integrity. His ready sense of humor was born of a genuine love of his fellow man and his forthright manner reflected his real respect for his fellow citizens.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with him soon after I came to Congress. As many have said, he was one of the most colorful men ever to serve in the Congress of the United States. When he spoke, which was seldom, he had something to say and he always had the attention of the House.

He was an able adversary in any debate. Many of us will remember his often witty but always pertinent retorts to interruptions in his speeches. His words were not wasted.

Most of all, however, I will remember him as a goodhearted man who loved his family and his countrymen. He took great pride in his sons, Quentin and Eugene, and his daughter, Mrs. Levering. To them we offer our deepest sympathy. They have every right to be proud of this man who devoted most of his long life to public service.

There was no posing about Usher L. Burdick. He knew what he stood for and never wavered in that stand. His life was rugged, but he would never have had it otherwise. He fought his battles and fought them well.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have served in this House with Usher L. Burdick from 1948 until his retirement. I am sure that all of our colleagues who were acquainted with him will agree that this House lost an able, intelligent and most diligent Member as well as one of its most colorful, when he retired at the close of the 85th Congress. He fought courageously for his principles.

A part of the story of this great man's life is told in the following obituary which appeared in the New York Times of August 20, 1960:

USHER L. BURDICK, LAWMAKER, DIES—EX-REPUBLICAN FROM NORTH DAKOTA WAS 81—SERVED 20 YEARS IN HOUSE

WASHINGTON, August 19.—Former Representative Usher L. Burdick, who was a North Dakota Republican, died tonight. He was 81 years old.

At his bedside when Mr. Burdick died was his son, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat of North Dakota, who took office only last week after having won a special election for the unexpired term of the late Senator William Langer.

C. J. Barry, the elder Mr. Burdick's former administrative aid, said the former legislator entered Sibley Hospital 3 days ago, suffering from a kidney ailment and a heart condition, along with other complications.

A MAVERICK IN POLITICS

Mr. Burdick was a "maverick" in Republican politics. He voted against his party almost as much as he voted for it, denounced the administration and demanded the removal of Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture.

A massive man who slogged along the Capitol corridors like a man pulling a sledge through melting snow, Mr. Burdick had been a teacher, lawyer, and rancher before becoming a legislator. He was a good friend of the Indians, spoke the Sioux language and lived among them in his youth.

While attending the University of Minnesota, Mr. Burdick became a track man. It had been contended that he was too big and heavy to race. At a weight of 220 pounds, however, he hit the 100-yard tape at 10.5 seconds.

With such speed for his weight, it was decided that Mr. Burdick should go in for football. He played right end on the Minnesota team, helping it to win the Big Ten championships in 1903 and 1904.

Elected to the North Dakota Legislature, Mr. Burdick became speaker of its House. He was elected Lieutenant Governor of the State in 1911. Previously he had used his legal talents as a prosecuting attorney with many bootleg cases on his docket. He resolved that national prohibition was a mistake, and fought it until repeal.

HELD SEAT 20 YEARS

First elected to Congress in 1934, Mr. Burdick retained his seat until 1944. He then ran for the Senate and was defeated. He was re-elected to the House in 1948 and served until 1958, when he was again a candidate for re-election as Representative-at-Large.

Earlier in 1958, Mr. Burdick had announced that he would not seek office if he were opposed by his son, Quentin. The son had been endorsed by the Nonpartisan League for the House seat.

Along with many Midwestern colleagues, Mr. Burdick was an isolationist until the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. Then, he said, it is my country, "right or wrong."

However, Mr. Burdick still opposed many continued foreign aid programs, and one of his targets was Britain. He predicted that such grants and loans would not be paid back in substance or in any other way despite the comradeship of the programs that brought them into being.

Among the times Mr. Burdick crossed party lines, be blasted what he called Republican blunders. He introduced measures embarrassing to the party. * * *

A cattleman and farmer, Mr. Burdick engaged also to some extent in writing. He was the author of pamphlets on western history and wrote also "The Life of George Sperry Loftus," "Tales From Buffalo Land," "The Story of Fort Buford," and "The Last Days of Sitting Bull."

Mr. Speaker, we will remember him fondly and well. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to those he left behind.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, the whole Congress and the whole Nation mourns the death of Usher Burdick who has passed away. In paying this small tribute to him, I know that I express the sorrow and regret of all who knew and revered him.

He was a very close friend of mine. During my first few years in Congress, his excellent advice and wise counsel was invaluable. Breakfast with Usher two or three times a week was an unforgettable experience during which he regaled us with his profound knowledge of the political history and development of the West. This is something which I never shall forget.

His warm heart, his devout soul, his boundless charity were characteristic of this truly good and great man. His sincere and genuine concern over the plight of the Indians whom he knew and loved so well typified this fine man.

He died as he lived, working for his fellowman, working for his God. The world has profited by his example.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and memory of the late Usher Burdick. I became acquainted with him when I came to Congress, and throughout the years since then I have been honored and benefited by the association and counsel which he was willing to give me.

As the RECORD will show, on most of the issues which came before this great body our decisions were the same—and I would like to add that I believe they were prompted largely by like ideals and philosophy. He used to chide me in a friendly way on matters on which we differed. I personally enjoyed his friendly yet most earnest criticism. Because of this relationship I have been a better and more effective legislator.

Our late colleague and friend was a unique figure among us. He had more than the average man's share of natural talents and he used these talents effectively and in the interest of his fellowmen.

The country in general and his State in particular are richer in the real values of life because our coworker and fellow servant was allotted his long life among us. He left a heritage of ability, industry, integrity, and usefulness to an exceptionally able family. I join with you, my colleagues, in extending to the members of Usher Burdick's family sincere sympathy in this time of sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join in an expression of sadness at the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Usher Burdick, who represented the State of North Dakota for over 20 years between 1934 and 1958.

Usher Burdick was a liberal representative who spoke and voted his conscience. He knew his constituents and their problems and received their manifestation of full confidence in many public elections. He was a man of strength; he was a man of courage. As a legislator he was among those who led.

It was Providence which permitted him to witness the elevation of his distinguished son, the Honorable QUENTIN BURDICK, to the U.S. Senate as well as the election of his distinguished son-in-law, the Honorable ROBERT W. LEVERING, who with distinction represents the 17th Congressional District of Ohio in the U.S. Congress.

To the State of North Dakota, to the Nation, and to his family, Usher Burdick left an enviable record of courageous public service.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very deep sense of personal sadness and loss that I join the Members here in expressing tribute to our late distinguished colleague, Usher Burdick.

Few men that have ever served in this body will be missed as much, and none more, than this most capable and amiable man.

For 20 years, he gave the fullness of his mind, his heart, and his health in patriotic service to the people of the United States and North Dakota.

In legislative probity, he had a mind like a surgeon's knife and, as witnessed in this Chamber on innumerable occasions, he could and did, with a brief comment, project a clear understanding of the complicated significance of a major bill. Most of us here today have benefited greatly by being privileged to work within the atmosphere of his recognized practical wisdom, philosophic outlook, gentle heart, kindly wit, and genial personality.

Few men who have served in this body have contributed as much as he toward that spirit of bipartisan good will out of which comes the most constructive legislation for the public welfare.

For this contribution alone his name will remain forever high on the annals of our national legislative history.

His passing is, indeed, a great personal loss to me; he was a good and close friend. I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family and assure them that Usher will long be remembered in our prayers.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the passing of our former colleague, Usher L. Burdick. It was my privilege to know Mr. Burdick for many years. It was my pleasure also to serve with him as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. He had a sense of humor, a keen mind, and the courage of his convictions. I have many pleasant memories of our association in committee as well as in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Burdick enjoyed a long, active, useful life, and a distinguished career of public service. To his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Usher Burdick has taken from us one of the most remarkable men in American political history.

Usher Burdick was endowed with the wit of a Lincoln and the agrarian faith of a Jefferson. His philosophy of government cut across party lines and was limited only by his faith in America and particularly the rural people of America.

I am grateful that I came to know him as a friend after my election to the Congress in 1956. He always demonstrated a special interest in his sister State, South Dakota, which it has been my privilege to represent.

When Usher Burdick's son, QUENTIN, was elected to succeed his father, I had the honor of presenting him to the caucus of Democratic Members of the House. Now QUENTIN is beginning what promises to be a brilliant service in the U.S. Senate. Usher Burdick's son-in-law, ROBERT LEVERING, of Ohio, continues the Burdick family's role in the House of Representatives.

There are many worthy traits that could be attributed to Usher Burdick. I believe, however, that most of us will cherish most fondly his salty humor and the sparkling wit that is the saving grace of American politics.

I join with my colleagues in expressing appreciation for his life and in extending sincere sympathy to his family in his passing.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Mrs. Levering, Usher Burdick's only daughter, and his two sons, QUENTIN, now serving in the other body, and Eugene, a district judge in the State of North Dakota, to thank our distinguished Speaker, our majority leader and so many of my colleagues for their kind remarks and expressions of sympathy on the occasion of the death of my father-in-law who served in this body for 20 years.

I have often said, "I never knew a man like Usher Burdick." I repeat that statement today. Someone has said, "I do not think the world is ever going to give much to the man who does not surprise it now and then." On the basis of this statement, the world gave much to Usher Burdick.

I have listened with pride to the praise which came from both sides of the aisle on how the "old gent" served his country here in the Halls of the people, but I knew him best for his love of the land, good cattle, and horses. Only hours before his death, he was making plans to return permanently to the land where he learned as a boy to speak the Sioux language. I will always cherish the hours spent with him riding over his Missouri River ranch on a summer day when the sky is as blue as a baby's eyes and the clouds are as white as the first snow of winter.

My father-in-law undoubtedly enjoyed a unique distinction in being one of very few families where the mother, father, and the three children were all graduates of the University of Minnesota. Also, all of the three children are admitted to the practice of law in the State of North Dakota. Usher Burdick always recognized the need for education and its importance in the molding of a wise and intelligent citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, as has been established, Usher Burdick was a humorist of the Bill Nye school and frequently devoted his weekly newsletter to the humorous side of grim events. A noteworthy example is his eyewitness account of the shooting incident by the Puerto Ricans in the House Chamber in 1954. The late Fred Othman, Washington columnist, yielded his weekly space on one occasion to carry this humorous account to the Nation.

He was the only Member of the House who was able to identify all four of the berserk Puerto Ricans, and he testified at their trial in New York in which they were convicted. He had remained standing on the floor of the House while bullets rained about him and made a careful mental note of the description of each intruder.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Usher Burdick which he made in this body on March 11, 1954, relative to the Puerto Rican incident:

Mr. Speaker, while the revolutionists of Puerto Rico were trying to shoot down Congressmen promiscuously there were some comic incidents connected with the tragic affair.

Martin Dies, of Texas, and FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama, were pretty much in line with bullets landing in their vicinity in the Chamber. They tried to flee to the Democratic cloakroom, and both attempted to pass through the door at the same time. They jammed in the doorway, and could not go either way. At this juncture, Martin Dies said to BOYKIN: "Who was it that just darted between us?" Finally BOYKIN got through and into the cloakroom. He announced he was going for his gun. Someone asked him where it was, and he said it was in Alabama.

Dr. MILLER, whose both legs are artificial and who walks pretty well with a cane, was in the center of the Chamber on the Republican side. Instead of ducking, he stood up, waved his cane at the gunman and shouted: "You can't do this—it's against the law."

Mr. Hale, of Maine, was more interested in the way the seats are constructed than he was in the shooting. He had tried to get his head under one of them, but a cage that holds the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was built too close to the floor and he could not get his head under it. Before the shooting stopped he was complaining about the poor plan of construction of the seats.

T. Millet Hand, of New Jersey, tried to get down in the space below the seats, but the one he selected was already occupied by Representative CANFIELD. He was still ducking down in that vicinity when someone asked him what he did when he found the space occupied by CANFIELD. "Well," he said, "I crawled under CANFIELD."

Judge Graham, of Pennsylvania, who is about 5 feet 2 inches tall, but still large in girth, could not find a place to get into to avoid the bullets, so remained standing up. Of course, I do not think the judge would have been much protected by getting down because he would have been about as high lying down as he is standing. For some unaccountable reason he was not shot.

JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, was at the door of the Chamber when the firing began, and TIP O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, was behind him. He is a powerful man and he wanted to see what was going on inside. He rushed at the door and shoved MCCORMACK right into the Chamber and close to the line of fire.

I did not think the firing was real until a bullet hit a seat to the right of me. The dust and splinters flew and for the first time I realized that this was the "real McCoy." I moved out of there with all possible speed and thought of getting down on the carpet, but it was so completely occupied I was prevented from doing so. The firing seemed to have ceased, and I walked down a few seats when the last of the bullets were fired. I did not see any place to go for cover, and someone asked me what I was standing for. I replied that I was looking for a gopher hole. The man said, "You could not crawl into that kind of a hole." "Oh, yes, I could," I replied. "Any common gopher hole would be big enough the way I feel now."

That was the last burst of bullets, and then we began to attend the wounded, and the attempt at assassination passed into history.

To show just what vim a few pistol shots will instill in a body like the Congress, I cite the case of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Bowler. Unfortunately, he is very badly crippled through a severe attack of arthritis. When the shooting began and a few bullets struck near him he rushed for the door leading out of the Chamber. Seven or eight other Members had the same notion of getting out of the Chamber at the same time. The others were not crippled, but the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Bowler, led the "flying squadron" into the lobby, and was ahead of the whole pack. He seemed to have the stamina of a Man of War or a Whirlaway in the last stretch run.

It ran through my mind, "Just what do those rebels want to shoot us for?" My first reaction was that we were being shot at because we have given $270 billion to foreign countries, but when I heard the rebel woman shout, "Viva Puerto Rico," I became convinced that these would-be executioners believed we had been more partial to England, France, and all the other 62 countries we have helped than we had been to Puerto Rico. You know, when we start giving everything away, jealousy creeps in among the donees. This should be a lesson to us.

The bravest men in the House were the women. They did not want to plunge headlong on the floor behind a seat and muss up their clothing and hair, so they sat in their seats and let the bullets come. There must have been a spark of chivalry among the assassins, for none of the women were injured.

I think it is a shame to be assassinated in the House, although in elections in North Dakota I am rather used to that procedure. I have been opposed to an increase in pay for Congressmen. I think we should refuse to wade in and boost our own salaries while thousands of citizens do not get enough to eat. But this shooting changed my views. I would be in favor of receiving combat pay—say 5 percent—and extra pay for flight duty—say a 20-percent increase on the latter. If a Congressman has to be prepared to run every time someone tries to kill him this is flight duty and we should receive some extra pay.

All the wounded Members are recovering rapidly, and no new elections will be necessary because of this shooting melee.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the death of our former House colleague, Usher L. Burdick, the Nation has lost one of its most colorful and brilliant statesmen.

It was my good fortune to be associated with him on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee after I was elected to the 81st Congress. Although we carried different party labels, our votes were much the same.

On the House floor, Mr. Burdick, with his ready wit and courage, always attracted attention when he rose to speak. He always had something important to say. All were eager to listen.

His service to his State and Nation won for him admiration and respect of all who knew him. Politically he was progressive and liberal.

He successfully opposed conservative opposition in his own party. His name in North Dakota is a byword. He was a fighter for the farmer and for the common folks of the Nation.

The election of his son, QUENTIN, as a Democrat to the U.S. Senate from North

Dakota, can be attributed to a great extent to the popularity of Usher Burdick's name in North Dakota.

QUENTIN has already indicated that he is a chip off the old block. His short but splendid record in the House and his successful campaign for the U.S. Senate gives promise of a successful career in public service.

Usher's daughter, a talented woman of strong character, is the wife of the Honorable ROBERT W. LEVERING, a Democratic Representative from Ohio.

To all members of the Burdick family I wish to express deepest sympathy on their great loss.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am most deeply touched by the passing of my very dear and cherished friend, Hon. Usher Burdick, for many years an outstanding Member of this body.

Anything I might say about the sterling qualities, high character, superlative ability, lofty patriotism, and magnificent contributions of this great American would be most inadequate fittingly to portray one of the noblest men I have ever known.

As the Members of this House who have served with him will testify, Usher Burdick was unique. When the good Lord created him, He broke the mold. There never could be another like him.

Usher Burdick was as many sided in his interests as Benjamin Franklin, as versatile in his talents and gifts as the great Thomas Jefferson, but he had the spark of life, the elan vital about him that was seemingly without parallel. His understanding and love of humanity was deep; his friends were bound to him with hoops of steel.

Patriot of the highest order, steeped in the richest traditions of the Nation, loyal Americanism was a part of his very being. It was well illustrated in a letter he sent me just a few days before he passed "to that land from whose bourne no traveler ever returns." He wrote:

> This is the land of my ancestors, the land I have been devoted to for many years. It is a great land of freedom and I propose with all my heart to fight against its enemies whoever and wherever they may be. I will do anything to preserve our U.S. institutions, including our capitalistic system which the Communists are dedicated to destroy.

It is a demonstrated fact that there never could be a better, a finer, or nobler American than Usher Burdick. And there could never be a human being in this whole wide world more unselfishly devoted to his fellow man. His rich, varied and busy life was principally one of most unselfish service to his great State and Nation and the American people. His career was most distinguished and illustrious. He filled several high posts of most important governmental responsibility with outstanding distinction and universally acknowledged approbation.

Integrity was his precious badge of honor, an integrity as rugged and enduring and unsullied as the eternal hills of his beloved State. Intellectual honesty was his prized possession and he stood by his ideals and convictions with a tenacity and, at times, a ferocity that neutralized his enemies and inspired his friends and supporters.

A brilliant experienced lawyer, veteran of many courtroom battles, his mind was as sharp as a razor. In argument or debate he was a master of pointed satire, and a pervasive sense of humor often devastating to his opponents.

He never hesitated when he deemed it necessary to hit hard at his opponents, but he scrupulously avoided bitterness, bias, or acrimony. Throughout his long illustrious career he exhibited and exemplified a spirit of tolerance, broadness, fairness, and good sportsmanship for which he was noted in the House.

Possessed of a keen sense of humor, he was virtually without an equal as a raconteur who reveled when among his friends in recounting many humorous anecdotes in his long, busy, eventful life.

Outstanding All-American football star at Minnesota where he worked his way through college and law school, he was an instinctive sportsman and displayed deep interest in competitive games. He carried the high code of his athletic training into public life, hitting hard when the occasion required it, but always following the rules of a noble Christian gentleman and a true sportsman.

While he devoted himself to helping all the people, he had a special interest in and sincerely felt compassion and love for the American Indian. Lifelong, effective friend of the Indian in and out of Congress, thoroughly schooled in Indian lore, customs, and language, he fluently spoke several different Indian dialects.

In his last campaign just a short while ago when he successfully appealed to his former constituency of his great State in behalf of his distinguished and able son, QUENTIN, our former esteemed and beloved colleague in the House, and now U.S. Senator from the great State of North Dakota, Usher is said to have referred to some of the opposition as being so devious that "they had to sleep in round tents."

The election of his son, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, to the U.S. Senate was undoubtedly one of the great satisfactions of his illustrious career, the crowning glory and triumph of a lifetime devoted to unselfish service to the people. In truth and fact, his joy and happiness were so great that he broke his usual taciturn and ofttimes stoic front to express his complete gratification.

A few short weeks later, after he had lived to see his beloved son take his seat in the great Senate of the United States, he was called by his Creator to his eternal reward.

His passing came as the crashing of a great oak in the forest reverberating through the Capitol, through his State, and the Nation, and reechoing again and again in so many places the depth of sorrow and grief that was felt by all upon the demise of such a great American.

Usher Burdick was a truly dedicated man, inflexibly and unalterably committed to great principles of government rather than to formal party organizations. His philosophy was primarily that which permeates the Constitution of the United States—liberty loving, peace loving, and devoted to forward-looking policies responsive to the needs, aspirations, hopes, and welfare of the American people.

Usher Burdick wore no man's collar. Fiercely independent minded and individualistic, he was an implacable foe of social injustice, profundly interested in ordinary people whose well-being and betterment always came first with him.

He sprung from early American ancestry, from a rugged country and from hard pioneer life, where the going was always tough, where luxury and ease were unknown, but he trained his great mind and widened his naturally curious interests until he encompassed an unbelievably wide range of activities.

He was a farmer and a rancher, a successful breeder of beef cattle and thoroughbred Palamino horses. He had a flair for farm business, but eschewed sharp practices.

He was a collector of old historic books and documents, and was as expert a binder as most professionals. His interest in books carried him to many places.

He was also a connoisseur of art, and he possessed at the time of his death some outstanding American masterpieces of the ranching and Indian country.

He was an avid reader and an accomplished author with several fine books to his credit, particularly his authoritative treatise on Sitting Bull.

In the Congress, he was long a powerful voice in behalf of the people of his State and the farmers of America. Steeped in the American free heritage, he opposed communism at every turn with all his heart and devoutly believed that in the great struggle now going on between communism and democracy, communism was doomed to defeat because it ignores man as an individual soul and a freedom-loving individual.

There are many facets indeed of the life of this great man, Usher Burdick, that I cannot deal with in this brief but truly heartfelt tribute to his memory. He has left us a precious legacy of loyal friendship, devoted family life, dedicated service to his fellow man and peerless Americanism.

A legion of people mourn his passing and his great contributions will long be remembered, not only in his great State, but in the Halls of Congress where he was so distinguished for rugged sterling charactor, unsullied integrity, untiring energy, and undeviating loyalty to the principles of the American Constitution.

He has also left a most distinguished family to follow in his footsteps—Hon. Eugene Burdick, a learned, highly respected, outstanding judge in North Dakota; illustrious Hon. Quentin Burdick, whom we all know, esteem, and admire, the most recently elected Member of the U.S. Senate; and Mrs. Eileen Burdick Levering, a charming, gracious, lovely, and accomplished woman and mother, talented lawyer, wife, and helpmate of our own beloved and esteemed colleague, so justly lauded in this body, the able and distinguished Congressman ROBERT LEVERING, of Ohio.

For those of us who knew and loved Usher Burdick as a great human being and great American that he was, his passing fills our hearts with deep sadness, but in the memory of his friendly, warm, beaming countenance, loyal friendship and distinguished, unselfish service to the Nation we will all have reason to be grateful that this great American from the great Midwest lived so courageously, worked so diligently and served so faithfully and effectively in the vineyards of American democracy.

A great man and a great Congressman has left us. Our hearts go out in profound sympathy to his bereaved family for their irreparable loss.

May the good Lord bring to our beloved friend, Usher Burdick, eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

THE LATE HONORABLE DANIEL ELLISON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as it must to all men, the Lord in His infinite wisdom has seen fit to call one of our former colleagues, Daniel Ellison, from his earthly labors to abide with Him in eternal peace.

It is therefore fitting and proper that we should pause in our deliberations to recall the memory and mourn the loss of a truly distinguished man who is now no longer among us.

Seventy-four years ago, Daniel Ellison was born in a foreign land far across the sea and, while still a mere infant, his parents brought him to our hallowed shores settling in the city of Baltimore, in the Free State of Maryland. There he was educated in its public schools and graduated from the Baltimore City College.

Daniel Ellison entered the Johns Hopkins University and received his bachelor of arts degree from the world-famous institution of learning in 1907. A few years later he received the degree of LL.B. from the Law School of the University of Maryland and was admitted to the bar.

It was because of his interest in civic affairs that he yielded to the urgings of his friends and admirers to enter the political arena. In 1923, Mr. Ellison was elected as a member of Baltimore's first unicameral city council. It is noteworthy that he was the only Republican elected to any city office in that election. As a councilman, he played a large part in the adoption of Baltimore's zoning regulations and the easing of its ancient Sunday blue laws.

I had the good fortune also to be a member of the Baltimore City Council during the time Daniel Ellison served in that body. There I had the opportunity to see at first hand the brilliant mind, the great civic consciousness, and the largeness of heart of this man. Because of his sterling qualities and leadership, the Fourth District of Maryland elected him as its Representative to the 78th Congress. That was before it became my great privilege to be a Member here. Many of my colleagues well remember him where he made a host of friends on both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives. Later, he served with marked distinction in the Senate of the State of Maryland and took a leading part in the framing of legislation.

Daniel Ellison will long be remembered, not so much for his truly distinguished career as one of Baltimore's topflight attorneys, nor for his activities as President of the American Jewish Congress and other religious and civic endeavors, nor for his having held political office, but more especially for his great qualities of both heart and mind which he utilized to help make his city, State, and Nation a better place. Daniel Ellison was a true American in every sense of the word. We deeply mourn this great loss and his memory is enshrined in our hearts forever.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of former Congressman Ellison.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PHILIP B. PERLMAN

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to pay my respects to an illustrious American. The death of Philip B. Perlman on July 31, 1960, has deprived the State of Maryland and the entire Nation of a great and good citizen. Mr. Perlman has been a part of the judicial and civic life of America for the major portion of his active 70 years.

A native of Baltimore, Philip Perlman was graduated from Baltimore City College in 1908. He was an enthusiastic college correspondent for the Baltimore American and joined the staff as a reporter upon graduation. Subsequently he studied English and political economy at Johns Hopkins and at the University of Maryland he studied law. He passed the bar in 1912. He then joined the staff of the Evening Sun and at the age of 23 was named city editor. For 5 years he held that position.

It was at the age of 28 that Philip Perlman began his long and brilliant legal career. He served his beloved State of Maryland as assistant to the attorney general, assistant attorney general, secretary of state, and was a competent adviser to many in high public office.

The distinguished public service record of Philip Perlman further included city solicitor of Baltimore. In private practice he was counsel for the Baltimore Housing Authority, the Baltimore Transit Co., and the Maryland Cooperative Milk Producers.

Mr. Perlman was appointed Solicitor General of the United States by Mr. Truman in 1947. His record in that office has become legend. Of the 53 cases he presented to the Supreme Court from the Department of Justice, he won 47—a brilliant record, indeed.

He served the Democratic Party with earnest zeal. He worked tirelessly as cochairman of the platform committee at the recent Democratic National Convention, as well as many conventions in the past.

Necessary and important Baltimore civic activities benefited from Philip Perlman's public-spirited service. These included such organizations as Baltimore's Associated Jewish Charities, its symphony orchestra, its museum of art, the Walters Art Gallery, and the Peale Museum.

Philip Perlman's life most surely represented what has been called the threefold function of a lawyer—adviser, representative, and advocate. The traditions and common precepts of his profession he held on a high plane. He found his highest honor in a reserved reputation. He was known for his fidelity to public duty.

I am certain you, my colleagues in the House of Representatives, join me in mourning his passing and acknowledging the Nation's loss in the death of Philip Perlman.

SUSPENSION OF SECTION 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (S.J. Res. 207) to suspend for the 1960 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That that part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended for the period of the 1960 presidential and vice presidential campaigns with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest.

(2) The Federal Communications Commission shall make a report to the Congress, not later than March 1, 1961, with respect to the effect of the provisions of this joint resolution and any recommendations the Commission may have for amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 as a result of experience under the provisions of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 207 proposes to suspend for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States for the 1960 campaign the equal opportunity requirement contained in section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is a most important proposal. It goes to the heart of our political institutions. Since the Radio Act of 1927 there has been the basic requirement now contained in section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 that equal time must be provided by broadcasting facilities for candidates in any political contest.

This provision of the act is of great importance because it is concerned with the use of an important public natural resource: the radio spectrum.

All members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have for several years given a great deal of thought and study to this problem. It is therefore not a new problem that is before us.

When the late and beloved Percy Priest was chairman of this great committee, he introduced legislation dealing with the subject, on which hearings were held. During this Congress a number of bills have been introduced in the House on this subject.

Our committee has held rather extensive hearings on bills dealing with section 315 and which are printed and which are available to any Member who desires to peruse these hearings.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the other body held hearings on S. 3171, a bill which would have required television stations to make available free prime time for candidates for the office of President of the United States. These hearings were held by that committee on May 16, 17, and 19 of the present year, and are available for the Members of the House in case they are interested in looking over them.

Senate Joint Resolution 207 is the result of those hearings. It was reported by the Senate committee and was passed by that body late in the session prior to our adjourning for the conventions. However, there was not sufficient time for the resolution to be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House to hold hearings on, and to report it back for consideration by the House.

Consequently, the Speaker, and I think appropriately so, held the joint resolution on his desk with the announced intent at that time of calling it up under suspension of the rules. As a matter of fact, I was alerted that it might be called up on July 4.

I realize there is a great deal of interest in this resolution on the part of many people, including many Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I realize there is some serious question in the minds of many Members with respect to this resolution. That concern has been demonstrated on every occasion on which legislation on this subject has been discussed. I feel deeply, Mr. Speaker, that the broadcasters of this Nation who have been given the privilege of operating broadcast facilities in the public interest have a public responsibility to strengthen our political institutions, and that is the issue here today. I want to urge, as a matter of great importance to all Americans who go to the polls this November regardless of political affiliation, the passage of this Senate joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 207—now before us. This resolution was passed by the Senate without dissent.

The purpose of this resolution is to permit the presidential and vice presidential candidates to accept free television time promised by the three major television and radio networks and their affiliated stations throughout the country, thus to permit television and radio to cover the 1960 presidential campaign more comprehensively than ever before.

In my opinion, this would be to the indisputable advantage of the American people since it would insure greater illumination of the political issues and the candidates. In a nutshell, this resolution suspends the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act as they pertain to the presidential and vice presidential candidates during the 1960 campaign only. It is an experiment for this election year. Under the present reach of section 315 of the Communications Act, radio and television broadcasting stations are compelled to give equivalent time to dozens of splinter parties and fringe candidates if they give time to any candidate. This, of course, means that the practical effect of section 315 is a tight proscription of broadcast coverage of political campaigns. In recent elections there have been as many as 18 separate parties and candidates which would have qualified for equivalent time if the Democrats and Republicans had been given time on the air.

This resolution would make it possible on an experimental basis for the networks and stations to give time on a fair and equitable basis to all substantial newsworthy candidates for President and Vice President. It does not in any way suspend the statutory requirements that the broadcasters continue to operate in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. In other words, fairness and balance would still be required of them in their handling of political events and personalities.

Furthermore, the resolution requires the Federal Communications Commission to keep track of and to report back to the Congress the broadcasters' record on the use of radio and television in this presidential campaign, and to recommend whether or not the Communications Act should be amended in view of the results.

Through this directive to the Federal Communications Commission, a sword of Damocles will be hanging over the heads of the broadcasting industry. Senate Joint Resolution 207 is not a carte blanche for broadcasters. It grants relief from the equal-time restrictions only with regard to presidential and vice presidential candidates and only for the 1960 campaign. The broadcasting industry is clearly charged to do its best to make the significant presidential candidates and issues, through debate and discussion, familiar to the vast radio and television audiences of the country. The resolution simply gives the industry the flexibility to do voluntarily what the broadcasters have vociferously acknowledged to be their duty: that is, to provide prime evening time during the presidential campaign for debate and discussion by the major candidates.

On the floor of the Senate, Senator PASTORE stated:

> The language of the resolution as it is drawn meets with the approval of the Republican National Chairman and the Democratic National Chairman. If we seek to change it at this time, I fear that any deviation might lead to ineffectiveness.

The worst that can happen under this resolution, as Senator PASTORE pointed out, is that nothing will happen—that none of the candidates will avail themselves of the free time offered. The best that can happen, on the other hand, is that the significant parties will receive millions of dollars worth of free time in which to present their cases to the American people through their presidential and vice presidential candidates.

The American people will be deciding a great and critical election this fall. Radio and television reach into virtually every home in the land. It is certainly in the public interest that these great mediums be used to their fullest and best potential in bringing the candidates and issues home to every family. But unless we act affirmatively on this resolution, the roles of both radio and television in the presidential campaign will be drastically restricted. And I suggest that what this country needs is more information, clearer information, and faster information. Let us remove the shackles for this year, give it a trial, and see how it works out.

Organizations in support of Senate Joint Resolution 207: Chamber of Commerce, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, Catholic War Veterans, Amvets, Radio-Television News Directors Association, Sigma Delta Chi, Oversea Press Club, National Grange, National Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three things I wish to cover that have been mentioned. First, in connection with other broadcasting legislation, there has been a great deal of fear expressed on the part of the broadcasters with reference to the imposition of tighter controls on the broadcasting industry. This resolution does just the reverse. It places responsibility on the broadcaster on an experimental basis. The Government will not control or direct this program, and the broadcasters will be in a position where they can show by their own actions that they will meet

the basic requirement of fair play. The resolution provides this, on page 2, at line 2.

With reference to third party or independent candidates, the basic fairness requirement under the resolution requires that if there is a third party or a substantial independent party represented by a candidate—as, for example, the so-called Dixiecrat ticket of 1948—then that candidate will be given, under the language of this provision, the protection of the basic fairness, so there should not be any fear by any substantial candidate during this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has again expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Arkansas 3 minutes, for the purpose of asking a question or two.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; may I suggest that I cover these other points first briefly, because there have been many questions asked on them.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. HARRIS. Third, the matter of sponsorship. There has been some talk about these debates by presidential candidates being sponsored. One of the networks said that under no circumstances would they have sponsorship of such programs. Two of the other television and radio networks hedged a little bit on the subject and seemed to want to leave it up to the candidates. One radio network also seemed to hedge a little bit. I shall put in the RECORD at this point the wires which I received from all four.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 18, 1960.

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Replying your telegram August 18, in absence of Mr. Leonard Golesono, ABC has made no public announcement affecting sponsorship of proposed appearances by presidential and vice presidential candidates pending expected expressions of opinion and preference by candidates representatives and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 207. ABC has had requests for right to sponsor from major institutional advertisers but has no plans to permit sponsorship of proposed joint appearances unless candidates should expressly wish it.

JOHN DALY,
Vice President.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 18, 1960.

The Honorable OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARRIS: In response to your telegram of August 18, our policy concerning sponsorship is, so far as debates are concerned, as follows: There have been recurring reports that consideration is being given to commercial sponsorship of the debates by the Democratic and Republican presidential nominees during the 1960 campaign. I would like to make it absolutely clear that CBS will not accept commercial sponsorship for these special programs. Even though public spirited business firms have been generous in offering to sponsor these debates, we, the CBS radio and television networks and their affiliated stations, want to make this our own contribution because we believe there is no single act of self-government that is more important than the quadrennial choice of our national leadership. The foregoing is full text of announcement which I made August 3.

FRANK STANTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 18, 1960.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

In response to your telegram of August 18, NBC plans to present the presidential and vice-presidential candidates in joint discussion of the campaign issues whether or not such programs are sponsored. We have received expressions of sponsorship interest from important companies. We have informed representatives of the candidates of this interest during discussion of arrangements for these appearances and solicited the decision of the candidates themselves on the acceptability of sponsorship. If the candidates have objection to sponsorship for these broadcasts we will accept their decision. If there is no objection from the candidates the type and manner of sponsorship would be appropriate to the importance of the broadcasts. In either case, whether sponsored or unsponsored, we believe these programs will represent a public service of a highly desirable character.

ROBERT E. KINTNER,
President, National Broadcasting Co.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 19, 1960.

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding your wire in connection with the possible adoption of Joint Resolution 207. Mutual will carry appearances by presidential and vice presidential candidates as unsponsored public service programing excepting where committees supporting candidates buy time for the express purpose of presenting the parties' candidate or candidates.

ROBERT F. HURLEIGH,
President, Mutual Broadcasting System.

But in my humble judgment what we intend here is public service to the American people without any sponsorship and I think we should expect all of the networks and the stations to carry out that policy.

The final matter, which is of great importance, is this. If you turn to the Senate hearings you will find that on account of this program, which the major networks and their affiliated stations have assured us they would be glad to undertake, there will be a saving both to the Republican and the Democratic national parties and any other substantial third party.

Page 11 of the Senate hearings sets out that in 1956 there would have been saved $3,654,000. It is also stated that since rates have gone up, savings to both parties would run in the neighborhood of $5,500,000 during the 1960 political campaign. So that is what it would mean.

Here we have networks and stations operated by people who are willing to undertake this responsibility, and we have the policy of basic fairness, that I trust will be adhered to. In my opinion it is worth a trial. We will then be in a position to know better how to legislate for the future. I would say let us remove the shackles for this one year. Let us give it a trial and see how it works out.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this joint resolution, although I must say I am not doing so with any great amount of enthusiasm. The resolution delegates too much authority to the broadcasting industry to make decisions on broadcasts that will be seen and heard throughout the United States. However, on the basis that the suspension is temporary, on the basis that it is an experiment, and that it will terminate at the end of this presidential campaign, I am willing to give it my support.

I should like to ask my distinguished chairman if there is any intent on his part that the suspension of section 315 in this campaign will be used as an argument in favor of repealing the section during the next Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. I can speak only for myself. Personally, I would not be in favor of repealing section 315 of the act outright. It is not the chairman's intent—and I say this so that the networks or individual listeners may be on notice—that the temporary suspension of section 315 should be construed as giving the broadcasters any basis for coming in here to ask for the outright repeal of the section after this election.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I cannot see how this resolution can be used as an argument for the outright repeal of section 315 because this refers only to the presidential and vice presidential candidates and no one else. If the broadcasters do a good job, and the people benefit by it, there might be some justification for some permanent legislation along these lines so that we could follow this pattern in each presidential election. However, I have a feeling that so far as the networks are concerned one of the reasons they want this suspension is to afford them a reason to come in later and say that in this campaign the suspension of section 315 has worked out satisfactorily, and therefore this section ought to be repealed outright. I wanted to be sure there was no intention of that sort here.

Mr. HARRIS. I have not had any such information that that would be their intention. However, it is certainly not my intention to have the passage of this resolution considered as a ground for the outright repeal of section 315.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Is there anything in the resolution that deals with the sponsorship of programs on which these presidential candidates may appear? If the networks decide to sell the time to a sponsor and have the 8 or 10 hours, or whatever they are going to allot here, paid for not by the presidential candidate or his party but by an independent or private sponsor, we are then in fact dealing with a paid political broadcast, are we not?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say that when I was alerted to the fact that I would be recognized to call up this resolution I

set out to get some additional information. I wrote a letter to each of the networks asking for certain information, and my letter and their replies are contained in this pamphlet to which I have referred. I direct this to the attention of every Member.

In addition to that, when the sponsorship question came up a few days ago I sent a wire to each of the networks asking what their position would be, because I thought that we ought to know what their position is on this particular occasion. I placed their replies in the RECORD earlier. Columbia Broadcasting System states very frankly that it will not have sponsorship of such programs. NBC and ABC indicate that they would have sponsorship only at the request of the candidates themselves. Mutual Broadcasting Co. said the same.

As I said a moment ago, in my judgment—and I think this has the approval of the leadership of both major national parties and of both candidates—in my humble judgment, it is the intention that there be no sponsorship, because if the candidates' appearances are to be sponsored commercially, then there would be no need for this resolution in the first place.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. But there is nothing in the resolution itself that would prevent sponsorship of these programs if the networks find sponsors and if they decide that they should like to do it in that fashion.

The point I am making is that unless there is assurance here that the programs will not be sponsored, there is no use in passing this resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the very point.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The problem that the networks are complaining about is that if they give some time to the major parties free, then they will have to give time to the fringe candidates which would cause them a great deal of trouble. If they are going to have sponsors for these programs, we would be passing something here that would be perfectly meaningless so far as I can see. Furthermore, I wish to say something on the question of "fairness."

The last sentence of the first paragraph of the resolution provides that nothing in this resolution shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under the Communications Act to operate in the public interest. One of the cardinal requirements which licensees of broadcasting stations must meet is the rule of fairness. A violation of the rule of fairness would amount to disregarding the requirement of operations in the public interest.

Note, however, that this requirement is imposed on the broadcasters and not on the networks, at least not on the networks directly. Thus, if a network should not deal fairly with the presidential candidates and give more time to one of them, the licensees carrying these broadcasts would violate the rule of fairness but not the network itself because the law does not impose any responsibility on the network as such.

This points up once again the inconsistency of the present provisions of the Communications Act which provide for the licensing of broadcasters but do not provide for the licensing or regulating of networks.

In my opinion, passage of this resolution demonstrates that the real power to discriminate is in the networks and therefore the networks, along with the individual stations, should be held accountable under the Communications Act.

Mr. HARRIS. But, I do not believe there will be any attempt at all along that line because I understand that the attitude of the candidates of the two major parties is that they would not want sponsorship and, therefore, I do not think there will be any effort at all to do that.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would permit me, I would like to make a brief statement here, which I believe is necessary in order to have the RECORD clear.

On page 2 of this resolution, on line 4, there is found the word "this." The language reads, "the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest."

That is a technical error. It should have read, "such act" because it refers to the Communications Act of 1936. I am sure that this will be understood correctly and I merely wanted to make this statement in order to clarify the RECORD.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], has answered some of the questions bothering many about this legislation. The fact that this exemption is limited to this election and that a thorough study and observation of the problem will be undertaken is a deciding factor in favor of the bill. The following statement gives the view of some who view the problem and its inherent dangers with alarm:

STATEMENT OF RICHARD D. PORTER, OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF. AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF POLITICAL BROADCASTING AND THE PROSPECT OF TELEVISION DEBATES

Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 has, particularly in recent years, emerged as a source of many problems and difficulties for the broadcaster. With considerable justification the broadcaster has criticized vigorously the often awkward applications and interpretations of this section. The 1959 Supreme Court decision regarding the WDAY (Farmers Union) case gave welcome relief from probably the most disturbing dilemma inherent in section 315.[1] A second dilemma derives from the core of this section—the equal opportunity provision.[2] What is just and proper under this system of government clearly stands in opposition to what is sensible and realistic in political broadcasting. This second dilemma likewise was partially, if questionably, relieved by Congress in amending section 315, also in 1959.

This amendment exempting newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events (including conventions and related activities) from the coverage of section 315 probably will prove, in the long run, to be equitable—assuming that the broadcaster in handling such matters will proceed actively to maintain objectivity and fairness. However in observing the political conventions of 1960, one could readily note the difficulty which the broadcaster will face in maintaining impartiality. Many candidates for congressional and other offices have, in the course of one or the other of the conventions, had a significant and highly impressive exposure, through speeches, interviews, and appearances, to a large part of their respective constituencies. It is difficult to suggest an opportunity in political campaigning which would approximate that of being seen by one's constituents while participating in a national convention. Certainly many inequities in the use of broadcast facilities by political candidates will arise during the 1960 election campaign as the broadcaster takes advantage of the new freedom to broadcast news, interviews, and special events. To what extent will the broadcaster be able to compensate for such inequities? Will the broadcaster make a sincere effort to accept the concomitant responsibilities of this new freedom? The answers to these questions will in large measure determine the future of election campaign broadcasting.

By not extending exemption to the broadcasting of debates while exempting other specific types of programs, the 1959 amendment to section 315 has left the possibility of a specific debate exemption highly unlikely in the near future. But should debates be exempted? The fact that two opposing (major) candidates debate an issue on a broadcast medium would tend to convey to the audience the idea that their views represent the two sides on that issue. On most of the important issues confronting the Nation, the major candidates hold remarkably similar viewpoints. It is the minority candidates who most often hold truly divergent viewpoints. Could it really serve the public interest to provide for television debates between two major candidates who might often find difficulty in disagreeing on an issue, while excluding minority candidates for the same office who do indeed hold differing opinions?

A Broadcasting magazine editorial, citing dramatic illustrations of the idiocies of Federal editorial control over a medium of journalism (the NBC television network granted equal time to the self-appointed candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, Lar Daly, since Senator KENNEDY had appeared as a guest on the Jack Paar show) and the virtues of freedom (broadcasters gave wide ranging coverage of the Democratic Convention because they were able to interview all newsworthy participants without worrying about granting equal time to their rivals in local political races), led to the following conclusions:

"The removal of that absurd restriction [by the 1959 amendment to sec. 315] gave broadcasters last week the freedom to interview at will. And the result was a heads-up job of coverage.

"When Congress reconvenes next month, a further modification of section 315 will be up for House consideration. Already passed by the Senate is a joint resolution suspending section 315 for the presidential and vice presidential candidates during this campaign.

"This resolution deserves the support of all broadcasters. But it must be considered no more than a preliminary to the final job that must be undertaken when a new Congress meets next year—the total repeal of section 315.[3]

[1] The broadcaster could be held liable for defamatory statements by candidates using his station which he was prohibited from censoring.

[2] Minority candidates readily demand equal opportunity when a major candidate is allowed broadcast time, particularly free time; thus broadcasters, although interested in making political broadcasts available to the public, are exceedingly hesitant in making such time available to candidates.

[3] Broadcasting (July 18, 1960), p. 106.

Certainly legislation to suspend or repeal the equal opportunity provision, would substantially reduce the broadcaster's problems in this area, but it should also be abundantly clear that such action would represent a rather severe encroachment on the rights of minorities. It is admittedly difficult for a broadcaster to appreciate the tenet of the right of the minority in view of the screwballs and publicity seekers who are first to lay claim to such a right under present regulation.

In the case of the particular "idiocy" cited by Broadcasting magazine, what reason, other than to make section 315 appear absurd, could NBC have had for allowing this to take place? Indeed NBC was ordered by the FCC to give Mr. Daly equal time—but on the assumption that he met all of the criteria defining a legally qualified candidate.[4] In this case Mr. Daly was purportedly a candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for President. Mr. Daly had publicly announced his candidacy (at least to the FCC) and might have been voted for—but had he made a substantial showing that he was a bona fide candidate? What evidence of this latter fact did the FCC accept in ordering NBC to grant Mr. Daly time equal to that given Senator KENNEDY on the Jack Paar Show? When will some broadcaster risk a demerit from the FCC and take Mr. Daly to court, requiring him to prove (and the burden of proof would be his) that he is a bona fide candidate? NBC had the best opportunity possible in the situation above. Further some of the recent interpretive rulings by the Federal Communications Commission regarding the equal opportunity provision seem to beg the question: "Is the FCC itself interested in the repeal of the burdensome section 315?"[5] Finally it would seem that the ultimate solution, championed by CBS as well as by Broadcasting magazine—the repeal of section 315—would, if ever it were accomplished, eventually result in the imposition upon the broadcaster of new tests of objectivity, fairness, public service, etc. Although the 1959 amendment of section 315 may prove advantageous and even reasonably equitable, it would seem that the congressional resolution to waive the requirements of section 315 during the 1960 Presidential and Vice Presidential campaigns, if passed, would set an undesirable and seemingly dangerous precedent.

Both the Democratic and Republican candidates have clearly stated that they would like to debate issues on network television. The networks have offered prime time free to these two major candidates for such purposes—if Congress passes legislation to suspend the requirements of section 315 for the 1960 presidential and vice presidential campaigns. If such legislation is adopted the responsibility of the broadcaster will not be met simply by maintaining equity between major candidates. Service of the public interest would also require reasonable recognition of, and attention to, the campaigns and opinions of serious minority candidates for these high offices.

If section 315 is not suspended, and if the broadcaster really wants to program television debates, then there remain at least two possible alternatives.

One alternative assumes that the major candidates truly believe in the value of and the need for such debates. In this case the broadcaster could set aside certain periods of time for these debates, then notify all candidates for a particular office that he will provide equal opportunity to purchase an amount of time equal to that provided opponents in each debate program. The amount of time provided would depend upon the duration of the program and the number of candidates who wish to take advantage of the opportunity at that time. It could be made clear in the notification that if a candidate did not wish to accept the opportunity at that time, he would waive any future claim to time equal to that given opponents in that debate. Since this action would seem quite clearly to meet the letter and spirit of the law, there would be no reason to expect any serious legal problems. Further there is little reason to expect minority candidates to buy very many half hours of network time, and if the major candidates are seriously interested in television debates, they (or their parties) should be willing to invest in such a participation debate which would allow the participants to determine the ground rules.

A second alternative in broadcasting debates would be even more practicable than the previous alternative in view of the 1959 amendment to section 315. Since the debates currently anticipated by the candidates as well as by the broadcasters would hardly be debates in the formal sense, it would seem reasonable that the broadcaster might arrange for a debate similar to what is anticipated, at no cost to the candidates without the suspension of section 315. To accomplish this the broadcaster might make use of the exempt news interview format, so structuring it as to provide for two opposing candidates to be interviewed simultaneously. Interviewers could prepare in advance for questioning in depth on perhaps one or two particular issues for a program of this type. Upon entering discussion of a given issue each candidate could be asked to state briefly his position on that issue. During the course of such an interview each candidate might from time to time be allowed to question his opponent. Thus within the exempt news interview format the broadcaster could present to the public the most desirable qualities of the debate idea. With competent interviewers participating, and with a definite interview structure determined by the broadcaster, the result might even better serve the stated purpose of informing the public than the anticipipated debate idea which in order to be used would require the suspension of section 315.

If the public is not given the opportunity to observe the major presidential candidates in some form of debate, either the candidates themselves, or the broadcaster, or both, should be considered responsible. It seems abundantly clear that there is no vital need for further modification of section 315 for this general purpose. Further, the state of the television art has risen to the point where candidates need not be in the same location in order to participate in these programs, thus the mere fact that candidates are campaigning in different parts of the country would not be relevant.

The case for further modification of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 should be based upon reasoning other than the urgent need to clear the way for television debates in the 1960 election campaign.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 207, has merit. The impact of radio and television, particularly, on the American public is undoubtedly the greatest of any news or communications media. To suspend for the 1960 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for presidential and vice-presidential nominees will give the three major networks an opportunity for improved service to the voting public. It will, according to the plans proposed by the networks, and the invitations they have extended both presidential candidates, permit of full and free exchange of views, in prime viewing time, for the greater edification of our citizens.

It has been the experience in the past that, while the intent and purpose of section 315 has been valid, it has been impractical to achieve pure equality of opportunity for all political candidates. The networks have been open to demands from every conceivable type of officeseeker. And, in attempting to comply substantially with the section, programs have been foisted upon the public which have been of especially biased nature and, in many events, have not been of enlightening benefit to the public. I think it is important to our political processes functioning at their best if the people of our country are well informed with respect to political events and public issues. The people need to be schooled to make an informed choice among competing candidates for the highest offices in the land.

I believe the suspension of the requirements of section 315 to permit the networks to invite the presidential and vice-presidential candidates to develop their positions on issues through face-to-face discussion or debate, or through response to impartial well-informed questions, will best serve the public interest and permit of a more widely and better informed voter.

We are in a time of world travail when, more than ever, it is vital that the public be made aware. Under the equal time requirements of the Communications Act as it stands, television and radio facilities must be tendered to any legally qualified candidate for a particular public office if an opponent has had time on such facility. A legally qualified candidate is determined by the laws of the several States and, in some cases, may be a person whose name does not appear on a printed ballot. This has served and could again serve to clutter up the air. In this year, there is no third party of any significance with presidential and vice presidential candidates competing with the Republican and Democratic candidates. It seems to me, therefore, that we best serve the public interest to permit free and open discussion of the issues by the dominant parties, one of which will direct the destiny of the Nation, and perhaps the free world, in the next 4 years, and not have issues clouded by representatives of splinter organizations.

The three major networks—ABC, CBS, and NBC—have made it clear to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that, with section 315 suspended, they will devote absolutely equal time for the presentation of the Republican and Democratic presidential and vice presidential candidates. Programs would be on a flexible basis, with the candidates speaking on issues on which they had been consulted in advance, with the candidates themselves taking part in deciding on the format of such programs. Today more Americans get their news and information from television and radio than from any other media. There are almost three

[4] FCC Rules and Regulations, sec. 3.657a.

[5] See, for example, the FCC Interpretive Opinion of June 15, 1959, paragraph 57 et passim, and particularly the concurring statement of Commissioner Hyde.

times as many television and radio stations in the United States as there are newspapers. I believe the networks are to be commended, in view of the numbers they reach, in the desire, as was expressed by Mr. Robert E. Kintner, head of the National Broadcasting Co., "to best accomplish our purposes of familiarizing the public with the candidates and the issues." I do not believe this can be totally accomplished under the limitations of section 315.

There is, of course, the measure of fairness inherent in section 315. Under its standard of equal opportunities it prevents a network or facility from exercising its own discretion in determining which candidates represent sufficiently important political views to merit the use of the broadcast or telecast station. I am sure that, to suspend the requirements of this section for the 1960 campaign, the standard of fairness will remain as it treats of the major parties. Actually, it is enhanced as the suspension of the limitations gives the broadcasters an opportunity to contribute further to public understanding of the issues and personalities of the campaign.

I need not point out that we are not eliminating section 315 from the Communications Act but only suspending its requirements for this 1960 presidential campaign. It may be that when the effects of this suspension have been evaluated and presented to the Congress by March 1 of next year, we will have found ways to improve this and other sections of the act through the experience gained. Certainly, as the suspension is only with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President, we will be enabled to make comparisons as the campaign moves ahead. I believe such reappraising of this section will prove of inestimable value to the Congress, particularly in view of the ever-growing power of television and radio where exposure of a candidate can be most valuable to the candidate's prospects of success.

I believe the suspension of section 315 to thus permit the free peak-viewing time offered the Republican and Democratic presidential and vice presidential candidates is in another sense an equitable proposal. In past years, one party or the other has been able to buy more television and radio time because of a bigger campaign treasury, so one or the other has been more fortunate. Neither party is prevented by this resolution from buying time beyond that which the networks are offering free, so one party can still outdo the other. However, the greatest and most valuable exposure will be equal, and this is all to the good.

Also, as the networks have affirmed, the donation of this free time does not preclude appearances of the candidates during the campaign on regularly scheduled news and other types of programs now exempt under section 315.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution, one which is bound to have far-reaching effects, and one that should be passed to bring about what I believe will be a major step forward in the application of television and radio to our presidential campaigns.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to make this one point; then I will yield.

I believe the networks are going to do a good job because this is a voluntary request rather than by rules imposed on them. They said, "Give us this authority and we will accept the responsibility." I think they will do a good job voluntarily.

I now yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. With regard to a matter of time the gentleman just referred to, I have information as to how the networks propose to handle this, the time they will give to it. CBS proposes to devote 8 hours of prime time during the campaign. NBC proposes to provide 8 hours during the campaign. I think ABC has worked out time for 3 hours, but I believe that has been modified since and that they have promised an additional 5 hours. That is apparently the way it will work out.

Mr. SPRINGER. So that will give 24 hours during the fall which, I think, is satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rather comprehensive and persuasive statement made by the chairman and other members of the committee, I see no need to delay further the consideration of this resolution. I might just mention two points briefly.

There is always concern by minority parties and groups that they are going to be disbarred or discriminated against, so to speak, by a resolution such as this. We recognize in fact that licensees will probably only provide free time to two major parties. Obviously it would be an imposition by the networks on their listeners if every candidate for President or Vice President were permitted to have free time which is required under present law. This does not in my opinion abrogate nor deny any right to an individual nor group of individuals.

I am quite impressed by the fact that so many of the major newspapers of the country support this resolution in principle. I am further impressed by the fact that some newspapers who take pride in their stated concern over the rights of individual and minority groups are also in support of this resolution; namely, I am referring to an editorial in a local Washington newspaper, the Washington Post, on Saturday, the 21st of last May. So I think those Members of the House who are concerned about that aspect of this resolution may be reassured that the press usually of their point of view is in support of this resolution.

Another matter that I wish to touch on briefly is the feeling in my State and in other parts of the country that possibly too much television time was devoted to the conventions and other matters relating to the campaign. I do not know what you heard in your district, but I do know that at home I heard a lot of criticism that there was too much television coverage given to the two national conventions meeting in Chicago and Los Angeles. So, as I would interpret what I heard in Kansas which I think is probably representative of most districts in the United States, perhaps 8 hours time might be as much time as any one network should devote to the two major candidates. It might even be a little more than is necessary. Certainly we do not want to create the illusion, that the campaign is not important, but I think there are some other things that are likewise important. We who are in public life are so close to this matter we may overly evaluate or estimate how much public interest there is in these political matters.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the passage of this resolution and certainly urge further consideration of it in the next session of Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], a member of the committee, 3 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I find that my position on the resolution is substantially the same as that of my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

I am not going to oppose this resolution; however, my support goes most reluctantly and with serious reservations. I am not too concerned with the three major networks, but the suspension here goes to each and every licensee of the Federal Communications Commission; it goes not only to the groups that support the nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, on a national level, but for their campaigns at the local level and for the purchase of time for the statement of political views and for the presenting of spot announcements or advertisements.

In connection with individual broadcasters, I have been increasingly concerned over the number of complaints that I have received from persons of both political parties over the abuse of editorializing by licensees. Remember that in this instance editorializing is removed from any requirement for equal time. I am concerned with that increasingly partisan operation of some broadcasters. This can change from section to section as to whether it creates prejudice to a Republican or Democrat.

I think that we must make it abundantly clear at this point that this is an expedient. It does not represent a well-thought-out change in policy, a policy which has guided communications by radio since the Radio Act of 1927 and should not be construed as indicating an intent by the Congress, among the Members now seated, as an abandonment of present law. Perhaps upon examination of the experiment it may be possible to arrive at some formula for modifying the present law to remove the burden presently imposed of giving equal time to even the most inconsequential of candidates.

This is a serious step, and I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will carefully review the operation of this suspension, not only by networks, but by individual licensees throughout the Nation and at the same time give careful thought to the manner in which they discharge their responsibility.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to the gentleman, not only is it my intention, and I am sure it will be the committee's intention, to review this experiment, but to also observe its application during this campaign in 1960.

Mr. MOSS. I am pleased to have the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I know that in connection with the matter of editorializing he is as concerned as I have become with the abuses reported to us, abuses that are taking place in a number of parts of the country where editorializing becomes purely propaganda of the most partisan type. This is a resource belonging to the people, and its regulation, a regulation at great cost to government, creates the value. Without regulation of broadcasting there would be no value, no one would invest a dime in a station if the man next door could overlap his frequency.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

AMENDING SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12753) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign principal, and for other purposes, as amended.

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 section 20 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 20." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"'(6) an individual domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, supervised, directed, or controlled by a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;'.

"(c) Section 3(d) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 613(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical financial or mercantile activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting and collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the Neutrality Act of 1939 (22 U.S.C. 441 and the following), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;'.

"(d) Section 4(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Every person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this Act who imports or causes to be imported, or who transmits or causes to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, any political propaganda shall, not later than forty-eight hours after the beginning of the importation or transmittal thereof, send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such importation or transmittal.'

"(e) Section 4(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this Act to import or cause to be imported, or to transmit or cause to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any political propaganda unless such political propaganda is conspicuously marked at its beginning with, or prefaced or accompanied by, a true and accurate statement, in the language or languages used in such political propaganda, setting forth that the person importing or transmitting such political propaganda or causing it to be imported or transmitted is registered under this Act with the Department of Justice, Washington, District of Columbia, as an agent of a foreign principal, together with the name and address of such agent of a foreign principal and of each of his foreign principals; that, as required by this Act, his registration statement is available for inspection at and copies of such political propaganda are being filed with the Department of Justice; and that registration of agents of foreign principals required by the Act does not indicate approval by the United States Government of the contents of their political propaganda. The Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe the language or languages and the manner and form in which such statement shall be made and require the inclusion of such other information contained in the registration statement identifying such agent of a foreign principal and such political propaganda and its sources as may be appropriate.'

"(f) Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Any person not within the United States who uses the United States mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce within the United States to circulate or disseminate any political propaganda shall be regarded, for the purposes of this Act, as an agent of a foreign principal who is acting within the United States. This subsection shall have no application to any such person outside the United States when his use of the United States mails or a means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce within the United States is confined to the transmittal of political propaganda to a person registered under the terms of this Act.'"

SEC. 2. The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is further amended by inserting, immediately after section 20 thereof, the following new section:

"COMPTROLLER OF FOREIGN PROPAGANDA

"SEC. 20A. There is hereby established, in the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury, the Office of the Comptroller of Foreign Propaganda, to be located at the seat of the Government in Washington, District of Columbia. Such Office shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury and who shall have rank and compensation equal to that of the Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs. The Director shall be a citizen of the United States, qualified by at least five years' experience in the import control of political propaganda, and shall maintain close liaison with the appropriate committee of Congress in order that they may be advised regarding the control of Communist and other foreign propaganda brought to, and sought to be disseminated in, the United States. He shall perform those functions with respect to the control of Communist and other foreign propaganda which are vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, to the extent that the performance of such functions may be delegated to him by the Secretary, and he shall perform such other functions as the Secretary may prescribe."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will state it.

Mr. MEYER. Should not a Member opposed to the bill have that privilege?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Ohio opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHERER. No; I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MEYER. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment is designed to meet certain deficiencies in the Foreign Agents Registration Act. While there has been no expressed opposition to this bill or this proposed amendment, there has been considerable opposition to it expressed in flank attacks, the principal one of which was made by two men who wrote a series of articles, the prime purpose of which was to discredit the Committee on Un-American Activities and its work.

In this series of articles one of the writers stated that the Committee on Un-American Activities subpenaed the same witness to testify on 9 different occasions to the same thing. Well, the fact of the matter is that this witness testified on numerous occasions as to the manner in which propaganda was coming into the United States and showing

that it was pursuant to a pattern. Now, these newspaper people knew this, and their charges were vicious and dishonest and made for the purpose of attempting to divert from the American people the fact that this country is being literally inundated by propaganda coming principally from behind the Iron Curtain. I have numerous samples of it, and I am sure that most of you know of this type of propaganda coming to the United States. And there is no question but what this is propaganda. Nobody has any idea of attempting to censor legitimate information such as technical or scientific documents.

Let me say this to you, that every single item coming into the nearly 50 points of entry into the United States from behind the Iron Curtain has, as its purpose, an attack on our way of life and to bring to the American people some ideas of the alleged glories of life behind the Iron Curtain. The testimony that was adduced in support of this legislation, coming from a man by the name of Irving Fishman, Deputy Collector of Customs and who is the expert in this propaganda field, is to the effect that if the matter is permitted to accumulate for over 2 weeks' time, it will be impossible to place anything else in the warehouses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been reading the bill, and I want to respectfully ask whether there is any place in existing law—and I find nothing in the bill about it—that explains the difference between information as such and propaganda as such, and I would like to have a definition of "propaganda."

Mr. WALTER. The definition is contained in the Subversive Activities Control Act and also in the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act defines "propaganda" fully.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is in the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct. Now, you ask, "What is the purpose of this particular amendment?" Under the law it is necessary, in order to compel registration, to show that the propaganda came from a foreign government or from a foreign political party. It is quite obvious that it is very difficult to establish subsidization, and that a foreign government is in control of the dissemination of this propaganda. The purpose of this legislation is to plug that apparent loophole so that the mere fact that the information is sent to the United States gives rise immediately to a presumption which, of course, is rebuttable; but the presumption is that it comes as a part of a very definite program.

It is indeed unfortunate that there are in this country, and among us, those who are not aware of the fact that there is an international conspiracy having as its purpose the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force and violence. Just recently the American Federation of Teachers in Ohio, at their convention, adopted a resolution calling for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities, because of some hearings it conducted in California with reference to schoolteachers. The fact of the matter is that hearings such as they complained of, were not held. When the Committee on Un-American Activities received information concerning upward of 100 schoolteachers in the State of California, it caused subpenas to be issued and served on them. Then the people who were subpenaed got together and protested in public demonstrations against the hearings, that they thought were going to be held.

California Teachers Association, by Arthur F. Corey, State executive secretary, wrote to this committee inter alia:

3. Boards of education for districts employing subpenaed teachers whose alleged activities have aroused suspicion regarding their loyalties should be given opportunity to call these teachers to an executive session in which the questions specified in the California Dilworth Act (Education Code, sec. 12604) would be administered. When transcripts of such interrogation are received by the committee, the teachers who have answered the questions should be excused from appearing as witnesses before the committee. This would enable the committee to obtain the information it might desire related to the loyalty of these California teachers, and at the same time would enable school districts to face the new term without their teachers being held under a cloud of suspicion by the mere inclusion of their names in a list of witnesses. If the teachers cannot or will not give satisfactory answers to the legally mandated questions, the governing board will have authority to initiate action for suspension or dismissal.

The committee complied with the request of the California Teachers Association and followed the procedure which I outlined in the following letter of August 20, 1959, which reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1959.

Mr. ARTHUR F. COREY,
State Executive Secretary,
California Teachers Association,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. COREY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 17, 1959, respecting the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities which have been postponed to October 14, 1959 in San Francisco, and October 19, 1959, in Los Angeles. I have given careful consideration to your impressive letter and in response I should like to make several observations and announce a conclusion which I believe is sound.

In the first place, may I comment that I regret the circumstances which have compelled postponement twice of the hearings, especially in view of the fact that the names of a number of the persons who have been subpenaed have been made public by other agencies.

You will recall that on April 3 of this year the Committee on Un-American Activities released an extensive report on the Communist Party and its activities in California. This report was the result of many months of investigation and revealed several ramifications of the Communist conspiracy in California.

One facet of the Communist network in California which appeared to be serious but in which investigative techniques could not develop without employment of subpenaed power of the committee was the activity of persons in the Communist movement who had penetrated educational institutions. Most of the factual material in this field was developed from confidential sources which could not be disclosed without jeopardizing security procedures and the identity of informants.

The only course which seemed sound was for the committee to proceed to issue subpenas for a number of people to appear in executive session so that a record could be made which could be the basis for public disclosure of a serious situation. Believe me, sir, the subpenas were not issued for service promiscuously nor have persons been directed to appear before the committee without careful consideration of confidential reports in each case.

There are pending in the Congress several legislative proposals designed to cope with Communist strategies and techniques for which the factual material that has been developed on this situation in California is pertinent and germane. One such legislative proposal is alluded to in your letter to me, namely, the so-called loyalty oaths. At this point, may I comment that the Committee on Un-American Activities operates under a continuing mandate of the House of Representatives to maintain a surveillance over the administration and operation of all our internal security legislation. Since the Communist operation is constantly changing its strategies and tactics, we are obliged to continuously explore factual situations which reveal these strategies and tactics in order that we can appraise the adequacies of our internal security legislation.

You will note from the enclosed report which I am sending with this letter the great number of recommendations for legislation and executive action which have stemmed from committee investigations.

The workload of the Committee on Un-American Activities is such that we cannot possibly discharge our duties in the Congress on other matters and thoroughly explore each of the several occurring and recurring problems of communism in the Nation. We feel that we are doing a creditable job, however, and have the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people as we seek to keep abreast of at least the general patterns of Communist activity.

With this in mind, I welcome your suggestion that in the instant committee project in California, we should transmit to the boards of education for the school districts employing subpenaed teachers the names of such teachers so that they may be interrogated by such boards which would then transmit to the committee a copy of the transcript of the proceedings. I am further persuaded that this is a good course of action by the fact that it would give the local school boards a firsthand opportunity to acquaint themselves with some of the problems which occur in the fight against Communists and communism in this country. This course would, moreover, enable the Committee on Un-American Activities to expend the time which it has allocated for hearings on the coast to other areas of Communist activity which could not possibly be handled by local authorities.

I am, therefore, instructing the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities to make available to each board of education in California the names of the persons subpenaed within the districts of such board and in cases in which information respecting the persons subpenaed can be disclosed without jeopardizing sources of information or security procedures, to make such information available in confidence. I am advised, however, that most of the cases reflect information which could not, because of the foregoing, be made available to the boards.

Under the Dilworth Act, as you note in your letter to me, provision is made for the governing board of school districts to interrogate the employees on matters relating

to the Communist Party and Communist activities. I hope that each school board will bear in mind a technique which we have recently discovered by members of the Communist Party to attempt to evade query by governing investigative bodies, namely, to resign technical membership in the formal entity known as the Communist Party, but to maintain themselves under Communist discipline in the Communist operation.

May I take this occasion to state further that the Committee on Un-American Activities will hold hearings in California at a time to be announced in the course of the next several months on certain other aspects of the Communist operation there.

With very best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. The statement has been made that these teachers who were subpenaed were held up to public ridicule, and that their names were made known to the public. I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman whether or not the Committee on Un-American Activities made public the names of these teachers when they were served with subpenas.

Mr. WALTER. No; the Committee on Un-American Activities did not divulge the names of these witnesses. The fact of the matter is that after some of these people were subpenaed they held an indignation meeting, and they attempted to raise a fund for the purpose of preventing the committee from conducting hearings in this field. The committee gave out no information; many were identified by the same people who were subpenaed who protested too loud.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the legislation before us will not prohibit this communistic propaganda from coming into the United States, but it merely provides for a certainty that it shall be labeled as Communist or political propaganda?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I think I said that. Anything at all can be sent into the United States, but if it is Communist progapanda then under the Foreign Agents Registration Act it should be labeled as that.

Mr. SCHERER. Under the present act it is required to be labeled, but our hearings disclosed that about 10 million pieces of this Communist propaganda come into the country each year that are not labeled as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, that is a fact. The pattern that was developed by Irving Fishman in his testimony before us was that the same material that came in, for example, to the port of Buffalo, was printed in Polish because there is a large Polish population in that area, and the same material when it was delivered, for example, to San Francisco, was published in Chinese because of the large Chinese population there. So it went all over the United States. When Irving Fishman testified, I think it was nine times, concerning this material, it was because he was establishing a pattern, and nobody has contradicted this testimony. I am sure that nobody has been fooled by the vicious attacks made on this very reputable and reliable witness. by the newspaper articles of Don Oberdorfer and Walter Pincus in the Washington Post.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the evidence before our committee declares that the Communist progaganda machine has developed certain techniques and procedures whereby they have succeeded in getting around the labeling of this propaganda as such? That is the evidence, that they succeeded in evading the present Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Mr. WALTER. They have just ignored the law completely, and the Attorney General has not proceeded because, as I stated before, he could not prove all the elements necessary in order to make out the offense.

Mr. SCHERER. All this legislation is doing is plugging up the loopholes in order to prevent them from circumventing the present law?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly. I think this is what the Attorney General feels is necessary in order to compel these people who are flooding this country with Communist propaganda to label the material for what it actually is.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman tell us what the term "propaganda" means in this legislation? What happens with respect to scientific periodicals that come into this country, for example, that are disseminated among our universities and various scientific institutions? Will they have to be labeled as foreign propaganda under this law?

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman knows no technical publication which could possibly by any stretch of the imagination be considered as propaganda. But let me tell you this: The college professors who are today receiving this technical material are on the same mailing list to which goes all sorts of Communist propaganda. Just the other day, one of the professors at Lafayette College, a neighbor of mine in Pennsylvania, brought to me some Communist propaganda. He told me it had gone to every professor in the engineering department, which is the department in which he serves. Now this was not a technical matter. This was Communist propaganda pure and simple and had to do with the alleged rapes by our soldiers on women in South Korea.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Do I understand the chairman's answer to be that if an article is contained in a Russian scientific periodical that there is no need for such an article or for that periodical to be registered under this law?

Mr. WALTER. Of course not.

Mr. YATES. There is not?

Mr. WALTER. No, and there is no intention on the part of anybody to require the labeling or registration of that type of material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on the surface this is one of those bills that we all could very easily support. Certainly, the general overall objectives of it are good. But, I think there are some hidden jokers in it, and I rise to point out some of the things that we might well question as to whether we are actually moving in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, my attention was first called to this whole matter by a professor of Russian history at the University of Vermont. He wrote to me that periodicals which he had ordered by subscription were denied to him by the customs and post office people. Finally, he did get them after a great deal of trouble. But, the whole matter of the legality of this has never been brought up for constitutional determination. In fact, I believe a part of this legislation seeks to cover this up at the present time. I think there is something wrong when professors in our colleges cannot get the information they need for their course work. Furthermore, other individuals have complained to me that they have subscribed to certain periodicals and, then, to get them they have had to put their name down on record, which means in turn that their names could be quoted at a later date as people who were interested in getting Communist propaganda rather than, perhaps, as individuals who wanted to get information that they really needed.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is this. How are we going to define what is political propaganda? If that were clear and if that could be done, then I would have no objection on that score. But I do not believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania has adequately answered the question as to what is political propaganda. To some people even a picture or a painting could be political propaganda. It is all in how you look at it.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is this and I read from the report on the bill. The report says:

(a) Every person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act who imports or causes to be imported, or who transmits or causes to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any political propaganda shall—

And so forth. In another place, it says:

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act to import or cause to be imported, or to transmit or cause to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any political propaganda.

The report also reads:

(e) Any person not within the United States who uses the United States mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce within the United States to circulate or disseminate any political propaganda shall be regarded, for the purposes of this act, as an agent of a foreign principal who is acting within the United States.

To me, Mr. Speaker, this means that we can label almost anyone an agent of a foreign government and, thus, shut out the flow of information to the United States that is needed not only by us, but by professors and many other individuals as well. I question whether this is a wise proceeding.

Furthermore, when it comes to the matter of the Comptroller, under section 20–A, I understand, and to the best of my knowledge know, that there were no hearings about this provision at all. It is stated here that it should be a man with at least 5 years experience in the import and control of political propaganda. I just wonder how many people are qualified for this job in the United States.

So I would sum up that before we pass this legislation there are many unanswered questions that we have to repeat, many things we are entitled to know, because we do want to shut out those Communist activities which are improper and which are harmful to our country, but certainly we do not want to start a type of control that comes upon us merely because we do not have an opportunity to read and consider and discriminate and make our own decisions. To me, this is exactly against the very principles of our Government. I believe that on this floor we should exercise more discrimination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman has referred to the term "political propaganda" contained in the present bill. I find in the Foreign Agents Registration Act, title XXII, the definition of "political propaganda" which will be applied under this bill. It reads:

The term "political propaganda" includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person first, which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissensions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My question is this: As I read that definition, I recall I used to read the London Economist. Now somebody is sending me a French magazine. It seems almost impossible for me to read any publication coming from a foreign country, whether official or unofficial, without being in some respect influenced with respect to my thinking.

Mr. MEYER. Does the gentleman mean that almost anything could be construed to be political propaganda, depending upon who is making the determination?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that would be the case. I would go further and ask the gentleman's comment in regard to section 209, page 5, lines 17 and 18. It seems to me the Congress is tying the hands of the President. Control of political propaganda is not a large field of job opportunities, and the number of men who may have such qualifications might be limited. I do not remember seeing in other laws such a tight definition of who may be appointed.

Are we not also running the risk of converting any foreign publication by later interpretation into "political propaganda"? The Constitution says that Congress shall pass no law interfering with the freedom of the press and freedom of speech. It seems to me that we transgress the constitutional limitation in approving such broad language as this.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Does the gentleman understand that the legislation in our bill changes the definition of political propaganda as contained in the Foreign Registration Act of 1938? All this does is to provide that it shall be properly labeled.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to answer the gentleman's statement. It is true, as you say, but I would say to the gentleman there are many scientific articles that probably would be clear, but I remember quite definitely when a Russian biologist advanced a certain theory dealing with heredity, and at that time this was broadly labeled as propaganda.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I know the gentleman does not want his earlier statement misunderstood in which he quoted from this amendment, and quoted to the effect:

It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign country and required to register to import or cause to be imported—

And if my memory serves me correctly the gentleman stopped there. The gentleman recognizes, I am sure, that the balance of the sentence includes the proviso—

Unless there shall be this registration and this identification.

And I am sure the gentleman understands this is not a flat prohibition, it is a prohibition unless certain requirements are met. I am sure the gentleman wants the RECORD to be very clear on that point.

Mr. MEYER. I would like it to be, and I think the gentleman is correct.

But the point involved is that it is already so. To get some information now, this clause makes it all the more difficult. I do not care who you stop from sending material that we do not want, but I object to this prohibition applied to what I believe it could be applied to; namely, many legitimate sources of information.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman acknowledges that this prohibition is conditioned by this matter of labeling.

Mr. MEYER. Absolutely, absolutely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT.]

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to ask one or two questions and to make one comment. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether it is the legislative intent of the committee that the definition of political propaganda which is contained not in the act which we are amending but in the Foreign Registration Act—is it the intent of the committee that that definition shall apply to this act?

Mr. WALTER. Actually what this proposes—and I am sure everyone who expressed opposition knows it—this does nothing at all to existing law. It merely adds one thing; namely, that it is not necessary to prove that the organization disseminating the information is subsidized in whole or in part by a foreign government. That is all it does; and what you have been talking about and what the gentleman from Vermont has been talking about is entirely irrelevant; it has nothing to do with the proposed amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the distinguished gentleman then tell me also on page 6, in order that the legislative intent of the committee may be clear, whether the last sentence with reference to this new office which is being set up: "and he shall perform such other functions as the Secretary may prescribe," is that intended to mean only such as is already a part, as legislatively described, of the Secretary's duties?

Mr. WALTER. Of course that is the intent; and the only reason the committee felt it was desirable to spell out its application was because we did not feel that the occupant of this position as liaison officer ought to be purely a politician. We were hoping it would be somebody who was conversant in this field so that no possible injustice could be done to anyone.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I certainly thank the chairman. I am sure we do not want to go to the extent—which I am sure would be abhorrent to most Americans—as to make this a form of censorship.

May I also ask you, sir, because I think perhaps inadvertently in your remarks you made the statement that the State of California following up the investigations that had been made as the result of material supplied by the House Un-American Activities Committee, had fired certain California teachers because of their affiliations. My question is: "Do you have effective proof such firings as took place of those who had been subpenaed were based on grounds of the Communist affiliations? The specific reason was not given, as a matter of

fact. Therefore it would be perhaps unfair to label them as Communists unless such specific reason had been given.

Mr. WALTER. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from California that not one single subpena was issued for any people connected with the school system of the State of California who was not an identified Communist; and the people who were discharged from their employment were discharged by the several school districts of the State of California based entirely on the result of independent inquiries conducted by the school districts.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. However, may I specifically say that the gentleman has not answered my question. My question was: Did the State of California or any other local institution say that their firings were because of Communist activity on the part of the persons fired?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know how to spell it out, but I was saying that every one of the individuals, of the hundred people subpenaed by the committee in any capacity, none of them was required to testify because of the intercession of the State of California; every single one of those people was identified at some time or other as being a Communist.

The gentleman may want those kind of people to teach his children in California, but there are people who do not.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to take the position that of the 100 named, well over 90 percent were not fired. Does that mean it was conclusively proven they were not Communists upon the very definition the gentleman has given?

Mr. WALTER. It does not prove that at all. It simply proves that the school authorities were derelict in their duty or they did not make use of the information furnished.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All I can say, then, is in that particular instance I would have to stand behind the school authorities of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult bill for us to consider because it is primarily amending other existing law. It goes into an area concerning which certainly the mood of the American people is this: If there is Communist propaganda coming in we would like it to be identified as such. But this bill refers not merely to Communist propaganda but to any political propaganda. The bill refers to it in terms of a very broad definition; indeed, it is so broad that while the intent may be as narrow as just stated by the chairman, the terms of the language of the bill which he reported to the House, put on the statute books a grant of authority which might well at some future time be used for proceedings far beyond the limited purpose to which he alludes.

I therefore now find myself, Mr. Speaker, in the same position that I have found myself in once or twice here before. That is to say, as one who has taken an oath and affirmation to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic, I must abide by the spirit of that Constitution. Therefore I must here register my protest against what I believe to be a proposed statute that is drawn so broadly as to transgress certainly on the spirit and quite possibly the letter of the Constitution itself.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, in response to an earlier question the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicated that technical publications did not qualify as political propaganda.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask the gentleman, Does he know any case where legitimate technical information has ever been questioned by the Justice Department?

Mr. YATES. I know of none. I was seeking an answer to what is within the purview of the definition. My question is now addressed to subparagraph (e) on page 4, and I should like to ask the gentleman as to whether or not publications from a foreign country, such as the London Economist or Manchester Guardian, for example, or other newspapers of that type, which contain articles about Russia, or other Communist countries, and which might be construed by some stretch of the imagination to be brought within the purview of the definition of political propaganda in the act to which the gentleman referred in his answer to the gentleman from Colorado, and whether this section is intended to cover such newspaper or magazine articles.

Mr. WALTER. Well, if the Christian Science Monitor is a Communist publication, then the London Economist is. That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. YATES. I submit the gentleman has not answered my question. This section is about a person not within the United States who uses the U.S. mails or some other governmental instrumentality. The Christian Science Monitor is published in this country. I am talking about a foreign publication which does use the U.S. mails, for instance, a newspaper. Is it the intent of this section to include such a publication?

Mr. WALTER. Of course not.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In earlier comment, Mr. Chairman, I asked a question which I now ask of you. On page 5, lines 17 through 19, you specify, "The Director shall be a citizen of the United States, qualified by at least 5 years' experience in the import control of political propaganda." Could you give the House some indication as to how many persons might qualify for appointment by the President under the language?

Mr. WALTER. I should say 51, offhand. That is all I can say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Fifty-one separate persons?

Mr. WALTER. At least 51 should qualify.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Who would qualify under this act?

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for that answer.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; for a brief statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if the opposition to this bill comes from substantially the same group and on the same theory that led the opposition to the creation of the committee and all of its subsequent activities.

Mr. SCHERER. I will answer that—yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want his answer. What does the chairman say?

Mr. WALTER. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you know?

Mr. SCHERER. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Speaker, numerous hearings conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal that approximately 10 million pieces of Communist propaganda is coming into the United States from behind the Iron Curtain each year. Now, this propaganda is not only printed in English but in 13 different languages, and it is directed to different nationality groups throughout the United States. The evidence was clear that whenever the Russian propaganda machine wanted a certain nationality group within the United States to take a certain position on a current political issue, that particular nationality group was flooded with Communist propaganda directed to that issue.

Now, as has been said, this legislation in nowise prohibits this propaganda from continuing to come into the United States through the U.S. mails. It merely says that it shall be labeled as was contemplated by the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 so that when a person gets the material he will know where it comes from, just the same as our pure food and drug law requires that we must label certain drugs as being poisonous, so that the individual can evaluate the propaganda better and know its source. This is all this bill is designed to do.

The question is raised: What kind of propaganda do we want to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act? Here is a piece (of propaganda) that was part of the evidence in the hearings in Buffalo. Thousands of these pamphlets were sent into the United States in 10 different languages. But listen to some of the propaganda. This is the type of vicious propaganda we are talking about—that we want properly labeled. This was printed not years ago but in 1959, and it came out of Peking, China. Listen to this:

> American imperialists have committed atrocities unprecedented in the history of mankind in their aggressive war in Korea. They have massacred at random innocent people in North Korea.

Now, we do not believe this tripe, but it is printed in different languages all over the world for the purpose of creating ill will and hatred toward the United

States. They do not talk about atrocities committed during the Korean war; they talk about alleged atrocities committed since the Korean war. This is what it says:

DATA ON ATROCITIES OF U.S. ARMY IN SOUTH KOREA

The atrocities of the U.S. Army in South Korea have been steadily increasing since the armistice.

Then they talk about "raping and killing women" by boys in the armed services. Then in another part of this pamphlet they say:

On February 25, 1958, in Poopyung, two U.S. officers and one corporal ruthlessly tortured a Korean boy, nailed him into a wooden box, and carried him away by a helicopter.

This is the type of propaganda coming into this country, millions and millions of pieces of it a year, and, because the Communists have developed techniques for avoiding the requirements in the 1938 Foreign Agents' Registration Act, which requires that this propaganda be labeled, it gets into the country unlabeled. All we are trying to do is to plug up the loopholes so that the spirit and intent of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act, which has been on the books since 1938, will be complied with by the Communist propaganda machine.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HIESTAND. Will the gentleman state to whom this type of propaganda is addressed in this country?

Mr. SCHERER. This propaganda is sent largely to people who have connections behind the Iron Curtain, who have relatives there, who have come from there. Much of this type of propaganda, which is printed in the slick-paper-covered type magazine, and which is subtle, is directed to colleges and universities. This magazine was sent to us by a professor of one of our leading universities. He himself said something must be done in order that the American people will be alerted to the fact that this type of material is actually political propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, since my time is limited, I include an article on this subject which I wrote for the magazine American Opinion:

AND THE GERMS COME BY THE MILLIONS

The second example is even more significant. Today there are coming into this country each year through the U.S. mail approximately 10 million pieces of subtle, effective Communist propaganda from Iron Curtain countries and Communist centers located in friendly nations. Let me describe one of a series of almost identical committee hearings dealing with Communist political propaganda, held in a few of the 45 ports of entry for mail in the United States.

Our committee met in Buffalo in October of last year. On the courtroom floor were dozens of large sacks of mail directed to the Buffalo area which came from behind the Iron Curtain. Sacks were opened at random and their contents dumped on the tables. Eighty percent of the mail in those sacks was pro-Russian propaganda in one form or another, emanating from Communist countries, addressed to people in the Buffalo community. Part of this propaganda, printed in eleven different languages, is directed to various nationality groups; often to individuals who have migrated to the United States from satellite nations, or who have families still living under the Kremlin's heel.

The propaganda is cleverly and subtly presented in magazines, newspapers, and pamphlets which, from a casual perusal, do not reveal the poison they contain. Expensive magazines, comparable in size and format to our Life and Look, are sent free, or sell for only a small fraction of the cost of printing. They are obviously subsidized by the Communist propaganda agencies, since they carry no advertising whatsoever.

The U.S. Information Agency testified that the boys in the Kremlin are spending approximately $3 billion a year on all forms of Communist propaganda, directed to every country in the world. Exactly what portion of this amount the comrades spend for the edification of the people of the United States is in the process of being determined. However, these bright-colored pictorial magazines, newspapers, and seemingly innocuous pamphlets, containing articles bearing attractive titles, are at this very moment being shipped into this country in huge quantities and at an accelerated rate.

THE DEAD RED HERRING

Those who want you to believe that the Communist Party is shattered, ineffective, and dying, and that the investigating committees are beating a dead horse for headlines, point to the recent folding up of the Daily Worker to sustain their charges. But the Daily Worker's demise was not a natural death. It was a well-planned suicide. The Daily Worker for years boldly carried the Communist line. It was the source of valuable information for both the FBI and the committees. Old issues carried the Communist activities of a long list of now indignant and self-righteous brethren who are today attempting to destroy or to handcuff the Bureau and the congressional investigating committees. The Daily Worker of yesterday was coming out of the archives too often to haunt these fellow travelers.

It is obvious that self-preservation, and not the Communists' pious interest in the preservation of the so-called civil rights of their fellow citizens, has prompted their recent tawdry efforts to cut off the appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities. So let's not be too jubilant over the Daily Worker's sham burial rites. The conspiracy has only switched its strategy by flooding this country with more subtle propaganda.

The evidence at the hearings shows that when the Communists want to influence the attitude of certain nationality groups in this country on current political and other issues there appears a rash of concentrated mailings to these groups, carrying the Communist line on the issue.

AND THE LIVE LEECHES

As I have said, people who receive these mailings are often those who have fled Iron Curtain countries and settled in the United States, or who have families and relatives in those countries. They become greatly disturbed when they find that the Communists know their addresses in the United States. Many were so upset that they changed their residences and their names. Some became panic stricken when, within a few weeks thereafter, similar mailings arrived bearing their new addresses and their changed names.

Our committee determined how these addresses were obtained by the oversea Communist propagandists. The findings illustrate how effective one Communist can be. The argument made by the leftwing that there is nothing to fear because there are so few Communists in the United States is again negated. Here is one method used. A member of the Communist Party joins, say, a Polish singing society. His Communist connections, of course, are unknown to the members of the group. He surreptitiously obtains the mailing list of the organization. One of his obligations to the Communist conspiracy is fulfilled when he sneaks that list behind the Iron Curtain.

Let me give you a few excerpts from the record of the hearings which indicate how these people feel about the material they receive. In order to protect them, the transcript of the hearings does not contain their names and addresses.

A woman writes to a postal official as follows:

"Lately I have been receiving propaganda from abroad. I do not know who sent my name in or how they found my address. Please return this material. My husband and I do not want trouble with this Government."

One person begs: "Please do not let these things pass through. I do not need this smelly stuff."

A former resident of Berlin has this to say:

"I would like to advise you that I do not want any mail sent to me sealed from Berlin. This is a black, dirty Communist Party literature to return us new Americans to our native countries. I am loyal to my new home, the U.S.A., and do not want to hear any of that kind of literature. Please destroy all that."

A group of displaced persons wrote as follows:

"We, the displaced persons. been getting by mail Communist propaganda here in five different languages. First it started with small sheets, now they are mailing large printed sheets over every other month calling us back, it is our duty to be back in your own country. * * * We shorten the working hours and raise the pay 30 percent, don't slave there, they don't want you there where you are now slaving your life out.

"We are very sorry we cannot give our names and addresses in this letter; we are in fear of danger same as five Russian seamen being kidnapped from here, most of us are as citizen now. * * * All we ask kindly to stop the propaganda mail coming over so we can live peacefully; we don't want their propaganda here and we don't want to be victims."

A professor at one of our universities, as late as January 10 of this year, wrote to the committee in part as follows:

"I am enclosing a bit of East German literary work. It is to be assumed that it is being circulated in appreciable quantity in this country by mail. * * *

"I am concerned about the influence of this propaganda upon the average person in this country. While one may argue that no red-blooded American could ever be affected by this literature, it is my experience that it requires more than an ordinary degree of sophistication in these matters to become fully aware of the presumptuousness of this magazine. * * *

"This is obviously a government-subsidized venture; no East German publisher is in a position to finance this grade of translation which, by Iron Curtain standards, is of excellent graphic quality. They take unfair advantage of the absence of censorship by the U.S. mail to further their shady cause, which is to cast doubt upon the U.S. position toward Russia. They provide additional eyewash for those who are eager to forget the Hungarian struggle for freedom, and to break down American morale by 'proving' that the Russians aren't so bad after all. * * *

"This is sneaky business. * * * The magazine I am enclosing was mailed to my address at an institute of higher learning, and the expectation is quite obviously to get wide circulation in a group of comparatively high intelligence. * * * It is an example of the new twist in Red psychological warfare. * * *

"The stuff is poisonous and, even if the reader is critical, too many of the facts are out of his reach. Maybe some education by your committee of potential recipients of such propaganda would help."

POISON FOR THE GULLIBLE

Of course, I would not want to lead you to believe that the propaganda is directed solely to nationality groups and those who have ties in Iron Curtain countries. In fact, only a small percentage of the total propaganda coming through the mails is devoted to this group. Of the more than 1,000 different types of these periodicals which come to our shores each year, the great mass is printed in English and goes to native-born Americans; to our libraries, colleges, seminaries, and to people with extreme leftwing propensities who are in positions to mold American opinion.

There is another facet to this Communist propaganda offensive. Some months ago the country was flooded with what purported to be scientific radio journals from the Soviet Union. Great prominence was given in these journals to a quiz for ham radio operators. A series of prizes were offered to the winners.

It is significant that, after the contestant had answered the questions, which in themselves were filled with propaganda, he was asked to give his address, the call letters of his radio station, and other pertinent information about his activities as a ham operator. It would be presumptous for me to detail how highly valuable such information is, not only to the propagandists but also to the Russian secret police.

Our postal and customs officials testified that of the tremendous number who participated in this contest, several thousand won "the second prize." It was a copy of a publication entitled "Radio Moscow." The Communists certainly got a lot of mileage out of the rubles spent on this one.

AND LIES FOR THE INNOCENT

Perhaps the most revealing development was brought to light in hearings at New York. These hearings were being held a few months after the Hungarian revolution. One of the exhibits was a magazine dated a few months before the Hungarian freedom fighters rebelled against Communist oppression. It was published in Hungary, but printed in English, and widely distributed in the United States.

It was interesting to read, immediately after the revolution, from this propaganda sheet printed immediately before the revolution, how the Hungarian people were happy and content and how they were prospering under the Communist regime. This piece of propaganda was done so cleverly that, had not the revolution and subsequent Russian atrocities taken place, thousands of Americans, particularly those of Hungarian extraction, would have been duly convinced of the alleged success of a benevolent Communist regime in Hungary.

SHOULD BE LABELED

Some readers will ask what legislative purpose, other than exposing this phase of the cold war, did the House Committee on Un-American Activities have in making the investigations and holding the hearings I have been discussing in this article.

Under the first amendment of the Constitution, which prohibits interference with freedom of speech and the press, these publications cannot be banned. The committee had no thought of attempting to do so. We do, however, have a law known as the Foreign Agents' Registration Act, which requires that all political and subversive propaganda coming from abroad must be properly labeled so that the recipient will know the source and nature of the material. Our pure food and drug laws require that bottles and packages containing certain foods and medicines, especially poison, must be labeled as to content. If the law requires that poison which may go into our stomachs must be clearly identified, it certainly should require that poison for the mind be also unmistakably labeled.

While the Foreign Agents' Registration Act apparently requires proper labeling, the loopholes and weaknesses are such that our customs and postal officials testified that they never saw one piece of the propaganda I have been talking about so labeled, except that which was sent to the Library of Congress, embassies, and other agencies of Government.

The straw of absurdity that broke the camel's back of patience in these hearings was the development of the fact that the taxpayers of the United States, who at present are subsidizing our tremendous postal deficit, help to pay the heavy cost of delivering this propaganda which would destroy us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 395, nays 3, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—395

Abbitt	Burke, Mass.	Fino
Abernethy	Burleson	Fisher
Adair	Byrne, Pa.	Flood
Addonizio	Byrnes, Wis.	Flynn
Albert	Cahill	Flynt
Alexander	Canfield	Fogarty
Alford	Cannon	Foley
Alger	Carnahan	Forand
Allen	Casey	Ford
Andersen, Minn.	Cederberg	Forrester
	Celler	Fountain
Andrews	Chamberlain	Frazier
Anfuso	Chelf	Frelinghuysen
Arends	Chenoweth	Friedel
Ashmore	Chiperfield	Fulton
Aspinall	Church	Gallagher
Auchincloss	Clark	Garmatz
Avery	Coad	Gary
Ayres	Coffin	Gathings
Bailey	Cohelan	Gavin
Baker	Collier	George
Baldwin	Colmer	Giaimo
Barden	Conte	Gilbert
Barr	Cook	Glenn
Barrett	Cooley	Goodell
Barry	Corbett	Granahan
Bass, N.H.	Cramer	Gray
Bass, Tenn.	Cunningham	Green, Oreg.
Bates	Curtin	Green, Pa.
Becker	Curtis, Mass.	Griffin
Beckworth	Curtis, Mo.	Griffiths
Belcher	Daddario	Gross
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Gubser
Bennett, Mich.	Daniels	Hagen
Bentley	Davis, Ga.	Haley
Berry	Delaney	Halleck
Betts	Dent	Halpern
Blatnik	Denton	Hardy
Blitch	Derounian	Hargis
Boggs	Devine	Harmon
Boland	Diggs	Harris
Bolton	Dingel	Harrison
Bonner	Dixon	Hays
Bosch	Donohue	Healey
Bow	Dooley	Hechler
Boykin	Dorn, N.Y.	Hemphill
Brademas	Dorn, S.C.	Henderson
Bray	Dowdy	Herlong
Breeding	Downing	Hiestand
Brewster	Doyle	Hoeven
Brock	Dulski	Hoffman, Ill.
Brooks, La.	Dwyer	Hoffman, Mich.
Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson	Hogan
Broomfield	Elliott	Holland
Brown, Ga.	Everett	Holt
Brown, Mo.	Evins	Holtzman
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Horan
Broyhill	Farbstein	Hosmer
Buckley	Fascell	Huddleston
Budge	Feighan	Hull
Burke, Ky.	Fenton	Ikard
Inouye	Milliken	Santangelo
Irwin	Mills	Saund
Jackson	Minshall	Saylor
Jarman	Moeller	Schenck
Jennings	Monagan	Scherer
Jensen	Montoya	Schneebeli
Johansen	Moore	Schwengel
Johnson, Calif.	Moorhead	Scott
Johnson, Md.	Morgan	Selden
Johnson, Wis.	Morris, N. Mex.	Shelley
Jonas	Morris, Okla.	Sheppard
Jones, Ala.	Moss	Shipley
Jones, Mo.	Moulder	Short
Judd	Multer	Sikes
Karsten	Mumma	Siler
Karth	Murphy	Simpson
Kasem	Natcher	Sisk
Kastenmeier	Nelsen	Slack
Kearns	Nix	Smith, Calif.
Kee	Norblad	Smith, Iowa
Keith	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Kelly	O'Brien, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Keogh	O'Hara, Ill.	Spence
Kilday	O'Hara, Mich.	Springer
Kilgore	O'Konski	Staggers
King, Calif.	O'Neill	Steed
King, Utah	Osmers	Stratton
Kitchin	Ostertag	Stubblefield
Kluczynski	Passman	Sullivan
Knox	Patman	Taber
Kyl	Pelly	Taylor, N.C.
Lafore	Perkins	Teague, Calif.
Laird	Pfost	Teller
Landrum	Philbin	Thomas
Lane	Pilcher	Thompson, N.J.
Langen	Pillion	Thompson, Tex.
Lankford	Pirnie	Thomson, Wyo.
Latta	Poage	Thornberry
Lennon	Poff	Toll
Lesinski	Porter	Tollefson
Levering	Powell	Trimble
Libonati	Preston	Tuck
Lindsay	Price	Udall
Lipscomb	Prokop	Ullman
Loser	Pucinski	Utt
McCormack	Quie	Van Pelt
McCulloch	Quigley	Van Zandt
McDonough	Rabaut	Vinson
McDowell	Rains	Wainwright
McFall	Randall	Wallhauser
McGinley	Ray	Walter
McGovern	Reece, Tenn.	Wampler
McIntire	Rees, Kans.	Watts
McMillan	Reuss	Weaver
Macdonald	Rhodes, Ariz.	Weis
Machrowicz	Rhodes, Pa.	Westland
Mack	Riehlman	Wharton
Madden	Riley	Whitener
Mahon	Rivers, Alaska	Whitten
Mailliard	Roberts	Widnall
Marshall	Robison	Wier
Martin	Rodino	Williams
Mason	Rogers, Colo.	Wilson
Matthews	Rogers, Fla.	Winstead
May	Rogers, Tex.	Wolf
Meader	Rooney	Wright
Merrow	Roosevelt	Yates
Metcalf	Rostenkowski	Young
Michel	Roush	Younger
Miller, Clem	Rutherford	Zablocki
Miller, N.Y.	St. George	Zelenko

NAYS—3

Johnson, Colo.	Kowalski	Meyer

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson, Mont.	Hébert	Norrell
	Hess	Oliver
Ashley	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Baring	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Baumhart	Kirwan	Smith, Kans.
Bolling	McSween	Taylor, N.Y.
Bowles	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, George P.	Thompson, La.
Dawson		Vanik
Derwinski	Mitchell	Willis
Durham	Morrison	Withrow
Grant	Murray	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Willis with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Withrow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues in the House, I have been watching with great interest the action on social security amendments in the other body.

Of course, I was pleased that the Senate version of H.R. 12580 retains the provision eliminating the age 50 requirement for eligibility under the disability insurance program, since my own bill, H.R. 917, was directed at this needed change in the law.

The proposed reduction in the retirement age from 65 to 62 years for men and the increase in the outside earnings limitation to $1,800 a year, are also worthwhile amendments which I have urged for many years.

It is regrettable that a number of liberalizing amendments contained in the House bill were eliminated by the Senate Finance Committee, including those provisions improving the unemployment compensation system. However, I am hopeful that floor amendments in the other body may restore these important provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest disappointment in the Senate Finance Committee version of H.R. 12580 was the failure to provide for an adequate and workable program to provide medical care for the aged within the established social security system.

I hope that some action will be taken in regard to catastrophic illness, the cost of which is a heavy burden on many families in the Nation, particularly among our aged citizens. Social justice calls for legislation to ease the burden of catastrophic illness, which often wipes out a lifetime of savings and toil for many of our citizens. Home, farms, possessions, are often lost in the struggle to meet the rising costs of medical care during a serious illness, or for hospital, nursing home or institutional care. These bring severe hardship and deprivation to many citizens and families.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the other body will reject the administration's repugnant "pauper's oath" approach to this problem and adopt a genuine, realistic program to deal with the problem of catastrophic illness of such vital concern to the old people of America.

THE COURAGEOUS AMERICANS: A STORY OF A DAY AND A MAN, THE HONORABLE DANIEL K. INOUYE

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a very interesting article written a week ago Sunday by Mr. Fletcher Knebel in which he outlined in detail the many exploits of our distinguished colleague here in the House, the Representative of the great State of Hawaii, DANIEL K. INOUYE. I am sure you will enjoy reading this article as I enjoyed reading it, and I think it is well worth the time spent in reading it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The article follows:

THE COURAGEOUS AMERICANS

(By Fletcher Knebel)

(Part 2 of a series on World War II)

It was April 21, 1945, in north Italy and the war was almost over. The day opened bright and clear. Only a few clouds flecked the early morning sky, and a fresh breeze plucked at the buds of trees on the small mountains that lay before Aulla, gateway to the Po Valley.

"Nice day for a walk," thought 2d Lt. DANIEL K. INOUYE of Honolulu, Hawaii.

Like many soldiers who found themselves on the Italian peninsula that morning, DAN INOUYE appeared somewhat out of place in the cynical business of mass killing called war. He weighed 120 pounds, stood only 5 feet 6. And his round, brown face wore an expression of almost cherubic innocence.

DANNY INOUYE was 20 years old, son of a Honolulu clerk. He had volunteered for the infantry 2 years before and had been fighting in Italy and southern France for almost a year. He had been commissioned from the ranks on the battlefield and had been wounded once. This day he was promoted to first lieutenant by distant orders, but was not to learn of the new rank for several weeks.

It was shortly after dawn that INOUYE and 25 men of the 3d platoon, E company, 442d regimental combat team, crawled out of their valley foxholes. They stretched, hunched, and flexed arms and legs to get the night chill from their bones. As they munched morning field rations, all was quiet. Wisps of mist floated through the sheltered ravine where they had hidden for the night.

FIRE FROM THE HILLS

INOUYE tramped back a mile or so to company headquarters to get his orders for the day. By the time he returned to his men and spread his topographical map on the ground, the big guns had begun to belch from the rugged hills where the enemy, German troops of the 361st panzer grenadier regiment, manned machinegun nests behind rocks and bushes.

The climax of the long, bitter Italian campaign was nearing. It had begun September 9, 1943, when Americans of Gen. Mark Clark's 5th Army had waded ashore at Salerno, far to the south, just above the instep of the Italian boot.

It had taken 589 days for the British Eighth Army and the American Fifth to slog their way up the narrow peninsula from Salerno to the heights before the Po Valley, a distance of 340 miles. On a few rare days the columns had raced ahead 5 to 10 miles. For weeks their advance had been measured in feet and yards. In all, they had averaged less than six-tenths of a mile a day advancing against the stubborn troops of Hitler's Reich.

Behind lay the bloody Anzio beachhead, where the spirits of men slowly dissolved under the persistent whine of shells and the thunder of daily bombing raids. Behind lay the Rapido River, little more than a stream, which became a liquid slaughterhouse where America lost 1,681 killed, wounded, and missing in less than a day.

Behind lay Cassino and its path of bodies to the famous abbey. Behind, indeed, lay 32,000 dead men from the polyglot allied armies of Americans, British, Poles, French, Brazilians, and a few Italians who fought northward.

It had cost the Allies almost 190,000 men killed, wounded, and missing to come a distance not as far as that from Pittsburgh to Chicago. The Germans had lost almost double that number in this strange war within a war, an almost forgotten conflict that flashed into the headlines only sporadically—as when the American troops marched into Rome.

AN UNINSPIRING WAR

It was a dreary war of the M's, of mountains, mud, mules, mortars, machineguns, mines, and malaria. In the summer, the sun turned heavy GI battle togs into soggy, stinking receptacles of body sweat. In the rain and brutal cold of winter, men shivered in foxholes and trenchfoot dragged thousands out of the lines.

In some actions, such as the allied drive through the heavily fortified Gothic line, olive groves and vineyards were battered into a terrain resembling a Salvador Dali painting. Snipers shot from hilltop monasteries. Hundreds of Italian villages were left with only grotesque shells where homes had huddled together.

Morale was always a problem. The allied high strategy called for General Clark to pin down the maximum number of German troops, thus diverting them from northern and southern France and later from the defense of Germany itself. For the job, Clark was given enough men and arms for a death struggle, but not enough for quick and decisive victory. Every GI knew this, if only intuitively. Men felt they had been marked for sacrifice the day they walked ashore in Italy.

But in one unit, the 442d combat team, morale had never been a headache to higher echelons. The men of the 442d were Nisei, Japanese-Americans. Almost all were volunteers who sought to dissipate, in the heat of battle, the cloud that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor had settled on their names. They were Americans of Japanese ancestry, most of them from Hawaii, but also drawn from the big cities of the American mainland.

Many of their parents had been put in segregated camps after Pearl Harbor. To a man they felt the sting of such words as "traitor" and "spy." When President Roosevelt authorized formation of a Nisei combat team in January 1943, they had rushed to enlist. They had trained for a year in camp Shelby, Miss., before being shipped to Italy.

Up the boot of Italy, with a brief spurt of fighting in southern France—where they rescued a lost Texas battalion—the Nisei had accumulated more than 3,500 wounds and won more than 1,000 medals for bravery. Under the "go for broke" slogan, the 442d had committed about 8,500 men to battle. Some of these had withdrawn from outposts under orders. Never had any of them turned and run.

ANOTHER DAY, ANOTHER HILL

Like other GI's of the 5th Army, the Nisei fought a war of small units. Almost every day seemed the same. A platoon marched up a hill under withering machinegun fire and heavy artillery barrage. Fear gnawed at every stomach. Men dropped screaming.

Then the hill was taken and they burrowed into the ground for the night. Tomorrow, another hill, another day of fear.

And so April 21 was another day. Lieutenant INOUYE pointed ahead to the objective, the rocky crest of Mount Marciaso. It was about 2 miles distant, and between lay two somewhat lower peaks that had to be crossed. The platoon began its march at 9 a.m., first Indian file and then spread out in a line, with several yards between each man.

DAN INOUYE, who had been a freshman pre-med student at the University of Hawaii when he volunteered, now carried almost 100 pounds of gear on his slight frame. To his waist was strapped a .45 pistol, a heavy bag of hand grenades and a trench knife.

Crooked in his right arm he carried a Thompson submachinegun. It wasn't regulation for a platoon leader, but INOUYE felt comfort in its firepower. To his back was strapped a walkie-talkie. The lieutenant had lost his battle jacket somewhere, and for the day's fight he had borrowed a parka. The hood drooped down his back and the coat was too warm for the April morning.

INOUYE'S helmet carried no officer's bar. Germans loved to shoot officers first, and no man in his right mind intentionally made himself a target. However, INOUYE'S parka was mottled gray-green, camouflage style, and he stood out prominently from his men anyway.

The little band of men walked slowly, cautiously over the first small, undefended peak. By noon, they had started up the second incline, ever so slowly, a step at a time. INOUYE spoke into his walkie-talkie, calling for close artillery support. The American self-propelled guns to his rear opened up at once, laying down a barrage only 100 yards in front of the slowly advancing men. For several months now, the coordination of artillery and infantry had been almost miraculous in its pinpoint accuracy. The men winced with the explosion of each friendly shell, but the curtain of fire was their shield.

A SILENCE IN THE SUN

"It's the kind of support an infantryman dreams about," thought INOUYE, very proud of the precision. A few Germans on the lightly held second ridge retreated ahead of the platoon.

Halfway up the final incline to Mount Marciaso's peak, INOUYE ordered the artillery to stop. The trajectory was such that the fire could reach no higher and a continuation would only wipe out the platoon.

For the first minute after the guns ceased, an unearthly quiet prevailed. The sun was hot now, and every man was bathed in sweat as his nerves added extra heat to the body. The platoon moved forward at a crouch. One man remembered afterward that a bird twittered in that brief moment of silence. Then, suddenly, an angry chatter burst from the rocks ahead.

INOUYE felt a terrific jolt on his right side, between hip and ribs. It was as though a sparring partner had landed a solid blow to his midriff. The impact knocked him down, and he instinctively looked around to see who had punched him. Then, quickly, he felt all right. He got to his feet and began walking at the crouch again.

His radioman and good friend, Pfc. John T. Suzuki, touched him on the shoulder from the rear.

"DAN," he said, "you're bleeding."

INOUYE looked down. Blood was oozing through his parka. The time was about 2:15 p.m. Suzuki motioned his head to the rear. Lieutenant INOUYE, the flick of the head said, should drop out of line. INOUYE shook his own head and kept walking. He felt pretty good, unaware that a rifle bullet has passed clean through his middle, nicking the wall of the right kidney.

Suddenly murderous machinegun fire burst from three positions, straight ahead and to the left. The Nisei flopped to the ground and quickly snaked on their bellies behind any protection they could find—a dip in the ground, a boulder, a tree trunk.

For perhaps 30 seconds the slugs flew overhead. INOUYE was weak with fear. His belly and face hugged the earth. It would be pleasant to record that in this moment of truth the young lieutenant evolved a rapid command decision as do the four-star generals who commit great armies to battle. Actually, only two thoughts raced through his mind.

UPRIGHT IN A HAIL OF STEEL

The first: "If this goes on another minute, we'll all die." The second: "Damn it, this is it. A leader can't run." And then, almost without conscious thought, DAN INOUYE spotted the three focal points of the machinegun fire and began to crawl toward the one directly ahead, pulling a grenade from the bag as he went.

Suddenly, and again without being conscious of having made a decision, he stood bolt upright in that hail of steel and ran toward the nearest machinegun, his submachinegun in his left hand, a grenade in his right. He felt like yelling, but his throat had no voice. A few yards ahead, very blurred, he could make out some sandbags, a niche between two rocks and three helmets and a machinegun. He pulled the pin in the grenade, counted one, two, and let fly from his right hand in a looping lob. In the explosion, he could see a helmet bounce crazily out of the firing nest.

INOUYE, pulling another grenade from the bag, ran to his left. This time he got within 30 feet of another machinegun, bent on his left knee, pulled the pin, counted one, two and threw. He thought his aim was off, and even while the grenade was exploding he reached for a second one. Which one silenced the position—he never knew, but two Germans slumped dead over their gun.

Another gun was firing, still further to his left. "I'm blessed, I'm blessed," INOUYE thought as he ran toward it. "They won't get me." There was no fear now, only a welling of emotion that seemed to propel him forward. Again he knelt, pulled the pin and prepared to throw. He kept the spring handle gripped tight in his hand. Only after this was released could the grenade explode. Just as INOUYE pulled his right arm back for the throw, turning his body 90° away from the target, his side vision picked up a German soldier standing only about 12 feet from him.

"WHY DOESN'T HE SHOOT ME?"

The soldier stood amid a clump of bushes and his rifle pointed straight at INOUYE. The German was tall. His face was screwed up as he squinted down the barrel. At the end of the barrel was a brown blob.

"He's shooting me with a rifle grenade," thought INOUYE, "what an inefficient way to kill a guy."

The German fired. The rifle grenade explosion missed INOUYE'S body, but it struck his elbow, spun him around and knocked him over. His right arm was shattered at the elbow. He looked wildly about for his grenade. To his surprise, it was locked tight in his fist, the spring handle still secure.

As he lay on his back in terror, he could see the tall German methodically loading a second rifle grenade. INOUYE loosened his grip on his machinegun with his left hand, reached over and pried the grenade out of his useless right hand.

The German looked up from his reloading. "Why the hell doesn't he shoot me, the stupe?" INOUYE asked himself.

INOUYE struggled to his feet, primed his grenade and threw left handed at the German just as the Nazi trooper was raising his loaded gun. The explosion seemed to lift the German bodily 2 or 3 feet in the air, so his feet could be seen through the top of the bushes. Then he vanished from sight.

Throughout this momentary action, which happened about 2:40 p.m. under a high sun, the third enemy machinegun nest has been firing bursts at INOUYE, but somehow missed him.

While his right arm dangled, almost severed below the shoulder, INOUYE picked up his submachinegun with his left hand, cradled it against his body, and walked unsteadily toward the enemy machinegun emplacement, firing as he went. The Thompson ejected its shells to the right, but since INOUYE was firing from his left side, each hot shell hit his left cheek, scorching the skin.

Thirty feet from the third machinegun nest, a sandbagged foxhole with a small boulder for added protection, INOUYE dropped his Thompson and pulled another grenade from his bag. One, two, throw. The two enemy gunners died instantly and the gun flew apart.

The third platoon of E company, about 25 yards behind INOUYE, scrambled to its feet and rushed up the hill. As the men and their lieutenant advanced in a fast, small wave, a fourth machinegun, thus far silent, suddenly opened up from the hillside. A slug hit INOUYE'S right shinbone, crumpling him as though he had been clipped in football. Again he fell over, but this time he rolled down the hill.

TRIUMPH AND A FLOOD OF PAIN

T4g. Yeiichi "Kelly" Kuwayama, a 27-year-old Princeton graduate from New York serving as the platoon's medic, ran to INOUYE'S side. He gave him a shot of morphine and tried to fit a crude splint to the shattered arm.

"You gotta go back, DANNY," said Kelly Kuwayama, "or you're going to bleed to death."

"Not before we take the hill," said INOUYE.

With his one good arm slung over the shoulder of an enlisted man, INOUYE started up the slope again. By this time the platoon had overrun the fourth machinegun position and the way to the top was clear. Twelve Germans on the peak surrendered without a fight. The time was 3 p.m. Mount Marciaso was taken.

Now pain flooded over DAN INOUYE. Kuwayama rigged him a litter and an enlisted man guided him back down the hill with four captured Germans carrying the litter.

As soon as the Nisei had seized the high ground, German artillery on the next slope opened fire. The shells passed over the peak and began exploding on the back side, where the litter party hurried down. Twice the Germans dropped INOUYE to seek cover, and only a threat to shoot one persuaded them to abandon the habit.

INOUYE reached an ambulance at 6 p.m. At 7 p.m., more than 4 hours after he suffered his third and final wound, he was placed on a table in a tented field hospital. A crew of weary doctors slowly worked their way toward him, amputating an arm here, a leg there.

"My arm, Doc," said INOUYE weakly.

"Your arm, hell," was the reply. "You can lose both and live. It's your stomach we're going to fix first."

Ten days and 17 blood transfusions later, Lt. DANIEL K. INOUYE found himself without a right arm. It had been amputated below the shoulder. But his leg and stomach healed.

Fourteen years later people were calling him Congressman INOUE, for he became Hawaii's first elected Member of the House of Representatives in Washington.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2830) to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes.

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 section 3 of the Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 352)

is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "nine succeeding fiscal years".

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 353) is amended by striking out subsection (b) and by striking "(a)" after "SEC. 4.".

SEC. 3. Section 6(c) of the Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 355(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) For the purposes of this section the 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of all the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands), except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum or less than 33 per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum."

SEC. 4. Section 6(d) of the Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 355(d)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)", by striking out "the States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the States and of all of the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands)," and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Promulgations made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe a Federal share for Alaska of 66 per centum and, for purposes of such promulgations, Alaska shall not be included in determining the per capita income of all of the States. Promulgations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available from the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year, or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years."

SEC. 5. Section 9(a) of the Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 358(a)) is amended by striking out "Alaska, Hawaii,".

SEC. 6. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall be effective in the case of allotments from sums appropriated under section 3 of the Library Services Act for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1961, except that no payment shall be made to any State from its allotment under section 4 of such Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, until its allotment for any preceding year has been exhausted or ceased to be available. The amendments made by sections 3 and 4 of this Act shall be effective in the case of promulgations of Federal shares under the Library Services Act made after the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Library Services Act, passed in 1956 authorized an appropriation of $7.5 million a year for each of 5 years to provide library services for rural America. At that time there were, according to various estimates, between 70 and 80 million Americans living in rural areas who either had no access to public libraries, or who had wholly inadequate library service.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today makes a few changes in the original act, most of which are necessitated by the fact that Hawaii and Alaska have been admitted as States since the original library services law was passed in 1956.

The bill before us extends the Library Services Act of 1956 for 5 more years.

The only other major change is the deletion of subsection (b) of section 4 of the original act which provides that an allotment under the act which has not been paid at the end of a fiscal year will remain available for payment until the end of the next fiscal year. It is felt that this provision is no longer necessary and that its deletion will encourage all States to use their full allotment in each of the years for which the appropriations are made.

We have spent a lot of time in Congress during the last few years discussing how we can best insure educational opportunities for all our citizens—the education so badly needed for this increasingly complex technical age, the education to enable us to withstand the threat of international communism. It seems to me indisputable that this act, which we are now considering, gives us a great deal for our dollars. When we have spent the taxpayers' money to establish 161 libraries in foreign countries, complete with bookmobiles and traveling bookshelves on the basis that books will help these people establish and maintain free and democratic government, it seems only reasonable that we should also be concerned with the 40-odd million of our own citizens who also need library services.

Mr. Speaker, when the Library Services Act of 1956 expires next year, 40 million people in rural America will still have inadequate or no library service. That means that about half or almost exactly half of the problem we had when we passed this bill in 1956 has been met and half of it remains. In this period of 4 years that has now expired, 5 million books have been bought with the money that we appropriated for the purpose. Two hundred new bookmobiles are now crawling across rural America laden with 1,000 books each. The States and local communities have enthusiastically entered into the spirit of this bill and as a result State appropriations for library services have increased by 54 percent and local appropriations have increased 45 percent. Large-scale buying and cataloging of books have cut costs of operation and the movement toward larger administrative units has increased efficiency and economy.

In addition to these, Mr. Speaker, there have been many intangible results of the passage of this act. It has increased the prestige, I believe, of local and State library groups, and they today are working harder and with greater activity than at any time within the history of our country. A tremendous amount of public interest has been developed in libraries and in library services, and increased cooperation has arisen between the libraries themselves, and between their separate units all along the line from the local to the national level. Workshops and inservice training activity and institutes have grown very remarkably.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is said by some that it might be wrong to extend this act, and perhaps it would be wrong to extend it if it had already accomplished its job. But, the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the job is not yet done. It is only half done. And, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that the job is just half done now is the fact that we have not appropriated all the money authorized in the original bill. Whereas we authorized $37.5 million, we have appropriated, including this year's appropriation bill—which has already passed the House and is now in conference—about 26 million of those dollars. The job is only half done.

And, may I call attention, also, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that when we passed this bill in 1956 it had been before the House for a number of years. We had been talking in terms of $37.5 million to do the job. So by the time we enacted the Library Services Act, in reality, the $37.5 million was obsolete. In terms of today's dollars it is worth 25 percent less. So when we consider this, and the fact that we failed by $11 million to appropriate the amounts authorized, then I think that we have a right to go ahead and complete the job. We ought to complete it. This bill passed the Senate without objection.

Mr. Speaker, an identical bill, H.R. 12125, was unanimously reported by our committee. Today we consider the Senate bill S. 2830 because it is identical to ours. Its passage will enable this legislation to go directly to the White House.

The bill has the full support of the Administration. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, Hon. Lawrence G. Derthick, has pertinently and well said about our need for libraries:

Our public libraries are one of the greatest educational resources and at their best can truly be "universities of the people." Yet, book and information services available through libraries are still completely lacking or are woefully inadequate in many areas of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the members of the Subcommittee on Special Education who have worked so faithfully with me to bring this legislation here today. They are the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO]. I want to commend, also, the minority members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], who has been most cooperative in preparing for today's debate, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLT], who has recently announced his voluntary retirement from Congress.

I would like to pay my especial respects to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. She sponsored the original legislation in 1956. She is a sponsor of the bill before us today. Her interest in libraries is heartfelt and enthusiastic.

She has been energetic and efficient in her pursuit of the goal of better libraries for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call the attention of the House to the fact that both party platforms approve the principle of this bill. The nominee of my party, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has sent me a special message that he supports this bill. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] may have an announcement from Vice President NIXON.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I list the cosponsors of this legislation. They, largely, built the sentiment for this legislation in the House. They have been an inspiration to the committee. They are all entitled to great credit for their interest in strengthening the sinew of America's spirit by providing public libraries for her people.

They are the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCGINLEY], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO], the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF]; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that I cannot cast my vote for this bill, H.R. 12125. I think the program has been a good one. It has brought library service to untold thousands of our rural people who theretofore had not had the benefit of library service. This is particularly true in my State of Mississippi, where it has been administered by hard working, dedicated people. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for it without breaking faith with this House and particularly with the Members of my own Committee on Rules. It will be remembered by some of you that when the original bill was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor, there was considerable opposition to it by the Committee on Rules. This opposition was based upon the fact that it was the starting of a new Federal aid program that would grow and expand as most of these programs do. But, when I was assured, as were other members of the committee, by its sponsors that the bill was limited to a 5-year program, that it would only cost the Federal Government $37½ million over the 5-year period, and that no request would be made to renew it at the end of that time, I made the motion that brought the bill out of the Committee on Rules to the floor. On the floor, in presenting the rule, I passed these assurances that we had on to the membership.

When the present bill to extend the program for another 5 years came up in the Rules Committee, these commitments were remembered by members of the committee who had previously opposed the bill and the bill again became stymied in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this and in order to keep faith with both sides, I have attempted for the past several weeks to work out a compromise whereby the act would be extended to permit the use of the full $37½ million, some several million of which have never been appropriated. However, this was unacceptable to the sponsors of the bill. Again just before the Congress recessed and because of my great interest in the program, I exercised myself to have the bill reported anyway under an open rule so that an amendment could be offered along the lines suggested or on some other compromised basis. However, when we returned here the past week we learned that the bill was scheduled to come up under this suspension of the rules route.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues as well as other interested parties will understand my position, namely that I must keep faith with my previous commitments to you and therefore must reluctantly vote against the bill. I certainly shall not find fault with others who do not find themselves in a position similar to mine and who vote for the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that this session of Congress might be political and maybe it will be for me, in opposing this bill, but political perhaps in reverse. The State librarian of Ohio comes from my congressional district. The president of the Ohio State Library Association comes from my district. The largest manufacturers of bookmobiles in the United States are in my district; three good reasons why I should probably support this legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that these facts must be brought to the attention of the House because I believe we are embarking on legislation that will continue and continue; and if we are going to have it, let us make it permanent, let us quit fooling ourselves and the people that this is a 5-year operation.

When this bill was passed we were assured it would be for 5 years. My recollection of only one who said it probably would not be was that it was the distinguished chairman of the committee who at that time I think said he was willing to have it go on for a while. I believe this is one of those cases where the States can handle their own problem. I would agree that if they had brought in a bill to continue this for 1 year, so that the additional $5 million originally authorized could be used, I would not object to it. But I do object to a continuance for 5 years, for an additional 5 years, of a program that we were told by so many of the leading advocates of this bill would last only 5 years.

The gentleman who just addressed the House, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, said this on the floor of the House:

> If we pass this bill, providing the small amount of $7½ million per year for 5 years, I want to hazard the prediction that at the end of the 5-year period the system of rendering library services by bookmobile will have spread all over rural America.

I see the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] with us. He said this:

> The people know of the terminal phase of this legislation. Already their plans have been laid with that in mind. They have known that what State aid they had, small as it has of necessity been, involved in the ever-present necessity of supporting themselves. With Federal funds, they face the same realistic approach.

Mr. Speaker, I could call the roll on both sides of the aisle of the advocates of this bill who assured us at that time that this would be for 5 years and that would be all; that at the end of 5 years the States would be in a position to take this over. I am sure many of the Members will remember my distinguished former colleague from Ohio, Cliff Clevenger. Those who sat with him in committees on appropriations will remember one of his favorite phrases:

> There is nothing so permanent in Washington as a temporary agency.

That is true here. Here is this temporary library program, and now we are in for another 5 years, and at the end of that time there will be another 5 years. It will go on as long as these programs do; once the Federal Government gets into these programs they continue.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] said the proposed program would be limited to 5 years, that "we have proved that after this period a rural library service program is most likely to be continued through the State and local support."

One of the great sponsors of the bill at that time said we already have proved that it will end, and they are laying the foundation to go ahead. Now, do we mean it when we say these things? Do we mean it when we tell the people we are going to set up a program with their tax dollars for only 5 years, or do we hope maybe they will forget about it and at the end of 5 years we will come back in and reenact it for another 5 years? Do we mean it when we say we are going to start to balance the budget in this country? Do we mean it when we say that States rights are something we will follow? Do we mean it when we say that States have certain responsibilities? If we mean it, then even though it is bad politics today to do it we will stand up and vote against this bill and serve notice now that when we say 5 years we mean what we say.

Let me give you an example of what this means in my State of Ohio. In Ohio we get about $270,635 for rural libraries. My friends in my library association and my State librarian tried to tell me that "we cannot have good libraries in Ohio without this $270,635." But may I point out to my colleagues here in the House that we have in Ohio an intangible tax, and of that intangible tax $21,261,612 each year goes to the libraries—$21,261,612. Yet they say now, "Unless you get us this $270,635 we cannot operate."

Let me cite one large county in Ohio, Cuyahoga County. Cleveland is the county seat. That county collects in intangible taxes $8,004,000, and the public libraries get out of that amount, $6,981,000, or 87 percent of all the intangible taxes collected in that county. Yet it would ask us to come down here with our hands out asking that some of you people who do not have that kind of tax revenues help to contribute to these places. Again I say, this is a matter of States' responsibility, and the State of Ohio can well take care of itself, and should, with figures of that kind.

We have been told that it is going to develop, that in 5 years we will have good library service all over the country. As I say, I would go along with 1 other year to get the full amount that was originally anticipated, but instead of bringing in that kind of bill, here is one you cannot amend. There is nothing to do but oppose it, and oppose it upon the grounds that the House of Representatives is a responsible legislative body. When one gentleman after the other stands on this floor and says this is a 5-year program, then we ought to make sure that we do not ask for this continual handout of Federal funds for the libraries, which should be a local responsibility.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCGINLEY].

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure, which has been very important and successful in the rural areas of Nebraska. I am conscious of the opposition's argument that statements were made on the bill's origin that it would not have to be in force for more than 5 years. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has explained, however, that the annual appropriations for the library services program have never come up to the full amount of the original estimated amount that was foreseen as necessary to do a complete job. Despite the statements of the opposition, I am here today to say most definitely that much remains to be done in assisting the development and growth of adequate library facilities in Nebraska, and particularly in the Sand Hill counties of my district.

The region that I mention is range cattle country, where the population is sparse and the towns are small. Great advance, under this program, has been made in county seats such as Thedford, Valentine, Bassett, Springview, Taylor, and other towns, toward supplying books by a centralized library, as well as by bookmobile to students who are enrolled in schools too small to be able to supply them with the most desirable type of library. This paucity of book material has proved to be a very strong factor in the inability of many high school students to carry on successfully in collegiate work.

The understanding of the worth of such a program is increasing in my State. I am in favor of continuing the Federal stimulus to the State and local cooperative movement, not just for the purpose of extending another Federal-aid program, but for the very strategic purpose of better equipping our local libraries with the implements to cause a better modern education for our schoolchildren.

I am certain, too, that the program in my State has been well administered by earnest men and women who are genuinely dedicated to the purposes mentioned, and who will continue to use this service efficiently for what are, at the present time, promising but incomplete results. I urge the House to adopt this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been worked on and worked over very carefully by extremely able and competent Members of this body. It is an effort to answer a great national need. I favor this bill and hope it passes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this is a very modest program. It is a small investment but the returns are very rich. There are many, many rural counties in my district and in other sections of the State of West Virginia that do not have library service. This legislation would do very much not only for the State of West Virginia but for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this program. The able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has described the progress which has been made under this act, yet much remains to be done. Since so much demonstrated progress has been achieved, I am convinced that even greater gains will be realized if the Library Services Act is extended.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this is a fine piece of legislation. I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and all the Members who have worked so diligently to try to get this legislation through. I am 100 percent in favor of it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I too rise in support of this bill. The programs which have been developing under appropriations already made have been well spent. These expenditures have been beneficial to many millions of our citizens who otherwise would not have access to any library. As recently as 1956, as the report in his bill points out, as many as 26 million persons were without any library service. Since then library service to many millions has been improved or made available for the first time.

These programs are not yet fully developed. Neither are they self-supporting. Perhaps the Federal Government, by cutting off its modest appropriations, could run the risk of curtailment or abandonment of library services. We might hope that necessary funds would be made available at the local or State level. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is a risk which should not be taken. This is a partnership program. Other proven benefits to many million throughout all 50 States justify this proposed continuation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, during the last month, I took occasion to follow many of these bookmobiles. I want to tell you that they are an unmitigated blessing to the youth of our country and, especially, to the youth in the rural areas where they need the service as these libraries can give.

Some of the States have been a little slow in catching on to this big movement and putting it into effect, but they

are coming along beautifully. Many State legislatures set up the program and appropriated their share of funds. Please let us not stop it now. Let us provide funds that it may go on until the States really come into their own.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL.]

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss briefly the proposed extension for 5 years of the Library Services Act of 1956.

You have before you the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, which gave its unanimous endorsement to this amendment.

The report clearly outlines the reasons for the support given to this measure, crossing party lines and the lines of geography which too often divide this House. These reasons are of far-reaching consequence and must have the earnest consideration of all of us.

However, the most important result of what we propose to do here today will be, without doubt, the spreading and the nurturing of knowledge in those quarters of our society which today lack the resources to bring to their people what the modern world demands: a full and informal awareness of the dynamic world in which we live.

It is therefore to the personalized results of this act that I address myself. In a program of this kind we would be remiss if we did not relate our actions to the concrete results affecting individual American citizens.

This program has effectively stimulated the availability of books and words which, when taken together, comprise the fount of human knowledge. Once having presented information in its most available form, have we any assurance that our citizens will come to drink at the fount? We know that they will. We know that on every occasion which arises for obtaining increased knowledge, many of our people have demonstrated their eager determination to make the most of it.

The key to our future is individual thirst for knowledge. I am not thinking here today of needs of the State, the county, the town or the village. It is of the young farm lad, the country schoolteacher, those youthful members of our society who can presently hope for no better than occasional opportunities to read and learn on their own of their past, the happenings of the present, and much more important, the hopes, dreams and plans for the future.

The lonely youth on the farm who can now only dream of college may consult, if he desires, the bookmobile for information on how to qualify. That information can lead to a better life, for him and perhaps, turn into reality the dreams of his family. He in turn can add his contribution to the rich heritage of his own State and community.

The farmer, vexed by the problems of his intricate business, can find factual and authenticated solutions on the shelves of the local, perhaps transient, library. It is a means to self-help in refreshing contrast to the Government servings of intellectual pablum that have become all too familiar to our farmers.

Our young men and women are the greatest natural resource that this Nation possesses. To allow any portion of this resource to lie fallow in the throes of ignorance because books are not available is wrong.

In considering individuals, we set ourselves apart from those societies and those governments which train and propagandize their people, not for the sake of those people, but for the state. These alien philosophies conceive of education and books as means to domination and control of the minds. We do the opposite in our great country. We look to the individual first, and to his mind, knowing that only by the liberation of intelligent minds can real human progress be attained.

Mr. Speaker, I have deliberately thus far confined myself to those aspects of this proposal which I feel to be the most compelling, avoiding the less appealing matter of statistics. As a member of the committee which approved this proposal, however, I do wish to call your attention to some interesting figures. The varied aspects of this program are demonstrated by the fact that it will soon be serving more than 75 million persons in rural areas.

Under the present act, the machinery in setting up this program, delayed so much at first, is just beginning to operate in such a manner as to reflect the thinking of the Congress. We have begun to receive the glowing reports of success in this endeavor, which were originally predicted. The notes of progress should not be allowed to prevent this program from reaching full fruition.

Now, one of the most gratifying aspects of this act is that it relies on the States, as well as the Federal Government for support. State aid to public library extension has increased 54 percent since the act went into effect on July 1, 1956. Under State programs developed under the act, 30 million persons now have new or improved library service. Library services have come to 1 million rural children for the first time. The rural communities of this Nation have added more than 5 million books to their facilities. A total of 200 new bookmobiles are in operation under the act. Projects and personnel have been improved.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those of you who have been accorded plentiful opportunities for reading can appreciate what it must be like not to have had those chances. How many untapped sources of greatness are there in this country? Thousands of individuals at all ages have the capacity of intellectual leadership so necessary today. We must afford them the material to develop their latent talents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of this extension of the Library Services Act of 1956, for the greater dignity of the American individual and for the greater good of our beloved democratic society.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House of Representatives is considering passage of the 5-year extension of the Library Services Act as one of its first official duties in reconvening for this extended 2d session of the 86th Congress. This, I believe, is an indication of the importance placed on the extension of the act at this time. It was my pleasure, on March 11 of this year, to introduce a companion bill to the one being considered at this time and to which I have given my complete support.

As the chairman is aware, the act, when passed in 1956, was so designed as to serve as a stimulus to the States to provide better public library services to rural areas.

In my home State of Washington, provisions of the act helped to inaugurate and successfully carry out the Columbia River Regional Library Demonstration in North Central Washington. As an example of the value of this demonstration in public enlightenment, nearly 48,000 residents of the five counties included in the demonstration now have library cards. Before the demonstration period, only 23,000 people had cards. Between 1957 and 1959 the number of library users increased nearly 76 percent, the amount of library materials borrowed increased more than 106 percent, and the hours of service per week increased more than 58 percent. Twenty-eight town or community libraries have had their shelves stocked with new books, and are open longer hours than previously. Three bookmobiles serve families living far from established libraries. Books may also be borrowed by mail.

When this particular project terminates, there will still be 17 counties in the State of Washington without rural library service.

That the people of my State feel that these programs are worthwhile is demonstrated by the fact that of the funds expended thus far in carrying out the provisions of the Library Services Act, the State itself has contributed $330,965 compared to $125,287 in Federal funds. Extension of the act will allow the State Library Commission to entertain proposals for demonstrations in other areas of the State. It is felt that such library demonstration programs are the one way of making known to rural residents the benefits of good library service.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House of Representatives to adopt this legislation at this time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the statement just made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON]. This is a very much needed program. I certainly see the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. However, it seems to me that the equities are far more in favor of continuing this library program. I was told earlier today by the Secretary

of Health, Education, and Welfare that the Vice President of the United States wholeheartedly endorses this program. I have a letter from the Vice President to that effect:

AUGUST 22, 1960.

Hon. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR STUYVE: I note that H.R. 12125 is to be considered today in the House under suspension of rules. This bill would extend the Library Services Act beyond its present statutory termination date of June 30, 1961. I understand that the Senate passed a bill to similar effect (S. 2830) on May 26, 1960.

Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick testified in support of extension of the act before your subcommittee on April 7, 1960.

I share the belief held by many, reflected in part by the large number of bills with bipartisan sponsorship which have been introduced in this Congress to extend the act, that it would be highly desirable to do so during this session of the Congress. Such timing of an extension would obviate uncertainty on the part of States and communities regarding the continued availability of Federal funds with which to plan and carry out programs of improved library services.

I am heartily in support of the basic purpose of the act; namely, to stimulate the States and rural communities to provide better public library service in rural areas. I understand that much has been accomplished since the act became effective in 1956. However, I also understand that the full attainment of the objective which Congress sought by this legislation would only be achieved if the act were extended.

I hope the House will act favorably on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

This letter from the Vice President as you see, seconds and urges the extension of this program on the membership of the House of Representatives. Further than that, the Democratic platform contains a particular reference calling for a library extension program. So does the Republican platform.

The only reason I call this to the attention of the membership is to point out that the opposition to the bill is partisan. Both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party have wholeheartedly endorsed this program as have our leaders of both parties.

In the few moments remaining, I would like to call the attention of the membership to an editorial from the New York Times of July 14, 1960. It is as follows:

LIBRARY BILL

When Congress adjourned for its recess, H.R. 12125, the bill designed to permit the Library Services Act to continue its worthwhile work of developing needed public libraries in rural areas, was still bottled up in the Rules Committee.

It is indeed odd that in this time of great need for more easily distributed information and knowledge there are still individuals who believe that the institutions which can make it possible, in this case public libraries, are not worthy of Government aid. The reasoning is hard to follow when one considers the efforts which have been put forward to make it possible for us to be better understood abroad. Is it not as necessary for our own citizens to have at their disposal the informational materials to help in developing their own understanding?

It would seem to be pennywise pound foolish to nip the Library Services Act program in the bud just as the first fruits of the initial 5-year program are being harvested. The cost of the program is minute when compared to such broad-based actions as the National Defense Education Act, yet the results are possibly of the longer lasting variety because of the different levels of people being reached, and perhaps for the first time, with useful knowledge.

Let us hope that when Congress reconvenes it will approve this useful legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, opposing a measure like this is very much like opposing motherhood, or favoring sin. But I think it is abundantly clear that once a program of this kind is embarked upon by the Federal Government, it is, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] said, with us to stay.

Men seek books. Men seek education. Books do not seek men. It is inconceivable to me that Abraham Lincoln could ever have achieved any measure of success without the assistance of a library program.

I am reminded of the fact that he sought books. He walked miles to get them. He studied them by candlelight in order that he might know of the wisdom of the ages.

It is not the principle of whether knowledge is good or bad that is here involved. It is purely a question of whether or not those who seek understanding are prepared to seek it of their own accord or whether it must be carried to them by the Government.

There is here involved a very profound question which so far exceeds the matter of the small appropriation involved. This is one of those questions upon which honest men and women may honestly disagree. But I do feel, with the gentleman who has put forth the viewpoint of the minority in this debate, that this is a function for the individual, this is a function for the community, for the county, and for the State. We in California, I believe, have handled our problem very well. There are adequate facilities for those who want to know. I would dare say that there would be more cut pages on Lolita than there will on Plutarch's Lives under this program.

This is a minority opinion which probably is not shared in large part by those on the floor, but it is well that the minority opinion may be voiced here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everybody agrees that making rural library service available to the people of the United States is a desirable objective, and I voted for the Library Service Act of 1956. At that time we were told that Federal aid was desirable for a limited time to stimulate state activity in this field. Now we are asked to extend it.

So I do not oppose the objective of this bill, but I do suggest that the provision of rural library service should be a responsibility of the States and local communities, and that the Federal Government should not engage permanently in a Federal aid program for this purpose. Where the States are able to support programs for rural library service, I believe that it is better that they should do so rather than adding to the responsibilities of the Federal Government.

The amounts here involved are almost small, but the principle is important. When Federal aid is relied upon, it involves taking money from certain States and redistributing it to others. It is noticeable that a State in the position of Massachusetts usually fares badly under this system.

Federal aid provided in this bill is no exception. Under the provisions of this bill each State receives a certain amount from the Federal Government and must itself make certain matching expenditures. In the case of Massachusetts, the Federal contribution is approximately 37 percent, while the State contribution is approximately 62 percent. For many States this figure is reversed. Even the great State of Texas receives 56 percent while itself contributing about 44 percent.

The State and communities of Massachusetts are ready and willing to furnish this service themselves and are doing so. I hope in the future the other States and communities will do the same, and not permanently rely on this new Federal aid program.

The more these Federal aid programs are adopted, the more the centralized power and administrative machinery of the Federal Government is built up. In many fields Federal aid is desirable, but I hope that it will not long be used in this field which should properly belong to the States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell us how much has been spent on the international media programs through the foreign handout program that he has supported so avidly?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, but I beg to differ good naturedly with my esteemed colleague from California [Mr. JACKSON]. This is not a case of being against motherhood; this is a case of attempting to insist on the proper parentage for this type of activity and this type of legislation. There are some of us who believe the proper parents should be the State or the local community, and not the Federal Government.

I would like to quote one sentence from a statement made by the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], when this bill was originally enacted. On that occasion he said:

> I believe when Federal funds cease after the fifth year the States and the communities will somehow find other sources of revenue to continue the service they have learned to appreciate.

I suggest that quite contrary to the prediction, hope, or expectation the demand for Federal funds has not ceased, and I note it is significant today that no advocate of this bill has suggested or ventured to predict that this will now be extended for only 5 years more.

I hope we may some day have the candor of one Member of Congress who publicly declared off the floor of Congress that there is every reason to use the Federal taxing system in preference to the State or local wherever there is a choice. At least that pronouncement has the virtue of candor and is an acknowledgement that its advocates are trying to centralize the tax-levying and revenue-dispensing functions of Government. I am against that proposal, but I honor the honesty of those who at least are frank about it. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to vote in favor of this measure. I supported it in the Committee on Labor and Education, and I support it here today.

Mr. Speaker, I have testified with firm conviction before the committee, on this measure, and I reiterate the stand I took at that time. There are so many valid reasons why this bill should be voted upon favorably. Certainly, the importance of books cannot be overemphasized. The access to reading matter, the rigid controls exercised over the minds of men through books, is a stamp peculiar to totalitarianism. However, here in our land, where the basic freedom of choice allows people to read what they want. it would be a grave omission and a contradiction on our part, if Americans would not be able to exercise that choice, simply because funds were not made available for libraries. It is very true, that library facilities in many American communities are inadequate or nonexistent. Under the Library Services Act, the bookmobile program has filled the need in those areas. In my own district of western Massachusetts, 30 towns are getting supplementary books via bookmobile and, still, there are communities which have not been serviced. These towns can only be included if this act is extended. People have written to me of their need for such facilities and others have attested to the great virtue of the program which has taken care of their needs the past years.

The expenditures under this Act are not great. The financial responsibility is shared with the Federal Government by the individual States. But aside from monetary considerations, I firmly believe that the great good which the program is doing cannot be computed only in terms of money. The minds stimulated by reading, the transmission of knowledge, the hours of pleasure and relaxation, contribute directly to the national good.

Therefore, I urge my distinguished colleagues to vote in favor of extending the Library Services Act for the benefit of our fellow Americans who are dependent upon its continuance.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support H.R. 12125, the measure to extend the Library Services Act for an additional 5 years. I introduced a companion measure, H.R. 11118 to the measure we are taking up today, under suspension of the rules and testified in favor of such legislation when hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Special Education earlier this year.

When the library services bill was signed into law in June of 1956, some 26 million people in this country's rural areas were completely without public library service. An additional 50 million had inadequate library service as measured by State standards. Three hundred and nineteen rural counties did not have a public library within their borders.

In order to improve this situation, the Library Services Act authorized an appropriation of $7.5 million a year for 5 years for Federal grants to accelerate and stimulate State and local library development projects. This cooperative Federal, State, and local program has chalked up an impressive record.

Thirty million rural people now have new or improved public library service available to them. County and regional library developments have brought public library service for the first time to over 1 million rural children and adults plus substantially improving service to 7.6 million more.

State library extension agencies have been able to strengthen their staffs and resources to assist rural communities in improving their library service or in establishing new services. Some 90 field consultants have been added to State agency staffs. This represents an increase of 80 percent over the total field staff in 1956.

Approximately 200 new bookmobiles are rolling down rural roads to bring books and information to people in remote areas. More than 5 million books and other informational and educational materials have been added to the cultural resources of rural communities. Because of the availability of more good books, more staff, bookmobiles and added library branches and stations, many county and regional library projects report increases in book circulating of 40 percent and up.

In my home State of Wisconsin, the Free Library Commission has used Federal funds appropriated under the Library Services Act to sponsor 6 library extension projects that serve 18 Wisconsin counties. The Barron County library project is in my congressional district. Under this project, a central collection of books has been deposited at the public library of Rice Lake, the largest town in the county. The books are available to all the libraries in the county.

In addition, the Wisconsin Free Library Commission has added eight members to its staff in order to improve and expand its services. Scholarship funds for library training have been made available, and a grant has been made to the University of Wisconsin for a statewide survey of public libraries.

Demonstration bookmobiles have been used in several counties and regions. In 1958, the Milwaukee Public Library received a grant to provide bookmobile service on a demonstration basis to rural areas around Milwaukee. Following the trial period, eight of the communities voted to continue this service at their own expense.

The Federal grants under the Library Services Act have encouraged the States and local sources to make more funds available for library services. Since Federal grants were made available in 1956, State appropriations for public library service to rural areas have increased 54 percent. Local appropriations for public libraries under State plans have shown a 45-percent increase during the same period.

This list of accomplishments is impressive, but much work remains to be done. As of July 1, 1959, 25 million people in rural areas still were without any public library service. An additional 21 million had not had an opportunity to benefit directly from the cooperative local-State-Federal library development projects under the Library Services Act; 253 counties still had no public library service within their borders.

Time is a major factor in the overall success of this program. It takes time to train new staffs and to acquire equipment such as bookmobiles and large enough quantities of books and other materials to fill demand. Surveying areas for library development, deciding on project details and arranging contracts and agreements are also very time consuming. That is why it would be penny wise, dollar foolish to fail to extend the Library Services Act for another 5 years.

Since the Senate has already passed the bill, I hope the House will act favorably in order that we may continue to bring library services to millions of rural Americans.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which would extend the present Library Services Act for a period of 5 years from June 30, 1961. This is an important and meritorious bill. I am sure all would agree that the library is a basic instrument of education. Education of our people is the foundation of our way of life and the preservation and success of our form of government depends on an informed and enlightened citizenry. Therefore, if our people are to be informed they must be able to read good books and other materials which should be made available by our libraries.

The library services bill was first enacted into law in June 1956 and it provided for an appropriation of $7.5 million a year for 5 years. The primary purpose of the act was to stimulate the States into providing better public library service for rural areas. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Special Education, of which I am a member, showed that in many rural communities library services were nonexistent prior to the enactment of the Library Services Act of 1956. Since this act has been in operation, 50 States and Territories have participated in the program and many library development projects were inaugurated, yet a number of these projects are incomplete and consequently the continuation of this act for an additional period of time has become a necessity.

The State of New Jersey in which I represent the 14th Congressional District has participated in this program and with the aid of Federal funds has been able to purchase books and other educational material and to engage library personnel, thus making greater and more efficient library service available to rural areas. Also New Jersey was thus able to inaugurate a demonstration center in that part of the State which lacked library facilities. Since the enactment of the Library Services Act, New Jersey has adopted a State library aid program and it is tailored after the Federal act and provides financial assistance on matching terms and in such a way that the countries and municipalities will be encouraged to increase their expenditures for library purposes and to raise library standards generally.

The opponents to this bill allege that it was originally enacted for a period of 5 years and that it should not be extended beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1961. The failure to extend this bill would mean an abrupt end of these library services before an orderly transition program or alternate progam could be established. I believe that the full intent of Congess, as expressed in the 1956 act, has not been realized for the following reasons:

First. It took much longer than anticipated to get the program underway. It was January 1957 before any State received any money;

Second. The $7.5 million authorized has not been appropriated each year. Two million fifty thousand dollars was appropriated for the first year; 5 million for the second year and $6 million for the third and fourth years. Even if the full $7.5 million is appropriated for the fifth year, only 70 percent of the total amount intended for this purpose have been spent;

Third. Inflation has cut into the cost of the program; and

Fourth. Seven and one-half million dollars was based on needs and values of the mid 1940's.

I urge extension of this act because 25 million people in rural areas are still without any public library service and because 253 counties are still without public library service within their borders.

I consider the funds spent on this bill as well spent, as an investment in the education and culture of our people and as an investment for the preservation of our American way of life. I ask your support and urge you to vote in favor of the passage of this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of the remaining time to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard much of this legislation during the past few years. It is my judgment that the money has been wisely spent. The organization is carried on by a group of dedicated people who take interest principally in the rural folks of the country. They have spent this money wisely. I have seen no evidence, either in the country or anywhere else, that the money has not been spent cautiously, sensibly, and wisely.

I realize that probably there were statements made that this would be limited to 5 years. I do not know whether I made any such inference or not. If I did, may I say that there are some in this House now who think they have sense enough to predict the economy of this country in advance by providing higher rates in the wage and hour law for the next 3, 4, or 5 years by providing a graduated rise of 5 cents a year. We know we do not have the judgment to do it. We have nothing to predicate it on. And personally I think it would be unwise to attempt it.

Now, in this instance I am not so concerned about statements made back yonder 3 or 4 years ago. I am concerned over the fact that the money has been wisely spent and the program has been successful. You know, I can remember a thousand times when people on this floor have said "Just this time on foreign aid and no more." Well, it is still with us, and we have learned through experience, except then we were dealing in billions. I am not disturbed over the expenditure of money in this land of ours for our own people when it is expended wisely and honestly and for a good purpose. It promotes education and good government, for I believe that it is just as important to know how to cast an intelligent vote as it is to vote. We know how it works with hospitals. We know how it works with roads, and we know how it has worked with this program.

Now, I am sometimes known as a fairly conservative fellow; in other words, I am pretty tight with taxpayers money, and I am, except when I see the evidence of a reasonable amount of money spent for a good purpose and for a good cause for the good of our own people.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think that this program has worked very well over the past years and it should be continued so that the States can increase their activities in this field. Testimony before our subcommittee showed that there has been a tremendous increase in good reading, and this service provides many, many people in our country with that opportunity. Therefore I think we should continue to encourage the States in this regard.

With the help offered by this act, the States have developed a variety of programs that seek to encourage lifetime reading habits and the use and support of libraries. Since June 1957, the Connecticut State Department of Education, Bureau of Library Services, with the help of the Library Services Act, has been able to assist over 100 small libraries in the State by supplying them with books.

The extension of the Library Services Act, in accordance with the provisions of this bill, is a definite necessity for Connecticut in order for the State to continue bringing good reading to its rapidly growing population. Libraries in Connecticut are subject to the same pressures from population growth as other agencies and institutions. Small public libraries, originally fashioned to serve a small, stable population, are finding themselves swamped by the demands of new families, new schools, and the growing number of youths.

Once a year during National Library Week this Nation acknowledges the wonderful service that our public libraries perform. This Congress should—this Congress must—by its actions reflect the importance our country attaches to continuing the growth of our public-library system.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, once again we are asked to disregard our promises of the past. When this bill was originally passed in 1956 it was represented to us that if we authorized a 5-year program that would be all that was expected and there would be no further need for additional authorizations for the library services program. It is my conviction that many Members who originally supported this legislation, just as I did, took the sponsors of this legislation at their word. Either they were right then or they are right now—evidently they have not and cannot express when they will be right. I cannot in good conscience support this legislation for a further 5-year extension of this legislation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON], and others have said here this afternoon, if we would only take the time to go out and spend a day on one of these bookmobiles, our minds would be made up, as mine and others have been in the past 2 or 3 weeks. I would not believe it unless I had seen it with my own eyes. Where no books are available to the people, in order to get books to read, young children and adults walk a mile to a crossroad or to a gas station.

It has been said by many educators in our country that our survival with Russia may not be determined by missiles

but may be determined in the field of education. And, when they come back and report to the Congress and to the committees of Congress that Russia is spending more on education than we are, I think that we should be concerned. Libraries are tied in with education. Libraries are teaching the youth of our country, and if we are concerned with the youth of our country and, with the problems of juvenile delinquency, the libraries are the centers where these people may go to gain knowledge. We have been told by experts in this field that one of the best ways to prevent juvenile delinquency is to provide young people with the facilities of learning and the books to read, because it is here that we are doing the most good for both youth and the adults of our country.

This bill to extend the Library Services Act—which I have been proud to support since its passage in 1956—places upon every one of us a tremendous responsibility. It enjoins us to consider the critical needs of our country with regard to education, and the basic role of libraries in the educational process.

On two recent occasions—a conference of the American Library Association, and a convocation at the Graduate Library School of the Drexel Institute of Technology—it was my privilege to discuss progress under the Library Services Act, and to commend library leaders for their active part in our educational system. I would like to include these two speeches in my remarks.

With the close of World War II, I pointed out, the value of education as a national resource was brought sharply into focus. It is now clear that America's supremacy and even survival demand a stronger fiber of education in the social fabric. One institution with a growing educational mission is the library.

It is my conviction—as expressed on this and other occasions—that libraries are more than storehouses: their broader function is to teach.

I often reflect on the importance of libraries to several programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—programs in which the role of libraries in education and science are vital. Many libraries and library groups collaborate in activities of the Office of Education and the National Library of Medicine. They share particularly the interests of the Public Health Service in aging and juvenile delinquency. I should like to mention briefly a few of the libraries' contributions in these problem areas that are of such deep concern to us all.

One of the great paradoxes of the modern world is the problem of our aging population—medical and social needs that have risen as a result of our longer lifespan. We can expect a continued increase in those burdens that weigh so heavily upon the aged—health problems, occupational difficulties, lower income, unsatisfactory living conditions, loneliness.

The American Library Association has outlined its objectives with regard to the aged. It has spelled out in congressional testimony how the public library renders direct service to the elderly; supplies middle-age groups with literature on retirement plans, housing, and income; coordinates interested civic groups and educational programs; and assists personnel who work with the aged through books, films, and exhibits.

An extension of the Library Services Act would enable libraries to continue this fine work of salvaging the elder population's vast resource of experience and skills.

Another group especially needful of library service is the young. At this critical age the mind of youth is capable of intense application in response to an inspiration. I have seen young people come to public libraries drawn by up-to-date material on inventions, the space age, sports, and recreation, career opportunities, and interesting lives. And I have seen this in districts where crime and violence beckon constantly to every child. The library stands as one of our great bulwarks against the terrible and ruinous waste of juvenile delinquency.

Many of you who are active in helping our young people will recall certain resolutions passed at the recent White House Conference on Youth, which included 100 librarians among its delegates. It was resolved that action should be taken to extend the availability of public library service to every citizen; that libraries be established in schools, with a view to helping them achieve higher standards; and that reading, training in the selection of literature, and recruitment of personnel trained in reading guidance be vigorously promoted. Most important of all, I think, was the resolution that young people should be encouraged to study the great ethical, moral, and religious truths, and to use these in formulating codes of conduct for their guidance toward good citizenship. Extension of the Library Services Act would do a great deal to further these worthy objectives.

Aging and juvenile delinquency are among the grave national problems to which the Congress has earnestly and effectively addressed itself in various acts. The bill before us now offers yet another opportunity to serve both the elder and the younger citizen.

This program administered by the U.S. Office of Education has already helped to bring library service to more than 30 million people in rural America. It has provided trained personnel, 200 bookmobiles, and 5 million books and other materials. Fifty-two States and Territories are now participating. Since the beginning of the program in 1957, the matching requirements have stimulated local governments to increase their library appropriations by 45 percent. One of the most encouraging results is the development of an effective system of libraries with strong centers, cooperative processing, and so forth. And there is a widespread and growing awareness of the meaning of libraries in education.

In my own State of Rhode Island, progress under the act has been typical. A special unit, public library services in rural areas, was set up in the office of the secretary of state to administer the program. A bookmobile was added, and a book grant was made to rural libraries, with provisions for emphasis on reference material. A series of workshops has been held at headquarters, and State consultant and bookmobile services have steadily grown. Although late in initiating a comprehensive plan, we have made remarkable progress under the act during the past 2 years. I am proud to say that 42 libraries have improved the quality of their collections, 33 have increased their circulation of books, and 14 have extended their hours of service. Local support has increased by 38 percent in Rhode Island in a period of 3 years only. And I would like at this point to include a table showing comparable statistics which has been prepared by Elizabeth G. Myer, supervisor of the Rhode Island Public Library Services in Rural Areas, as of July 14, 1960:

	1956	1959–60	Percent of increase
Total hours open	486¾	589¾	21
Total circulation	436,391	597,058	37
Local support (town)	$56,213.00	$77,339.50	38
Other sources	44,076.36	50,366.16	
Total	100,289.36	127,705.66	27

Behind these statistics is a story of sincere and dedicated effort and of deep gratitude on the part of many citizens for the legislation that has made this growth possible. I am so impressed with our progress in Rhode Island that I am confident—as many of you must be after reviewing the library program in your own States—of continued accelerating success. With public opinion firmly behind it, and with increasing resources, this program will advance until no man, woman or child in this country is denied the opportunity for intellectual and spiritual growth which access to a good library affords.

Society depends upon the library for many things. Not the least of which is its capacity to deepen appreciation and stimulate interest in the arts and sciences, in our principles and traditions, and in the peoples of other lands. This is an intangible role, but nonetheless a real one. It evokes a vital spirit in every American—the spirit to see our country progress and lead.

To summarize, I urge you to extend the Library Services Act in the broad interests of national progress and security. The libraries of this country must continue to help special groups, such as young people and the aged. They must continue to further science—directly by providing reference and educational materials, and indirectly by improving the national climate for scientific endeavor.

Public libraries are the bedrock of our communications structure. More than any other institution, they are responsible for passing information "vertically"—down through time. Today they are assuming a greater role in the dissemination of current facts. And they have always been instrumental in shaping our national destiny. An extension of the Library Services Act would help

in a very substantial way to strengthen America's heritage and insure her future.

Of particular interest to the people in my own State of Rhode Island is the following article written by Phyllis Meras for the Providence Sunday-Journal and an editorial which appeared in the Providence Journal on June 14, 1960, along with a number of letters which I have received from persons in Rhode Island who are vitally concerned by the possibility of the discontinuance of this most necessary service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will pass by a big vote.

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 10, 1960]

BOOKMOBILE SERVES RURAL AREAS: TWO THOUSAND VOLUMES TOUR STATE

(By Phyllis Meras)

Three days a week the Rhode Island bookmobile leaves the parking lot behind the Roger Williams Building and sets out down a road leading to a rural part of the State.

In three neat birch bookcases it carries 2,000 volumes. It stops at trailer camps and general stores, gas stations, drugstores, public schools. Its territory is any area where there is no public library within 2 miles.

On a northern Rhode Island trip the blue, blue-black and gray truck rolls down Louisquisset Pike to the Diamond Hill Trailer Camp. Driver James McCann honks a greeting to potential patrons. Trailer doors open and the bookmobile door opens.

A young mother in blue jeans climbs aboard and says she's looking for books on child care. She says also she's to pick up books for a neighbor. "He wants them on World War II or the Civil War," she explains.

Librarian Claire Mitsock searches the shelves and offers Bruce Catton Civil War accounts, JOHN KENNEDY'S "Profile in Courage," Ernie Pyle's "Brave Men."

The young housewife examines them all with a sigh.

"He'll say to me what do you think I am, just a book reader?" But she takes out the lot, along with "The Parents Guide to Everyday Problems of Boys and Girls," and "Is Your Child Really Fit?"

SERVICE STATION

At Gorst's Country Store, with its flower seed and feed advertisements in the windows, Mrs. Fred Gorst runs out with an armload of books from the bookmobile's last trip 2 weeks earlier.

"How about one on Senator KENNEDY? Got any of those today?

She's also interested in "How To Run a Small Business," and picture books for her children, and novels for her mother.

Across Diamond Hill Road and down a bit, the bookmobile stops again at McGee's Service Station so Mrs. McGee can bring back John Galsworthy's "Forsyte Saga."

She doesn't think she'll take anything out this week, she explains, because she's due to go down to Baltimore for a visit, But, under urging, she agrees to take "just a couple."

"If my husband can't find them when you come back, you just go in and look. I'll put them on top of the piano."

Librarian, Miss Mitsock, inquires about an invalid friend of Mrs. McGee's who lives down the road and likes historical novels. The bookmobile heads down the road.

It pulls in at Bradbury's Drugstore where Mrs. Richard Mania comes on to get books for her third graders at the Garvin School. Another patron takes a look at Rafael Sabatini's "Scaramouche."

"No, that's not my cup of tea."

MUCH EASIER

Inquiries are made for children about "Black Beauty" and "Swiss Family Robinson" and "The Wizard of Oz." One patron has extra books to get because neighbors' children are sick.

A book about Egyptian excavations is looked over. The librarian makes a note of Mrs. Edward McPartland's interest in Egyptology.

Whenever the bookmobile comes to Bradbury's, Mrs. McPartland—often with her youngsters—is on hand. "It's easier than going to the library. I live right up at the next house. I'm ironing today. All I have to do is run out the front door. I don't have to get the car and take the children and drive into town."

In 1959, the Rhode Island bookmobile—public library services in rural areas is its proper name—made 113 trips through Rhode Island. It lent 18,750 books to children and 8,646 to adults.

HEADQUARTERS

The bookmobile began after Congress Library Services Act of 1956 which authorized Federal money to match State money spent to improve library service in country areas. Besides the purchase of books for the bookmobile, the money is used for volumes for 42 rural libraries in the State.

Headquarters for the operation is the Roger Williams Building on Hayes Street, where books are processed and cataloged, orders sent out. A rural library patron can request any book he or she chooses. Unless it is clearly a book to be used only for a specific piece of research, Rural Library Services will buy it.

"It's worth our while because we can circulate it among all our libraries," Miss Elizabeth G. Myer, director of the program, explains.

As a result, books on bookmobile and rural library shelves include works on electrical engineering, dye making, foreign languages. A dictionary is among the most popular of bookmobile books.

Rhode Island's bookmobile has been in service only since 1958, but its staff maintains that the 20-foot long caravan of knowledge has made thousands of country-bound Rhode Islanders more conscious of the riches in books.

[From the Providence Journal, June 14, 1960]

A USEFUL FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR LIBRARIES NEEDS HELP

The Federal Library Services Act, embodying a program of State-Federal aid to libraries in smaller communities, is in danger, and it will die unless the House Committee on Rules reconsiders an adverse vote on the legislation or unless the measure can be taken from committee directly to the floor.

The act was passed in 1956, and a measure to extend its 5-year term past the expiration date of June 1961, went through the Senate without trouble. It also cleared the House Committee on Education and Labor, but the Rules Committee declined to let the bill get to the floor of the House.

Ironically, the vote in the Rules Committee was a tie, six to six, but the tie was as effective as an outright "no" in keeping the measure bottled up. Four Republicans and two Democrats joined to keep the bill from a vote which, it is reported, would be almost certain to be favorable.

The reason for the broad support of the plan to extend the life of the act rests on the success of the operation. The bill is intended to foster libraries in communities with populations under 10,000; in Rhode Island alone, 42 small libraries have qualified for help and have received substantial aid.

For the current fiscal year, the Federal Government's contribution to the program here is about $52,000; the State's cash share is about $21,000, and it is supplemented by various credits. Nationally, there are active programs in 52 States and territories, and rural library service has profited tremendously.

Although the act was passed in 1956, many of the States and Territories were not able to qualify for 2 or more years because of the need to get enabling State legislation and appropriations and to set up local programs. Now, with the program in full swing at last, it is in danger of being killed off.

In Rhode Island, for instance, the program has been of special value for hundreds of school youngsters. With the new interest in regional high schools, the program promised to be of even greater value than it has in the past. How the program will fare if Federal sharing of costs is killed isn't certain.

The entire delegation from Rhode Island in the House and Senate has supported the program. In particular, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY has been active on its behalf. But letters of support for the bill to the delegation would be useful in demonstrating to the Rules Committee the extent of general voter support for the program.

The program is not a handout; the State is required to match pretty closely the Federal grant through cash and services. At the very least, Congress ought to provide for an orderly transition to total State support, because outright refusal to extend the act now would throw the State programs into chaos.

Reconsideration of action by the House Rules Committee is highly desirable, but if it is necessary to circumvent the committee through suspension of House rules, we hope that the Rhode Island delegation will be as diligent in that effort as it has been to date in support of the program itself.

THE GREENVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY

For 74 years the Greenville Public Library occupied a tiny building in the center of the village, next to St. Thomas Episcopal Church.

It had no running water. Even in recent years, only electricity of sorts. Before that, just a lamp or two. It was warmed by one small stove; later by a one-pipe furnace, the heat from which came through a central register and swiftly vanished as it neared the outer walls. The children's alcove was an area 8 by 10 feet square, its boundaries marked by bookshelves. But the walls and stacks of the library were crammed with books.

Small as the building was, and inconvenient, the librarian and the townsfolk loved their library. Year by year they gave it books they had enjoyed—6,000 books of travel, biography, and fiction. In 1948 two of its association members, Mr. and Mrs. Henry F. Jenckes, bequeathed the library several thousand dollars and a parcel of land halfway up the hill on the edge of the village. This fund, accumulating through the years, was finally sufficient for the erection of the present building. The library then had three assets—a delightful site, its 6,000 books, and enough cash in hand to pay the construction costs of the Jenckes Memorial Building, completed in 1956.

Equipment, furnishings, and maintenance were another matter. Furnishings and equipment were provided for through funds contributed by the townspeople, and by outside friends responsive to the library's readiness and eagerness to meet the needs of a fast-growing community. From a township beset with the problems of assimilating a dozen or more large housing developments suddenly sprouting in its outlying districts, only a modest budget can be asked for. Maintenance, therefore, rests on a sum considerably less than $2,500 received from the town of Smithfield, to which are added the annual dues from association members, plus

such special contributions toward maintenance, improvements, and educational activities as may be received annually from members and friends.

Books are purchased from the ever-helpful State and Federal allowances. The book circulation, which stood at 1,642 in the old building, reached 17,421 in the new building during 1959. The staff comprises an enthusiastic and industrious librarian and a part-time caretaker, plus a score of unpaid volunteer assistants, who under direction shelve, catalogue, type, file, paste, and label; or run art shows, lectures, musicales, receptions, teas or cake sales, as the case may require. Thus fortified, the library pursues its joyous but frugal way.

In the short years since the new building opened, a local arts and crafts festival conducted by the library has brought to light the surprising amount of skilled and professional work that is being done in the township. A junior craft festival has stimulated the work of our young people. Local artists have been invited to hold one-man and group shows in the lower study, as the library's assembly room is called, and other art shows have been provided by members of the Providence Art Club and the Rockport Art Association. And lectures on Russia, Alaska, and other timely subjects have been given before the association or the community at large. In fact, Professor Smiley, of Brown University, lectured at the library on satellites, while Sputnik I was still visible in orbit.

Meantime, over 4,000 books have been added to the original 6,000 on our shelves. The circulation, on the 3 days a week when the library is open, has become more than the librarian can handle single handed. New shelves have recently been installed for nonfiction and mystery books, in order to allow more space for new science and reference material. An anteroom planned and used as a workroom has had to be converted into a reference room, constantly filled with teenage students looking up their home assignments. Schoolchildren use the library in such numbers that the children's and junior sections as well as the reference room are already overcrowded, and ways and means are being discussed for a new wing. At the present rate, in another 2 or 3 years an addition to the library will be essential.

MARGARET BINGHAM STILLWELL,
Secretary, Greenville Public Library.

HARMONY, R.I., *July 5, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I must say thank you again for all your work to keep the bill H.R. 12125 alive for a vote on August 22. The Rural Service Act has been a wonderful help to our small Harmony library. Six hundred books have been received. We hope the bill will pass so that we may have more help next year.

Sincerely,

ADAH S. HAWKINS,
Librarian.

RHODE ISLAND STATE LIBRARY.
Providence, June 7, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: The program of the public library services in rural areas in the State of Rhode Island has been exemplary.

Newsletters of progress have been filed with Germaine Krettek of the American Library Association, Washington Office, 200 C Street SE., Washington 3, D.C.

This morning we received a letter from the supervisor of this program in Rhode Island who advises us that immediate action is needed to save the Library Services Act extension bill. Since June 2, the House Committee on Rules considered H.R. 12125 and denied it a rule.

The Rules Committee is the powerful House committee which decides what legislation shall come before the House for consideration, and under what provisions it shall be debated.

We are writing to the members of the House Rules Committee as of today asking for reconsideration of the decision and we are also writing to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress asking for their special effort to have this particular program of public library services in rural areas continued.

With Rhode Island, as the smallest State, in which the program has been exceedingly successful, we have the earnest desire to advise of our keen interest in favorable action with respect to this particular resolution.

Your assistance will be deeply appreciated.

Most cordially,

GRACE M. SHERWOOD,
State Librarian.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Providence, June 6, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Second Congressional District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: News from Washington on H.R. 12125 has quite dismayed us who believe in the extension of the Library Services Act.

We appreciate your support on behalf of this vital educational opportunity, and are writing members of the House Committee on Rules to request a reconsideration of their action.

Thanking you for all that you are doing on behalf of better education, health, and well-being of American citizens,

Very sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH G. MYER,
Supervisor.

PEACE DALE, R. I., *June 24, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: I am very certain that you are doing everything possible to retain the absolutely vital Library Services Act for at least another 3 years and, if possible, a longer period.

Our board of trustees is very concerned about the latest threat to curtail the above referred to act. It might interest you to know that our Peace Dale Library had approximately 17,000 books on its shelves and that our circulation in the year before the act became effective was 18,000. Our circulation for the year ending October 1959 was 35,000. These figures speak for themselves.

Cordially yours,

THOMAS P. HAZARD.

ARNOLD'S MILLS COMMUNITY LIBRARY,
Cumberland, R.I., June 15, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: The Arnold Mills Community Library Board members urge that the Federal Library Services Act, bill H.R. 12125, be placed on the floor and request a favorable vote on it.

Our library is deeply indebted to and appreciative of the Federal services to rural libraries.

Without the additions that the 1959–60 appropriations provided our library we could never have filled the need for up-to-date and necessary material for our students and adult patrons.

We appreciate your activity on behalf of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE B. TODD,
Mrs. Gordon F. Todd,
Library Board Secretary.

JAMESTOWN PHILOMENIAN LIBRARY,
Jamestown, R.I., June 17, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: Please support bill H.R. 12125, Library Services Act, as it is of vital importance to small libraries.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISE BRAMAN,
Librarian.
HOPE E. CARR,
Assistant Librarian.

ARNOLD'S MILLS COMMUNITY LIBRARY,
Cumberland, R.I., June 21, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: As librarian of a small rural library, I would like to express my appreciation and deep gratitude for your aid and support of the Library Services Act. Without such aid we could not have adequately served our schools in their increased science and reference demands, and we look forward to a continuance of the act to insure us the much-needed supply of books for the future.

We are exceedingly grateful for your interest in the past and look forward to your continued support in the future.

Respectfully yours,

FLORENCE G. ALDEN,
Librarian.

GREENE PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Greene, R.I., June 16, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to a bill H.R. 12125, known as the Library Services Act. This bill would greatly benefit the poor, small libraries in purchasing needed books, which otherwise we would not be able to obtain.

A companion bill S. 2830 passed the Senate May 25 without a dissenting vote.

All efforts to get H.R. 12125 out of the Rules Committee have failed. If you would contact some of the members of this committee, and persuade them to let this bill come out on the floor for a vote, I am quite sure it would pass.

Almost invariably it is not opposition to libraries, but unawareness of them that causes lack of support. We would greatly appreciate it if you would help get this bill out of committee and on to the floor of the House for a vote.

With all good wishes, I remain,

Cordially yours,

CLIFTON W. STEERE,
Librarian.

KINGSTON FREE LIBRARY, INC.,
Kingston, R.I., June 14, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY: The board of trustees of this institution has just learned that the House Rules Committee has denied the Rural Library Services Act, H.R. 12125, a rule and the opportunity to be considered by the House. This is very disturbing to us. The act has enabled us to increase our acquisitions at a time in which it is extremely difficult for small communities to meet rising costs in services and in purchase of publications. We urge you to do whatever you can to have the House consider this bill—and, no doubt, to pass it as

has already been done by the Senate. As we have written each member of the House Rules Committee: "Surely the United States of America which is spending so much money on material things can afford a contribution to rural libraries."

Please do what you can for us.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL H. THOMAS,
President.

TIVERTON, R.I., *June 20, 1960.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: I wish to express our appreciation for the public library services in rural areas and express our desire to have the act, H.R. 12125, continued.

Our library serves a rural community. A large number of our patrons are children from a nearby school. They are the future leaders of our community, State, and Nation. With the aid of public libraries in rural areas we have been able to purchase many volumes which we would not otherwise have. This aid has enabled us to order a new set of encyclopedias and to bring our science collection up to date. We have replaced some of the classics with more appealing editions. Many of our classics were of ancient copyright.

I trust you will approve the motion to suspend the rules and thus get H.R. 12125 out of the Rules Committee. When the bill comes up for a vote please remember what this aid has meant to one rural library and multiply that appreciation by all the rural libraries.

Our future citizens have enjoyed the books we have purchased. We hope to be able to continue enlarging our book collection. A reading public is a well-informed public.

Please do as much as possible to be present and vote favorably on H.R. 12125.

Very truly yours,

GRACE M. SNELL,
Mrs. Ralph Snell,
Librarian, Union Public Library.

ELMWOOD PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Providence, R.I., June 9, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: I was most distressed to receive the special memo from Miss Kretek dated June 3 with the news about the action of the House Committee on Rules regarding the Library Services Act. I am sure that you must be equally disturbed.

For Rhode Island, especially, any action to terminate the Library Services Act program would be most disastrous. As you fully realize, it is the only program specifically designed to serve rural areas, and it has made a marked improvement in library service in these areas since its inception. Although we hope that some day the State will be able to carry on this program, it will require much advanced planning for such an undertaking.

I am confident that you will do everything possible to influence members of the House Rules Committee to reconsider this ruling and to vote favorably on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY W. BUDLONG,
Librarian and Past President Rhode Island Library Association.

ASHTON, R.I.

Hon. JOHN FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FOGARTY: During the past year our school has been very effectively served by the bookmobile operated by the Rhode Island Department of State Public Library Services in Rural Areas. This service has been keenly appreciated by the teachers, pupils, and parents, because we have no other library service available in this area. I understand that you have great personal interest in this project.

In a recent communication from the American Library Association we have been informed that this service may be terminated unless the House Committee on Rules reconsiders its action and votes favorably on bill H.R. 12125. We understand that the Senate has already voted favorably on the companion bill, S. 2630.

While the bookmobile is a comparatively new project in Rhode Island, it has proven to be very popular and highly beneficial. Any consideration that you may be able to give in behalf of its continued service will be greatly appreciated by your many friends in Cumberland.

Sincerely yours,

MARY M. GEDDES,
Principal, Ashton School.

NORTH SCITUATE, R.I., *June 29, 1960.*

MY DEAR MR. FOGARTY: Just a note in regards to the money appropriations for the rural library service. I would like you to be in favor of continuing this service. Our little girl has enjoyed the books so much that she has brought home from the bookmobile.

Sincerely,

EMILY ANGELL.

NORTH SCITUATE, R.I., *June 30, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I express my appreciation to you for your efforts in behalf of the extension of Federal grants for rural libraries, and may I assure you of a vital interest in this program in our community in Rhode Island.

The enthusiastic response to the bookmobile in North Scituate clearly indicates that our people want to read, and will if good material is available.

Important additions have been made to the shelves of our public library, and a great deal more could be done there, in regard to volume and the days and hours that the library is open.

It would be a real loss to us if this program should be abandoned, and I heartily endorse your proposed 5-year extension of appropriations for same.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET M. CHAMBERLAIN
Mrs. George W. Chamberlain.

WAKEFIELD, R.I., *June 28, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I realize you were instrumental in getting through the Library Services Act, originally.

Understanding there is a question it might be killed through adverse legislation, I want to express at least my hopes that your efforts to have it continued will be successful.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK R. KROENER.

KINGSTON FREE LIBRARY, INC.,
Kingston, R.I., July 15, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY: I wish to thank you for your recent letter concerning the Rural Library Services Act which was tied up in the House Rules Committee and for your efforts to have this bill brought out on August 22. This information was reported to the meeting of the trustees of our library earlier this week. I was requested by the members to write you thanking you for your interest, for your leadership in the move to get the bill before the House, and for your interest in our problem.

I am happy to do so at this time. It costs a rural library a very large proportion of its budget simply to pay the cost of the building and its upkeep and the salary of a librarian. Our own library is relatively fortunate because of an endowment from which we get the larger share of our income. Nevertheless, we were able almost to double our purchases because of the $800 which we received through the Library Services Act during the past year.

Again, it was good of you to take the leadership in the effort to keep this bill alive and to work for its passage. We want you to know that it is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL H. THOMAS.

BROWNELL & FIELD CO.,
Providence, R.I., July 15, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Custom House Building,
Providence, R.I.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my thanks to you for your recent work which should ultimately insure passage of the bill extending Federal aid to rural libraries for the next 5 years.

I wrote you on behalf of the Barrington Public Library last April. I want you to know how much we appreciate your work aiding rural libraries.

Again I want to thank you for your efforts on behalf of the bill which would aid our library, the many rural libraries in the State of Rhode Island, as well as throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL W. FIELD, Jr.,
Chairman, Barrington Library Trustees.

MANVILLE, R.I., *May 19, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May we here at Sherman Leclerc Library urge you to continue your interest in the extension of the Federal Aid to Rural Libraries Act.

It has meant so much to our organization to have been able to receive this extra help in adding to our book collection, and, as a result, watch our ever-increasing circulation.

Sincerely,

MARGUERITE C. WEGIMONT
Mrs. Francis J. Wegimont,
Librarian.

CONGRESS CONSIDERS LIBRARIES AND EDUCATION

(Address of Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Public Library Association meeting, Washington, D.C., June 26, 1959)

I am grateful for this opportunity to meet with an organization that is doing so much on behalf of causes that I have long been proud to serve. I refer particularly to the broad fields of health and education. Few groups are more important than the American Library Association in meeting these national challenges.

These are times when every institution concerned with maintaining a free and informed citizenry is playing a critical part in our Nation's destiny. Public libraries, as a mainstay of our communications structure, are indispensable in this era of science and technology, of farflung interests abroad, of international tensions and complex domestic problems. These are times when every thinking person needs the information, the background that only reading can give, and the kind of stimulation and diversion that literature alone affords.

Let me say at the outset that the library's role in meeting the intellectual challenge of today is not, in my opinion, a passive one. It is a dynamic role that calls for action on the part of librarians, trustees, and the friends

of libraries. It is a role that demands a strong organization, in which all members are highly sensitive to social needs, their own goals, and the roads that are open to those goals. The needs that face us—and I think again of our many interests in common—urge an attack with all our resources.

For many years I have been concerned with those needs, both as a Representative to Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, and as chairman of the subcommittee in the House of Representatives which is responsible for appropriations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Libraries share many of the Department's interests in the fields of health and education, particularly those of the Public Health Service in aging, juvenile delinquency, and blindness. Other common interests are the program of scientific translation and the National Library of Medicine, which became a part of the Service in 1956.

Since ancient times, libraries have served the civilized community as storehouses of information. The importance of this function alone is attested by the fact that an ability to accumulate knowledge and transmit it down the generations is an essential difference between man and the lower animals. Increasingly, however, libraries have assumed additional functions—have taken a more active role in the community. The library today is not only a medium of communication; it is an integral part of our educational structure. One of its principal functions is to teach.

We think immediately of school libraries and their importance in general and professional education. But I have in mind a broader concept. The educational institution—the school or college—must not only teach; it must point the student down the road of knowledge. With school behind us, our education has only begun. Here, then, is perhaps the main role of the library—to help us gain the education we need on our way through life. In this, the school library is joined by the public and special libraries—those of industry, societies, government. Together, these facilitate our self-development, our intelligent participation in public affairs, and our pursuit of special interests.

The broader role of the library, in the eyes of a mere observer, calls for more intensive development of special resources for communication, such as films and recordings. The addition of musical and audiovisual dimensions to literature can provide a rounded approach to the library's educational mission. To be sure, there are many difficulties. But only through such expanded programs can libraries, it seems to me, realize their full potential for education and creative experience.

This is most obvious with respect to special groups I have mentioned. Recordings for the blind, for example—an extremely valuable service—certainly bring the library into the forefront of educational institutions. The same might be said of records and prints used in seminars on music and art for the elderly. Or the showing of films in conjunction with courses under way in local schools, as an aid to the guidance of youth. It is these active ventures into education that I, in my work for these groups, find most gratifying in the progressive library of today.

I should like to make a special point about the efforts of the ALA toward the control of juvenile delinquency. This is a problem that has come often to my attention as a legislator. We have worked out, I believe, some good measures, such as the collaborative activity proposed in the current appropriation bills for the Children's Bureau and the National Institute of Mental Health. This is an effort to provide coordination and leadership through two agencies with interest, experience and resources in the fields of child welfare, child behavior, and child psychology. But legislation, however sound, can never solve this problem alone. It is a problem for the total community: the school, the church, the family—all of our social institutions. The library is very important here, primarily as a preventive, for it can offer books and programs to help our young adults understand themselves and adjust to life.

Many of you have given real thought to the problem of juvenile deliquency, and some of you, I know, are very active in this field. Libraries can reach children early and maintain contact as they grow and develop. Good progress has been made in bringing libraries to low-income areas; and in some cities, librarians trained for service to young people work cooperatively with welfare agencies. Given adequate funds and staffs, libraries can offer individual help, particularly to those who cannot read well. I believe the services to young people should be extended and promoted through adult groups, collaborative projects with juvenile courts, and mass media such as radio and television. To learn the best role of libraries in this problem, studies might well be done in collaboration with research and welfare agencies.

A realistic view of the library as an educational institution must take into account the question of funds. Legislation for the support of educational and research programs should generally be interpreted to include libraries as educational and research facilities. In the current research construction program of the Public Health Service, for example, the National Advisory Council that recommends grants to the Surgeon General holds that libraries are definitely research facilities. Few projects to date have included library construction because the funds have been insufficient to meet the need for laboratories, but the Council at its October meeting will consider whether research library construction can be expanded.

One of the Nation's most pressing medical and social problems is blindness. There are about 350,000 blind persons in this country, and the number is increasing despite public and private efforts over many years. The Public Health Service's National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is attacking the problem from the medical standpoint. On the social side, I have introduced a bill to establish a temporary Presidential commission to study and report on problems related to blindness and the needs of the blind. A prime objective is to help create a national atmosphere more favorable to the blind person and his role in society. This will call for studies of existing conditions, including rehabilitation programs, the education of blind children, and social services and research. One consideration will be how to provide books and recordings, including problems of procurement and distribution.

I am confident that standards and legislation will be developed through which the best library services now available for the blind will be augmented and extended. It gives me great satisfaction to work toward that end.

Among the most important library services are those extended to the older citizen. The magnitude of the aging problem demands that major resources such as libraries, so valuable in guidance, recreation, and many special activities, be encouraged in every way possible to do more in this field. Since 1900, people over 50 have increased in our population from 13 percent to more than 22 percent. By 1970, nearly 25 percent of the American people will be over 50, and 10 percent will be over 65. Social institutions should prepare for the impact of this growth. In an effort to help libraries in this regard, I will urge that they be cited in current bills before Congress.

Probably the legislation most directly significant to the ALA is the Library Services Act. As you know, the Congress has never appropriated the full $7.5 million authorized for this Office of Education program. But much progress has been made under the act, such as the extension of library services to 11 million people in rural American areas. I understand that 50 States and territories are now participating, and that the matching requirements have stimulated State and local governments to put 45 percent more money in libraries than they did before the program began.

Because this is one of the appropriations my subcommittee handles, I am proud of my own part in these achievements. The President's budget called for only $3 million last year. We in Congress raised this to $6 million—twice the budgeted amount. This year, the President's budget was $5 million. We in the House voted an additional million making it $6 million, the same amount as last year. The Senate on last Wednesday voted for $7.5 million. If a reasonable compromise is agreed to, the tremendous task of providing library services for 25 million more rural people in this country who do not now have access to public library service will be able to proceed. Having followed the program closely in Rhode Island, I am determined to see similar benefits extended throughout the greater United States.

I should like now to discuss some broad problems in which libraries are involved—problems impeding social and scientific progress, particularly in the field of medical research. One of these is the problem confronting the scientist when he searches the literature before undertaking an experiment. Although he may work in a highly specialized area, the information he needs will be widely scattered. Annually throughout the world, about 180,000 research reports appear in some 5,000 journals, and an estimated 10,000 books are published on medical and scientific subjects. The libraries can do little, of course, to control this volume of publication, although I am sure they would like to. There is, however, a major library responsibility for documentation—the vast field of lending order to this mountain of words.

I do not presume to understand the problem in detail—the many good proposals for solving it, the new equipment available, the programs under way. I do know that researchers in all fields, including the biological, physical, and social sciences, depend largely on libraries for the storage and retrieval of information. Those who write it and those who print it share the responsibility, but cannot come to grips with the problem because they are independent workers. The one unified element—the library—well organized and influential, should take the lead.

If some major library organization, such as the ALA or Library of Congress, were to adopt a plan acceptable to scientists and editors, cooperation would be assured through the desire of authors to be included in the system. For instance, authors would submit abstracts through editors to a central point for indexing, storage, and electronic retrieval. But this is just a thought; many of you are way ahead of me. I only mean to stress that the library—not the individual author, editor or reader—is the place to begin. It is the logical point of vantage for instituting a system that would streamline the search for data, now a task of such proportions as to threaten the value of reports themselves—even to threaten the continuity of knowledge.

Another major need—one in which libraries could play a larger part—is the distribution of educational material on science

and health. People are eager for literature on these subjects—current, factual, plain materials that answer their questions and expand their understanding. Federal, State, and local health departments, voluntary health agencies, and many other groups publish pamphlets and other materials on all the major health problems. Unfortunately, public libraries are often excluded from the distribution lists through doubt that the materials would be promoted or displayed. And the libraries have been unable to afford stocks of giveaways, the best approach to meeting the need. I believe, however, that cooperative arrangements could be worked out in which public libraries would play a key role in health education.

In making these various suggestions, I have failed to specify how they might best be adopted. Who would set the ball rolling? Certainly, librarians and ALA officials can do much in their own right, and it is they who must follow through once the services are instituted. But their authority and influence are limited. I appeal to the trustees and friends of libraries. They should take the initiative more often, lending their names and efforts to increasing support for their public libraries. Without the active participation of trustees and friends, the library can be little more than a storehouse. With their active aid, the library can be a dynamic agency working side by side with educational, research and welfare groups. It is largely through trustees and friends that an ancient and honorable institution—a latent force for social betterment—can realize its potential in the modern world.

To my mind, the most important ancillary function that a library can perform (a function so intangible that legislators can only talk about it) is to further the spirit of learning in this country. Basic to the improvement of domestic and foreign relations, to supremacy in science and technology, to the attainment of major national goals, must be a climate of public opinion more favorable to science, education and scholarship in general. Our need for this is felt keenly when one talks to scientists and educators, to people abroad. We need a national shift toward deeper appreciation of all that the library represents in our culture—knowledge, art, and their advancement through communication.

Librarians, through the selection of reading matter, group activities, and individual guidance, can help immeasurably to further the understanding of science and of the need for research. They can help acquaint young people with names and events in science, shaping their image of the scientist and a research career. They can call attention to opportunities in the sciences—courses of study, scholarships, positions. And above all, they can capture and stimulate that interest in the humanities which affects so strongly our sense of values, and thus our attitude toward the learned professions and their contribution.

To summarize, I would urge librarians to continue developing their programs along educational lines. You have an important mission in helping young people—the misguided and the gifted—older people, and many special groups. Health education is a particularly appropriate field. I urge you, collectively and individually, to further the sciences through advances in documentation and efforts to improve the national climate for scientific endeavor. And I call especially upon the trustees and friends of libraries to work on behalf of their institutions in such matters as support and the expansion of library functions.

For my part, I will do all I can to help the libraries of the Nation extend their basic and special services to every citizen.

Libraries, Education, and Society

(Remarks made by Representative John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at Drexel Institute of Technology, May 17, 1960, on occasion of his receiving the Distinguished Achievement Award from the Graduate School of Library Science and the Library Alumni Association)

Today I saw for the first time the impressive new quarters of the library school here at Drexel.[1] I am sure they bring to you a deep sense of pride and gratification—much as your Distinguished Achievement Award, and this opportunity to meet with you have given me. It is a fine thing to feel that one's efforts have played some part in strengthening the American heritage.

A library school—or legislation to aid libraries—can do just that: it can enrich society and strengthen the Nation. It does this mainly through the enduring contribution of libraries to education.

America's strength was once felt to lie predominantly in her agricultural and geographic advantages. Since the turn of the century, industry and natural resources have been paramount. Both, of course, remain essential to our country's strength and her leadership among free peoples. But the close of World War II brought sharply into focus another basic resource—education; and recent years have commanded its critical appraisal. It is now clear to many that agriculture and industry, however prolific, cannot insure supremacy or even survival without a stronger fiber of education in the social fabric.

The modern concept of education is a broad one. Besides the schools at all levels, many institutions and media are recognized as educational—partly because of their mounting interest in the role. There are more and more educational uses of films and recordings, radio and television, magazines and newspapers, pamphlets and books. There is an upward trend in the publication of all factual matter. I believe these changes reflect generally a felt need of people for a broader view of the world about them.

One institution with a growing educational mission is the library. It is axiomatic, of course, that libraries should serve scholarship; but I refer to a more active part in the educational process. Increasingly the progressive library is concerned with information—with collecting, lending, and promoting current reading matter, films, recordings, and other educational materials. Thus, the library alines itself with institutions and forces that are shaping our national destiny.

It is my conviction that this is the way in which libraries of all types can best serve the community in our dynamic times. Libraries are more than storehouses; their broader function is to teach.

For many years I have given my best thought to certain needs and aspirations of our people. This has been basic to my responsibilities as a Representative to Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, and as chairman of the subcommittee in the House of Representatives which is concerned with appropriations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am pleased to say that many libraries and library groups are closely allied with the Department in several of its programs. They collaborate in activities of the Office of Education and the National Library of Medicine. They share particularly the interests of the Public Health Service in aging, juvenile delinquency, and blindness.

As an interested layman, I should like to express briefly some views on the library's role in these tremendous problems.

One of the great paradoxes of the modern world is the problem of our aging population—the medical and social needs that have risen as a result of our longer life span, which is largely attributable to advances in medicine and public health. Since 1900, people over 50 have increased in our population from 13 percent to more than 22 percent. By 1970, nearly 25 percent of the American people will be over 50, and 10 percent will be over 65. This implies a continued increase in those burdens that weigh so heavily upon the aged—health problems, occupational difficulties, lowered income, unsatisfactory living conditions, loneliness.

In attempting to come to grips with such a problem one naturally turns to institutions and individuals that might be expected to help. A group that has outlined its objectives with regard to the aged is the National Library Association. It has spelled out in congressional testimony[2] how the public library renders direct services to the elderly; supplies middle age groups with literature on retirement plans, housing and income; coordinates interested civic groups and educational programs; and assists personnel who work with the aging through books, films, and exhibits.

These seem to me excellent, practical objectives that might well be extended to all libraries. In addition, I should like to see library schools expand the training of librarians to work with the elderly. Some studies should be undertaken to settle the question whether cultural and educational interests can actually retard mental decline, and to learn how libraries can help bring out and utilize the older person's best attributes. It would be a great credit to library science, and quite fitting, if some library group were to lead the way toward salvaging the elder population's vast resource of experience and skills.

The library's place in our culture is nuclear: it offers literature, information and recreation to many groups, the young as well as the old. I feel that its values to youth have barely been tapped. In many young people, there is a spirit that rebels against education—or rather, against being taught. This finds a terrible and ruinous expression in the juvenile delinquent, whose rebellion may lead to total loss of educational contact. And yet the delinquent or predelinquent does not necessarily resist learning. His indifference or hostility may embrace only the formal aspects of education—the classroom and its implication of discipline and conformity. The same individual may sometimes be reached through an appeal to his curiosity, his need to excel, or his natural love for reading, music, or some related pursuit. Every era has its Bohemian movement, which is essentially rebellious and yet intellectual or artistic.

The difficulty, of course, is to capture and hold interest. The library has strong competition, and I can offer no formula. I only know that the mind of youth is capable of intense application in response to the right appeal. With no coercion whatever, youth can master difficult sports, jazz music, automotive mechanics, radio engineering. And we have all seen young people come to public libraries in underprivileged metropolitan sections, drawn by up-to-date material on invention, the space age, sports and recreation, career opportunities, and interesting lives. I have seen this in districts where

[1] The Graduate School of Library Science (3d oldest in the United States and among the first 5 in enrollment) and the Drexel Library are housed together in the Library Center, opened in the fall of 1959, and the latest addition to the physical plant in the current expansion program.

[2] Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Aug. 4, 1959.

crime and violence beckon constantly to every child. In light of these things, I am confident that ways can be found to enhance the appeal and effectiveness of libraries in helping the prospective citizen.

You may be interested in certain resolutions passed at the recent White House Conference on Children and Youth, which included nearly 100 librarians among the delegates.

One resolution called for adequately supported studies to determine the effects of reading books, magazines, and newspapers upon young people. Another recommended that much more extensive use be made of films and other instructional material in both formal and informal education. Several resolutions were aimed at augmenting the opportunities for training and participation in dramatics, theater arts, and film production.

With direct reference to libraries, it was resolved that action should be taken to extend the availability of public library service to every citizen; that libraries be established in schools, colleges, and universities, with a view to helping them achieve higher standards; and that reading, training in the selection of literature, and recruitment of personnel trained in reading guidance be vigorously promoted.

One of the forums resolved that young people should be encouraged to study the great ethical, moral and religious truths, and to use these to formulate codes of conduct for their guidance toward good citizenship.

I believe we shall soon see legislation and other efforts to implement these recommendations at local, State, and Federal levels. Meanwhile, library workers will be able to draw on the resolutions in seeking interest and aid.

Another medical and social area in which libraries are making a valuable contribution is blindness. Despite public and private efforts over many years, the number of blind persons in this country is about 350,000 and is steadily increasing. The Public Health Service's National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is attacking the problem from the medical standpoint. On the social side, I believe there is need for a good study on problems related to blindness and the needs of the blind. One objective would be to help create a national atmosphere more favorable to the blind person and his role in society This would call for studies of existing conditions, including the problem of providing books and recordings. The best library services now available for the blind should be augmented and extended.

Some of you may not know that the Library of Congress' program to provide books for the blind is currently operating under an appropriation of $1.6 million, which is a little more than ever before. To date, the Library has provided about 5,600 titles in braille and Moon type and 4,000 talking books. Approximately 70,000 of the Library's machines are now in use.

As I have indicated, many grave medical and social problems call strongly on libraries among other key groups. Assistance to libraries themselves has been made available through the Library Services Act. In fiscal year 1960 allotments are based on the maximum authorized appropriation, $7.5 million. In this session of Congress, I have introduced a bill to extend the act for another 5 years beginning July 1.

This Office of Education program has helped to bring library services to 30 million people in rural America. It has provided trained personnel, 200 bookmobiles, and 5 million books and other materials. Fifty-two States and territories are now participating. Since the beginning of the program in 1957, the matching requirements have stimulated local governments to increase their library appropriations by 45 percent. One of the most encouraging results is the development of an effective system of libraries, with strong centers, cooperative processing, and so forth. And throughout the Nation, there is a growing awareness of the meaning of libraries in education.

In my own State of Rhode Island, progress under the act has been typical. A special unit, Public Library Services in Rural Areas, was set up in the office of the secretary of state to administer the program. A director, assistant director, clerical staff, and a bookmobile were added and new quarters obtained. A book grant was made to rural libraries, with provisions for emphasis on reference materials. Books are ordered and processed by the State agency. A series of workshops has been held at headquarters, and State consultant and bookmobile services have steadily grown.

Another law that has much significance for libraries is the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This is primarily designed to strengthen, improve, and expand education in the United States at all levels. Libraries are specified as basic to the educational process. I should like to call attention to the fact that projects developed under the act may include books and other materials, and that these are not yet available in adequate quantity and quality. Library materials to aid both teachers and students are needed for a balanced program.

Of the 10 titles in the act, title III offers the most direct opportunities for libraries. This authorizes $70 million a year until July 1962 for improved science, mathematics and modern foreign-language instruction in public schools. Federal funds are available for laboratory and other special equipment. By the language of the act, special equipment includes printed materials (except textbooks) and audiovisual materials and equipment. Minor remodeling and special equipment needed by the library because of its necessary expansion may be included, under projects approved by the State educational agency and the U.S. Office of Education.

Other titles also pertain to libraries and librarians—title II, for example, which provides loans up to $5,000 for college students. Persons training to become librarians are eligible, and 50 percent of the loan will be cancelled for those who serve as school or teacher librarians for 5 years. Another example is title IV, which provides graduate fellowships aimed particularly at the preparation of teachers for colleges and universities.

I urge all of you to review the provisions of the National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864) and to be sure your students are familiar with the aspects pertaining to libraries. The ALA or the U.S. Office of Education will glady supply details.

While speaking of Federal aid to libraries, I will make a point that may seem to the older hands here a little obvious. I refer to the fact that a library in the modern sense, adequately stocked and staffed to pull its own weight in an educational program, requires strong support from many quarters—particularly in the form of funds. A school of library science would do well to train its advanced students in the practice of fund raising. You must have support at local, State and national levels. To this end, librarians should take steps to increase public awareness of the library—to make it felt as a part of the community. It is largely through trustees and friends of libraries that the trend toward a more educational role must be advanced.

Such a role is necessarily diversified, and I have mentioned only some aspects. I have merely alluded to the library's part in cultural enrichment. Society depends upon the library for many things, not the least of which is its capacity to deepen appreciation and stimulate interest in the arts and sciences, in our principles and traditions, and in the peoples of other lands. This is an intangible role, but nonetheless a real one. It evokes a vital spirit in every American—the spirit to see our country progress and lead.

In this complex troubled world, the sciences loom in importance. Our prestige among nations depends largely upon our scientific preeminence. No amount of military preparedness could compensate for a lag in scientific knowledge or manpower. Nor can we ignore the value of the health sciences in a military and economic sense, for the cost of disease is the greatest burden any country can bear in war or peace. All this has direct bearing in the library field. You must continue, and I hope expand, your efforts to interest more people in the various sciences—in their support, their progress, and their application. Again the library is a powerful force for motivating, guiding, and teaching.

It is a responsibility of libraries to help keep alive the spirit of culture and learning. I know of no better way than to cherish and promote the freedom to read. As a nation we are not given to slogans or glib phrases for expressing our deeper values. It is not easy to tell in a word or two what America stands for. Yet we can say that our country and its Constitution are flatly opposed to censorship—that anyone can go to a public library and read any book fit to print, whether or not the ideas it expresses are generally accepted. This is specific enough, and should be widely proclaimed as a basic fact. It is the librarians who make such freedom possible by seeing that all sides of a social issue are presented, trusting in the American way to speak for itself. Freedom to read is fundamental to true democracy.

I have rambled a good deal, but I believe I can sum up the main theme. The library in modern society is particularly important as an educational institution. To enhance its social value, it must strengthen its educational role. This may be effected through the teaching of librarians, studies in the use of the library as an educational instrument, promotion of science, and aid to special groups such as the young at critical ages and the elderly. Progress along these lines will require friends, funds, and a strong voice in the community. Finally, libraries of all types, in preserving the freedom to read, in the broadest sense, both serve and exemplify the American ideal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 190, noes 29.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A similar House bill and a motion to reconsider were laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama and many from both parties have given sound, clear

reasons for the extension of their well-proven legislation. I support it strongly and hope it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, few measures considered on the floor of this House do so much for so many individuals who desire to increase their knowledge and improve their minds at such a small cost. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 2830, to extend the Library Services Act.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to plead for the extension of one of the most universally approved pieces of legislation passed by the Congress in the last decade. This legislation, the extension of the present Library Services Act, was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have the honor to be a member. It was recommended by the present national administration and at the urging of State library commissions in a vast majority of our States.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961 there will be an estimated 22 million rural Americans still without access to library service and 13 million more Americans with inadequate service. One hundred and fifty counties in the Nation have no library service.

The present act will have accomplished before its expiration on June 30, 1961, extension of service to 4 million additional Americans; 32 million more will have their library service improved. One hundred and sixty-nine counties previously without library service are participating in the program.

Since a major part of these costs are provided by States and local communities, I feel that the appropriations to be made under the extension of this act are fully justified and will result in great good.

I handled the legislation in 1955, which failed to pass by a margin of two votes. The following year, 1956, a new proposal, sponsored and supported by the chairman of the Committee on Education, was approved for a 5-year period. It is this legislation that we seek today to extend. I urge my colleagues to give full support to this service to the American people.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the need for extending the Library Services Act has been well demonstrated by the resounding success of this worthy program since it was first approved by Congress a few years ago and I wholeheartedly applaud the leadership for making it possible for the House to work its will by bringing up this bill today under suspension of the rules.

I worked for and supported the original bill when the Congress authorized the enabling legislation after our Committee on Education and Labor received such impressive testimony in favor of this program. I was also pleased to join my colleagues in seeing to it that the necessary funds were made available to get this vital library activity under way.

Now that we have had the opportunity to see what a program of this kind can accomplish in its early stages, it becomes necessary more than ever to protect and advance these early gains by extending these necessary library services for another 5 years, so that those States which have not yet fully implemented their programs may yet take advantage of helpful Federal library aid.

I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, for his outstanding leadership in handling this bill. His eloquent appeal in behalf of H.R. 12125 has fully demonstrated the need for this legislation.

I propose to vote once again in favor of this vitally needed program and I hope the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote.

I am very proud and grateful for the unflagging interest and sustained able endeavors of my esteemed friend and constituent, Mrs. Alice Wallace, of Fitchburg, Mass., and her associates. Her inspiring leadership and their superb work for the entire library program constitute a magnificent public contribution that will long be remembered.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the extension of the Library Services Act.

The whole purpose of this act is to stimulate the States to provide better public library service for our rural areas.

Through this legislation in past years, much progress has been made in expanding the availability of books to that part of our public which would otherwise not be served by libraries.

It would be a pity to cut short the program at this time. The expansion of knowledge is one of the great aims of our democracy and this legislation will substantially further this objective, and thus serve the welfare of our country.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago when Congress passed the Library Services Act it established a program which has now become an indispensable branch of the education system in rural areas throughout every State.

The needs in education today—more schools, more teachers, more vocational training, rehabilitation, training for the gifted and opportunities for higher education—have become a seamless web. Every effort is closely related to another and if we drop one thread we weaken the whole structure.

Rural library services which now supply more than 5 million books to remote areas where people would not otherwise have access to them, is an invaluable adjunct to the overburdened educational systems of the States.

During the last month I have had the opportunity to visit one of our Maine bookmobiles as it stopped in the little town of Stockholm. I viewed the panorama of inviting books attractively displayed inside the bookmobile, and I realized the number of remote rural homes to which the world of books was being carried. Here, on the four wheels of the bookmobile, rode the principle of equal educational opportunity. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, these rolling tomes gather no moss.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, Maine will have available a total Federal allotment of $83,021, if State and local sources can raise $58,750 in matching funds. Here is one program where the Federal expenditure is modest in terms of the harvest—the cost of 1 week's storage of agricultural surpluses—where the incentive principle has worked, and where the allocation of funds takes into account the fact that States vary in their financial resources.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the House this afternoon has an opportunity to extend for another 5 years one of the most inspiring and beneficial programs in which the Federal Government participates—the library services program.

Of the great many areas of our national life in which the Federal Government cooperates with States and local communities, I know of none where the return on the Federal investment is greater in terms of strengthening the basis of American democracy than it is with the Library Services Act. An informed and judicious electorate is still the greatest strength of democracy. And the public library is still the greatest educational institution in America.

Under the Library Services Act, States and the Federal Government have taken giant strides in expanding the services of public libraries, especially in rural areas, in developing new techniques and administrative arrangements for circulating more books to more people throughout the country.

There is something especially wonderful about this, Mr. Speaker. From the time most people are first introduced to the world of books, from the moment they first come in contact with the world of thought and imagination and information, the reading habit is caught. To foster this interest, to help make it available to others, to bring more good books within reach of more people—this is noble work, work worthy of the encouragement and support of governments dedicated to freedom and opportunity and the service of their people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial which was published in the August 17 issue of the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News. As a thoughtful statement of the reasons for supporting this legislation, I urge our colleagues to read it, and then approve this extension of the Library Services Act.

The editorial follows:

LIBRARY SERVICES

Now that the House, too, has reconvened, it is hoped that one bill, lacking the glamour attached to space age projects or proposals of global significance, will not be forgotten in the concluding session so highly charged with politics.

When the Congress recessed last July 3 it failed to act on the library services bill. The Library Services Act became law in 1956. It provided Federal funds for library development in rural areas through 1961. Millions of Americans in rural areas gained new and improved public library service thanks to this act.

New Jersey has received nearly $300,000 from the Federal Government for its libraries. Added has been the State's matching appropriation. As a result, it has been possible to add to staffs, equipment, and books in rural communities. It also has helped the book borrower in rural communities where there are no libraries. Borrowers have obtained books through the State library's extension service.

In these wild-spending days, one hesitates to add a cent to a U.S. budget which has swollen to inflationary proportions. Yet, there are some services that States should perform for their residents but cannot because they are beyond their financial scope—particularly in times like this when the Federal Government takes a large share of the tax dollar.

The library service in rural areas is one of these responsibilities. America's greatest weapon today is knowledge—and knowledge is stored in books. We cannot afford to deprive anyone of information whose use can help America.

Thus, the Library Services Act must be extended.

The needed legislation has passed unanimously in the Senate. If this bill remains bottled up in the Rules Committee of the House then, on August 22, two-thirds of the House quorum can suspend the rules in order to act on this bill that would aid 1½ million residents of rural New Jersey, and millions of other Americans.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, much has been made of the point that this was to be only a 5-year program. Rather than looking at words of well-meaning men and women 5 years ago, let us look at the urgent needs of today.

When Admiral Rickover appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee, he stated very forcefully that in his opinion "we must spend more on education even if we have to take it away from the Defense Department." It seems inconceivable to me that today, 3 years after the first sputnik when we are recognizing as we never have before the urgent need for more highly trained people—when we are seeking the best brains in the country—when we are putting more and more emphasis on adult education—it seems inconceivable that we would cut down on the funds for the libraries across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the rural Library Service Act is not the most extensive or the most costly of the Federal grant-in-aid programs. It may be that it is not the greatest contribution the Congress has ever made to adult education in this country, but this program is surely one of the most rewarding, one of the most encouraging, and one of the most productive of the educational grant programs. The experience we have had in the first 5 years surely augurs well for what can be accomplished in the last half decade as library doors swing open for more and more of our people. The best testimony as to the effectiveness of the program comes from the people who have been charged with the responsibility of working with the program.

From the editor of the Wilson Library Bulletin comes this statement:

Books have been the ultimate weapon in today's war of ideas. In its short life, the act has strengthened America's ideological arsenal out of all proportion to its cost.

From a librarian in Ohio:

It is of vital importance to library service in Ohio that the funds be continued for another 5 years. I believe it is imperative to urge prompt and favorable action on the bills to extend the Library Services Act.

And from a director of a library in Decatur, Ga.:

Since we know what the Library Services Act has meant to the rural development of this State, we are more than hopeful that you can have the Library Services Act extended for 5 years after 1961. We serve the largest rural population through regional service of any library in Georgia, and feel impelled to speak of what Federal funds have meant to us.

From the president of the Iowa Library Association:

I know of no legislation in Congress which has affected more people than the Library Services Act. An extension of this law will enable librarians throughout the country to continue their efforts of providing library service to all people.

From the Federal relations coordinator of the Massachusetts Library Association comes testimony of what it has meant to them:

The Library Services Act has made possible in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the establishment of a State regional library center in the northeastern part of the State with personnel, books, a bookmobile, and quarters. This had been a rural area with distinctly inadequate library service. In addition the services of the three regional library centers previously established by the State on a limited basis have been expanded * * * these important activities have come about only because of the grant made to the State under the act.

From the Federal relations coordinator of the Arizona State Library Association comes a persuasive argument for the effectiveness of this program:

In 1957 there were 27 public libraries in Arizona and now in March 1960 we have 130. This is a 500 percent growth in 2½ years. The Library Services Act made this possible. There is still much to be done in this comparatively new State—drawing areas together in regional service and improving in qualitative ways. With the continuation of the Library Services Act and financial help from our own State we can continue to grow.

From North Carolina we are told:

Many of us in rural areas have programs of extended services begun with Federal funds which need more time and continued support until gradual absorption locally.

The American Association of University Women in West Virginia has this to say:

As a result of Federal appropriations under the Library Services Act, library facilities have been made available to many more areas in West Virginia and our per capita expenditures for such services has increased from 26 cents in 1956 to 45 cents in 1959. The West Virginia division feels strongly that extending the authorization for appropriations under this act is essential to maintain and even further increase library service which can be rendered in West Virginia.

From the American Association of University Women in my own State of Oregon comes this plea:

The American Association of University Women Oregon Division urges you to vote "yes" on the Library Services Act extension. Many rural areas and smaller towns in Oregon need this help in establishing library services for our citizens.

While this bill is largely for library service in rural areas, it also has the support of the people in the larger cities who know the value of such facilities.

From the city of New York, the secretary of the board of trustees of the Brooklyn Public Library, has this to say:

Brooklyn is not a rural area and our borough will receive no benefit from the Act, but we believe its enactment is of great importance to the country at large.

From Eloise Ebert, Oregon State librarian, comes this statement:

There is no doubt but that this program has had terrific impact in the areas where projects have been held and where a grant has been offered. The educational value of this program has made more people aware of library needs than anything that has happened in years.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no Federal program that offers so much to the American people for so little in dollars expended. I urge that this bill be passed and that the full appropriation be made for each of the next 5 years so that the libraries and the library services can be further expanded in the rural areas of this great country.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us which would extend for 5 years the Library Services Act. As one of the cosponsors of this bill I am convinced that its passage is in the best interest of the American people.

First enacted in 1956, the Library Services Act was designed to assist the States in furnishing improved library service for rural areas. In many States, including South Dakota, there existed an acute shortage of library service for smaller towns and sparsely settled rural sections.

By encouraging the purchase and operation of bookmobiles and other library services to these areas, the Library Services Act has proved to be an invaluable program for rural America. An enlightened citizenry is our best defense against communism and the surest foundation for a better America. Good books contribute mightily to the enrichment and the enjoyment of the citizens, young and old, who determine the richness and strength of our Nation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to approve the legislation before us and thus insure for another 5 years the operation and improvement of the Library Service Act which has already contributed so much to my own State and to the country as a whole.

THE LATE FRANK J. DOWD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Chicago and my home State of Illinois, and indeed all of these United States, have suffered a great loss in the passing at the early age of 63 of Frank J. Dowd, one of the ablest lawyers that ever practiced in the courts of Illinois and as fine a gentleman as ever I have known. Frank Dowd was my close and beloved friend. He had a heart of

gold and a brain of matchless brilliance. I have known and have counted among my friends many lawyers and jurists of preeminent ability but I have never known a member of the legal profession that in my opinion had a more profound knowledge of the law or a keener analytical brain than Frank Dowd. He was one of the truly great men of the period of my lifetime.

To his wife Virginia, to his three fine daughters and his son, and to his eight grandchildren, members of a family closely knit in affection, goes my warmest sympathy.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

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 this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960."

SEC. 2. Section 416 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 416. (a) A person appointed as a staff officer or employee shall receive basic salary at one of the rates of the class to which he is appointed which the Secretary shall, taking into account his qualifications and experience and the needs of the Service, determine to be appropriate for him to receive.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that the needs of the Service warrant the appointment of staff officers or employees in a particular occupational group uniformly at a rate above the minimum rate of the applicable class, he may adjust the basic salary of any staff officer or employee in the same class and occupational group who is receiving less than such established rate."

SEC. 3. Section 417 of such Act is amended by striking out "(b)" in the first sentence.

SEC. 4. Section 431 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence of paragraph (a) the phrase "the termination of time spent on authorized leave, whichever shall be later," and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "upon termination of his service in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section,"; and by amending paragraph (b) of this section to read as follows:

"(b) The official services of a chief of mission shall not be deemed terminated by the appointment of a successor but shall continue until he has relinquished charge of the mission and for such additional period as may be determined by the Secretary, but in no case shall such additional period exceed fifty days, including time spent in transit. During such period the Secretary may require him to render such services as he may deem necessary in the interests of the Government."

SEC. 5. Section 441 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE AND IN THE DEPARTMENT

"SEC. 441. (a) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in order to facilitate effective management, the Secretary shall classify all positions in the Service at posts abroad, excluding positions to be occupied by chiefs of mission, and in the case of those occupied by Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and staff officers and employees, he shall establish such positions in relation to the classes established by sections 412, 414, and 415, respectively. Positions occupied by alien employees and consular agents, respectively, shall be allocated to such classes as the Secretary may establish by regulation.

"(b) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary may, notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071 and the following), classify positions in or under the Department which he designates as Foreign Service Officer positions to be occupied by officers and employees of the Service, and establish such positions in relation to the classes established by sections 412, 414, and 415."

SEC. 6. Section 444 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"COMPENSATION PLANS FOR ALIEN EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 444. (a) The Secretary shall, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, establish compensation plans for alien employees of the Service: *Provided,* That such compensation plans shall be based upon prevailing wage rates and compensation practices for corresponding types of positions in the locality, to the extent consistent with the public interest.

"(b) For the purpose of performing functions abroad, other Government agencies are authorized to administer alien employee programs in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Act."

SEC. 7. Title V of such Act is amended by adding at the beginning thereof the following new section:

"POLICY

"SEC. 500. It is the policy of the Congress that chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers appointed or assigned to serve the United States in foreign countries shall have, to the maximum practicable extent, among their qualifications, a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which they are to serve, and knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions, and the interests of such country and its people."

SEC. 8. (a) The heading to section 516 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "ADMISSION TO CLASS 7 OR 8".

(b) Section 516 of such Act is amended by striking out "SEC. 516." and inserting in lieu thereof "SEC. 516. (a)" and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (b) which shall read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may furnish the President with the names of those persons who have passed such examinations and are eligible for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, whom he recommends for appointment directly to class 7 when in his opinion, their age, experience, or other qualifications make such an appointment appropriate."

SEC. 9. (a) Section 517 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "A person who has not served in class 8" which appear at the beginning of the first sentence, and inserting in place thereof the following: "A person who has not been appointed as a Foreign Service officer in accordance with section 516 of this Act".

(b) Section 517 of such Act is further amended by striking out the second and third sentences of such section.

SEC. 10. (a) The heading to section 520 of such Act is amended by striking out the phrase "REINSTATEMENT AND RECALL" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "REAPPOINTMENT, RECALL, OR REEMPLOYMENT".

(b) The first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 520 of such Act is amended by inserting a period after the word "Service" where it appears for the third time, and by striking out the remainder of that sentence.

(c) Paragraph (b) of section 520 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may recall any retired Foreign Service officer temporarily to duty in the Service whenever he shall determine such recall is in the public interest."

(d) Section 520 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (c) which shall read as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of title 5, United States Code, section 62, and title 5, United States Code, section 715a, a Foreign Service officer heretofore or hereafter retired under the provisions of section 631 or 632 or a Foreign Service staff officer or employee hereafter retired under the provisions of section 803 shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in Federal Government service in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer."

SEC. 11. Section 528 of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence of such section the phrase "subsection (d), section 7, of the Classification Act of 1923" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "the Classificaton Act of 1949".

SEC. 12. Section 531 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 531. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, appoint staff officers and employees on the basis of qualifications and experience. The Secretary may make provisions for temporary, limited, and such other types of appointment as he may deem necessary. He is authorized to establish appropriate probationary periods during which newly appointed staff officers or employees, other than those appointed for temporary or limited services, shall be required to serve. The Secretary may terminate at any time, without regard to the provisions of section 651 or 652, or the provisions of any other law, the services of staff officers or employees appointed for temporary or limited service and of other staff officers or employees who occupy probationary status."

SEC. 13. Section 532 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 532. Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary may assign a staff officer or employee to any post or he may assign him to serve in any position in which he is eligible to serve under the terms of this or any other Act. A staff officer or employee may be transferred from one post to another by order of the Secretary as the interests of the Service may require."

SEC. 14. (a) Section 571 of such Act is amended by striking out paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d), and the heading to such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"ASSIGNMENTS TO ANY GOVERNMENT AGENCY OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years.

"(b) If a Foreign Service officer shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, to a position in any Government agency, any United States delegation or mission to any international organization, in any international commission, or in any international body, the period of his service in such capacity shall be construed as constituting an assignment within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section and such person shall not, by virtue of the acceptance of such an assignment, lose his status as a

Foreign Service officer. Service in such a position shall not, however, be subject to the limitations concerning the duration of an assignment contained in that paragraph.

"(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII. No officer or employee of the Service who, subsequent to the date of enactment of the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960, is assigned to, or who, after June 30, 1961, occupies a position in the Department that is designated as a Foreign Service officer position, shall be entitled to receive a salary differential under the provisions of this paragraph."

(b) Paragraph (e) of section 571 of such Act is amended by striking the phrase "with heads of Government agencies" where it appears in the second sentence and by redesignating the paragraph as "(d)".

SEC. 15. Section 575 of such Act is amended by striking out all after the word "accordance" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "with the appropriate provisions of titles III and IX of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 7 and 13; 22 U.S.C. 1451–1453, 1478 and 1479)."

SEC. 16. Title V of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"FOREIGN LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE PREREQUISITE TO ASSIGNMENT

"SEC. 578. The Secretary shall determine annually the number of Foreign Service officer positions in a foreign country which shall be occupied only by an incumbent who has a useful knowledge of a language or dialect commonly used in such country. After December 31, 1963, the prescribed quota of language officers shall be maintained for each country: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make exceptions to this policy when special or emergency conditions exist. The Secretary shall establish foreign language standards for assignment abroad of officers and employees of the Service, and shall arrange for appropriate language training of such officers and employees at the Foreign Service Institute or elsewhere."

SEC. 17. Section 625 of such Act and the heading of such section are amended to read as follows:

"WITHIN-CLASS SALARY INCREASES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS AND RESERVE OFFICERS

"SEC. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in a given class for a continuous period of nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law, the Secretary is authorized to grant to any such officer additional increases in salary, within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service."

SEC. 18. Title VI of such Act is amended by inserting after section 625 the following new section and the heading thereto:

"RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROMOTIONS AND FUNCTIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC AREA SPECIALIZATION

"SEC. 626. The achievement of the objectives of this Act requires increasing numbers of Foreign Service officers to acquire functional and geographic area specializations and to pursue such specializations for a substantial part of their careers. Such specialization shall not in any way inhibit or prejudice the orderly advancement through class I of any such officer in the Foreign Service."

SEC. 19. The heading "PART D—SEPARATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS FROM THE SERVICE" under title VI of such Act is amended to read as follows: "PART D—SEPARATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM THE SERVICE".

SEC. 20. Section 631 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS WHO ARE CAREER AMBASSADORS OR CAREER MINISTERS

"SEC. 631. Any Foreign Service officer who is a career ambassador or a career minister, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall upon reaching the age of sixty-five, be retired from the Service and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821, but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such an officer's service."

SEC. 21. Section 632 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"PARTICIPANTS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM WHO ARE NOT CAREER AMBASSADORS OR CAREER MINISTERS

"SEC. 632. Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who is not a career ambassador or a career minister, shall, upon reaching the age of sixty, be retired from the Service and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821; but, whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such participant's service for a period not to exceed five years."

SEC. 22. Subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (b) of section 634 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(1) one-twelfth of a year's salary at his then current salary rate for each year of service and proportionately for a fraction of a year, but not exceeding a total of one year's salary at his then current salary rate, payable without interest, from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, in three equal installments on the 1st day of January following the officer's retirement and on the two anniversaries of this date immediately following: *Provided*, That, in special cases, the Secretary may in his discretion accelerate or combine the installments; and

"(2) a refund of the contributions made to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, with interest as provided in section 841(a), except that in lieu of such refund such officer, if he has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a), may elect to receive retirement benefits on reaching the age of sixty in accordance with the provisions of section 821. In the event that an officer who was separated from class 4 or 5 and who has elected to receive retirement benefits dies before reaching the age of sixty, his death shall be considered a death in service within the meaning of section 832. In the event that an officer who was separated from class 6 or 7 and who has elected to receive retirement benefits dies before reaching the age of sixty, the total amount of his contributions made to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, with interest as provided in section 841(a), shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 841(b)."

SEC. 23. Section 635 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS RETIRED FROM CLASS 7 OR 8

"SEC. 635. Any Foreign Service officer in class 7 who is appointed under the provisions of section 516(b) and any Foreign Service officer in class 8 shall occupy probationary status. The Secretary may terminate his service at any time."

SEC. 24. Section 636 of such Act is amended by striking out the phrase "Any Foreign Service officer" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System".

SEC. 25. Section 641 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 641. All promotions of staff officers and employees to a higher class shall be made at a higher salary on the basis of performance and merit in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe."

SEC. 26. Section 642 of such Act and the heading thereto are amended to read as follows:

"WITHIN CLASS AND LONGEVITY SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 642. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service shall receive an increase in salary at periodic intervals to the next higher salary rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant any such officer or employee additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon specially meritorious service.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee who has attained the maximum salary rate prescribed by section 415 for the class in which he is serving may be granted from time to time an additional salary increase beyond the maximum salary rate for his class in recognition of longevity or proficiency in the Service. Each such salary increase shall be equal to the maximum salary rate increase of the applicable class and no person shall receive more than four such salary increases while serving in the same class."

SEC. 27. Section 701 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary may also provide to the extent that space is available therefor appropriate orientation and language training to spouses of officers and employees of the Government in anticipation of the assignment abroad of such officers and employees. Other agencies of the Government shall wherever practicable avoid duplicating the facilities of the Institute and the training provided by the Secretary at the Institute or elsewhere."

SEC. 28. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 704 of such Act is amended by striking out "1923" in the two places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1949".

(b) Section 704 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph (e) which shall read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the absence of suitably qualified United States citizens, employ persons who are not citizens of the United States by appointment to the staff of the Institute either on a full- or part-time basis or by contract for services in the United States or abroad at rates not in excess of those provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071)."

SEC. 29. (a) Section 803(b)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows—

"(2) have paid into the Fund a special contribution for each year of such service in accordance with the provisions of section 852(b)."

(b) Section 803 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (c) which shall read as follows:

"(c)(1) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, any Foreign Service staff officer or employee appointed by the Secretary of State who has completed at least ten years of continuous service in the Department's Foreign Service, exclusive of military service, shall become a participant in the System and shall make a special contribution to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 852.

"(2) Any such officer or employee who, under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, becomes a participant in the System, shall be mandatorily retired for age during the first year after the effective date of this paragraph if he attains age sixty-four or if he is over age sixty-four; during the second year at age sixty-three; during the third year at age sixty-two; during the fourth year at age sixty-one, and thereafter at age sixty.

"(3) Any officer or employee who becomes a participant in the System under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section who is age fifty-seven or over on the effective date of this paragraph, may retire voluntarily at any time before mandatory retirement under paragraph (c)(2) of this section and receive retirement benefits under section 821."

SEC. 30. Section 804 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 804. (a) Annuitants shall be persons who are receiving annuities from the Fund and all persons, including surviving wives and husbands, widows, dependent widowers, children and beneficiaries of participants or annuitants who shall become entitled to receive annuities in accordance with the provisions of this Act, as amended, or in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Act of May 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 125).

"(b) When used in this title the term—

"(1) 'Widow' means the surviving wife of a participant who was married to such participant for at least two years immediately preceding his death or is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"(2) 'Dependent widower' means the surviving husband of a participant who was married to such participant for at least two years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage, and who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, and who received more than one-half of his support from such participant.

"(3) 'Child' means an unmarried child, under the age of eighteen years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age eighteen is incapable of self-support. In addition to the offspring of the participant and his or her spouse the term includes (a) an adopted child, and (b) a step-child or recognized natural child who received more than one-half of his support from the participant."

SEC. 31. Section 811 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 811. (a) Six and one-half per centum of the basic salary received by each participant shall be contributed to the Fund for the payment of annuities, cash benefits, refunds, and allowances. An equal sum shall also be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for payment of his salary. The amounts deducted and withheld from basic salary together with the amounts so contributed from the appropriation or fund, shall be deposited by the Department of State in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund.

"(b) Each participant shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular services during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this Act, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary."

SEC. 32. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 821 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 821. (a) The annuity of a participant shall be equal to 2 per centum of his average basic salary for the highest five consecutive years of service, for which full contributions have been made to the Fund, multiplied by the number of years, not exceeding thirty-five, of service credit obtained in accordance with the provisions of sections 851, 852, and 853. However, the highest five years of service for which full contributions have been made to the Fund shall be used in computing the annuity of any participant who serves as chief of mission and whose continuity of service as such is interrupted prior to retirement by appointment or assignment to any other position determined by the Secretary to be of comparable importance. In determining the aggregate period of service upon which the annuity is to be based, the fractional part of a month, if any, shall not be counted.

"(b) At the time of retirement, any married participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity payable to his wife or her husband, commencing on the date following such participant's death and terminating upon the death of such surviving wife or husband. The annuity payable to the surviving wife or husband after such participant's death shall be 50 per centum of the amount of the participant's annuity computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, up to the full amount of such annuity specified by him as the base for the survivor benefits. The annuity of the participant making such election shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of any amount up to $2,400 he specifies as the base for the survivor benefit plus 10 per centum of any amount over $2,400 so specified.

"(c)(1) If an annuitant dies and is survived by a wife or husband and by a child or children, in addition to the annuity payable to the surviving wife or husband, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each child an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 40 per centum of the annuitant's average basic salary, as determined under paragraph (a) of this section, divided by the number of children; (ii) $600; or (iii) $1,800 divided by the number of children.

"(2) If an annuitant dies and is not survived by a wife or husband but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 50 per centum of the annuitant's average basic salary, as determined under paragraph (a) of this section, divided by the number of children; (ii) $720; or (iii) $2,160 divided by the number of children."

(b) Section 821 of such Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (d), (e), and (f) which shall read as follows:

"(d) If a surviving wife or husband dies or the annuity of a child is terminated, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child had not survived the participant.

"(e) The annuity payable to a child under paragraph (c) or (d) of this section shall begin on the first day of the next month after the participant dies and such annuity or any right thereto shall be terminated upon death, marriage, or attainment of the age of eighteen years, except that, if a child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, the annuity shall be terminated only when such child dies, marries, or recovers from such disability.

"(f) At the time of retirement an unmarried participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity equal to 50 per centum of the reduced annuity payable after his or her death to a beneficiary whose name shall be designated in writing to the Secretary. The annuity payable to a participant making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in paragraph (a) of this section and by 5 per centum of an annuity so computed for each full five years the person designated is younger than the retiring participant, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum. No such election of a reduced annuity payable to a beneficiary shall be valid until the participant shall have satisfactorily passed a physical examination as prescribed by the Secretary. The annuity payable to a beneficiary under the provisions of this paragraph shall begin on the first day of the next month after the participant dies. Upon the death of the surviving beneficiary all payments shall cease and no further annuity payments authorized under this paragraph shall be due or payable."

SEC. 33. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 831 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any participant who has five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), and who becomes totally disabled or incapacitated for useful and efficient service by reason of disease, illness, or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall, upon his own application or upon order of the Secretary, be retired on an annuity computed as prescribed in section 821. If the disabled or incapacitated participant has less than twenty years of service credit toward his retirement under the System at the time he is retired, his annuity shall be computed on the assumption that he has had twenty years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a participant under this provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his age at the time of retirement and the mandatory retirement age applicable to his class in the Service.

"(b) In each case, the participant shall be given a physical examination by one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons designated by the Secretary to conduct examinations, and disability shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the advice of such physicians or surgeons. Unless the disability is permanent, like examinations shall be made annually until the annuitant has reached the statutory mandatory retirement age for his class in the Service. If the Secretary determines, on the basis of the advice of one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons conducting such examinations that an annuitant has recovered to the extent that he can return to duty, the annuitant may apply for reinstatement or reappointment in the Service within one year from the date his recovery is determined. Upon application the Secretary shall reinstate any such recovered disability annuitant in the class in which he was serving at time of retirement, or the Secretary may, taking into consideration the age, qualifications, and experience of such annuitant, and the present class of his contemporaries in the Service, appoint him or, in the case of an annuitant who is a former Foreign Service officer, recommend that the President appoint him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to a class higher than the one in which he was

serving prior to retirement. Payment of the annuity shall continue until a date six months after the date of the examination showing recovery or until the date of reinstatement or reappointment in the Service, whichever is earlier. Fees for examinations under this provision, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in order to submit to examination, shall be paid out of the Fund. If the annuitant fails to submit to examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability is satisfactorily established.

"(c) If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued is for any reason not reinstated or reappointed in the Service, he shall be considered to have been separated within the meaning of section 834 as of the date he was retired for disability and he shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to the benefits of that section or of section 841(a) except that he may elect voluntary retirement in accordance with the provisions of section 636 if he can qualify under its provisions."

(b) Section 831 of such Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (d) and (e) which shall read as follows:

"(d) No participant shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this Act and compensation for injury or disability to himself under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, covering the same period of time. This provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either Act for any part of the same period of time. Neither this provision nor any provision of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall be so construed as to deny the right of any person to receive an annuity under this Act by reason of his own services and to receive concurrently any payment under such Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, by reason of the death of any other person.

"(e) Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the right of any person entitled to an annuity under this Act shall not be affected because such person has received an award of compensation in a lump sum under section 14 of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, except that where such annuity is payable on account of the same disability for which compensation under such section has been paid, so much of such compensation as has been paid for any period extended beyond the date such annuity becomes effective, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall be refunded to the Department of Labor, to be paid into the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund. Before such person shall receive such annuity he shall (1) refund to the Department of Labor the amount representing such computed payments for such extended period, or (2) authorize the deduction of such amount from the annuity payable to him under this Act, which amount shall be transmitted to such Department for reimbursement to such Fund. Deductions from such annuity may be made from accrued and accruing payments, or may be prorated against and paid from accruing payments in such manner as the Secretary of Labor shall determine, whenever he finds that the financial circumstances of the annuitants are such as to warrant such deferred refunding."

SEC. 34. Section 832 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 832. (a) In case a participant dies and no claim for annuity is payable under the provisions of this Act, his contributions to the Fund, with interest at the rates prescribed in sections 841(a) and 881(a), shall be paid in the order of precedence shown in section 841(b).

"(b) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is survived by a widow or a dependent widower, as defined in section 804, such widow or dependent widower shall be entitled to an annuity equal to 50 per centum of the annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (e) of this section and of section 821(a). The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the date following death of the participant and shall terminate upon death of the widow or dependent widower, or upon the dependent widower's becoming capable of self-support.

"(c) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is survived by a wife or a husband and a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821(c)(1). The child's annuity shall begin and be terminated in accordance with the provisions of section 821(e). Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the annuity of a child, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife or husband or child had not survived the participant.

"(d) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is not survived by a wife or husband, but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821(c)(2). The child's annuity shall begin and terminate in accordance with the provisions of section 821(e). Upon termination of the annuity of a child, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though that child had never been entitled to the benefit.

"(e) If, at the time of his or her death, the participant had less than twenty years of service credit toward retirement under the System, the annuities payable in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section shall be computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821 on the assumption he or she had had twenty years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a deceased participant under this provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his or her age on the date of death and the mandatory retirement age applicable to his or her class in the Service. In all cases arising under paragraphs (b), (c), (d), or (e) of this section, it shall be assumed that the deceased participant was qualified for retirement on the date of his death."

SEC. 35. A new section 834 is hereby added to such Act as follows:

"DISCONTINUED SERVICE RETIREMENT

"SEC. 834. (a) Any participant who voluntarily separates from the Service after obtaining at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), may, upon separation from the Service or at any time prior to becoming eligible for an annuity, elect to have his contributions to the Fund returned to him in accordance with the provisions of section 841, or to leave his contributions in the Fund and receive an annuity, computed as prescribed in section 821, commencing at the age of sixty years.

"(b) If a participant who has qualified in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section to receive a deferred annuity commencing at the age of sixty dies before reaching the age of sixty his contributions to the Fund, with interest, shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of sections 841 and 881."

SEC. 36. Section 841 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 841. (a) Whenever a participant becomes separated from the Service without becoming eligible for an annuity or a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the total amount of contributions from his salary with interest thereon at 4 per centum per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1960; semiannually as of December 31, 1960; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of separation including all contributions made during or for such period, except as provided in section 881, shall be returned to him.

"(b) In the event that the total contributions of a retired participant, other than voluntary contributions made in accordance with the provisions of section 881, with interest at 4 per centum per annum compounded annually as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section added thereto, exceed the total amount returned to such participant or to an annuitant claiming through him, in the form of annuities, accumulated at the same rate of interest up to the date the annuity payments cease under the terms of the annuity, the excess of the accumulated contributions over the accumulated annuity payments shall be paid in the following order of precedence, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"(1) To the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated by the retired participant in writing to the Secretary;

"(2) If there be no beneficiary, to the surviving wife or husband of such participant;

"(3) If none of the above, to the child or children of such participant and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"(4) If none of the above, to the parents of such participant or the survivor of them;

"(5) If none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such participant;

"(6) If none of the above, to other next of kin of such participant as may be determined by the Secretary in his judgment to be legally entitled thereto.

"(c) No payment shall be made pursuant to paragraph (b)(6) of this section until after the expiration of thirty days from the death of the retired participant or his surviving annuitant."

SEC. 37. Section 851 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 851. For the purposes of this title, the period of service of a participant shall be computed from the effective date of appointment as a Foreign Service officer, or, if appointed prior to July 1, 1924, as an officer or employee of the Diplomatic or Consular Service of the United States, or from the date he becomes a participant under the provisions of this Act, as amended, but all periods of separation from the Service and so much of any leaves of absence without pay as may exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year shall be excluded, except leaves of absence while receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, and leaves of absence granted participants while performing active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States."

SEC. 38. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 852 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) A participant may, subject to the provisions of this section, include in his period of service—

"(1) civilian service in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the Federal Government and in the District of Columbia government, prior to becoming a participant; and

"(2) active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"(b) A person may obtain prior civilian service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(1) of this section by making a special contribution to the Fund equal to 5 per centum of his basic annual salary for each year of service for which credit is sought subsequent to July 1, 1924, and prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960, and at 6½ per centum thereafter with interest compounded annually at 4 per centum per annum to the date of payment. Any such person may, under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Secretary, pay such special contributions in installments.

"(c)(1) If an officer or employee under some other Government retirement system, becomes a participant in the System by direct transfer, such officer or employee's total contributions and deposits, including interest accrued thereon, except voluntary contributions, shall be transferred to the Fund effective as of the date such officer or employee becomes a participant in the System. Each such officer or employee shall be deemed to consent to the transfer of such funds and such transfer shall be a complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands against the other Government retirement fund on account of service rendered prior to becoming a participant in the System.

"(2) No officer or employee, whose contributions are transferred to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, shall be required to make contributions in addition to those transferred, for periods of service for which full contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund, nor shall any refund be made to any such officer or employee on account of contributions made during any period to the other Government retirement fund, at a higher rate than that fixed by section 811 of this Act for contributions to the Fund.

"(3) No officer or employee, whose contributions are transferred to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, shall receive credit for periods of service subsequent to July 1, 1924, for which a refund of contributions has been made, or for which no contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund. A participant may, however, obtain credit for such prior service by making a special contribution to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section."

(b) Section 852 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof new paragraphs (d) and (e) which shall read as follows:

"(d) No participant may obtain prior civilian service credit toward retirement under the System for any period of civilian service on the basis of which he is receiving or will in the future be entitled to receive any annuity under another retirement system covering civilian personnel of the Government.

"(e) A participant may obtain prior military or naval service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this section by applying for it to the Secretary prior to retirement or separation from the Service. However, in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, except that in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in the line of duty during a period of war (as that term is used in chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code), or is awarded under chapter 67 of title 10 of the United States Code, the period of such military or naval service shall be included. No contributions to the Fund shall be required in connection with military or naval service credited to a participant in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this section."

SEC. 39. Such Act is amended by adding after section 854 a new section as follows:

"RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN FORMER PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 855. The annuity of each former participant under the System, who retired prior to July 28, 1956, and who at the time of his retirement had creditable service in excess of thirty years, shall be recomputed on the basis of actual years of creditable service not in excess of thirty-five years. Service which was not creditable under the System on the date a former participant retired, shall not be included as creditable service for the purpose of this recomputation. The annuities payable to such persons shall, when recomputed, be paid at the rates so determined, but no such recomputation or any other action taken pursuant to this section shall operate to reduce the rate of the annuity any such person is entitled to receive under the System."

SEC. 40. The heading "PART H—OFFICERS REINSTATED IN THE SERVICE" under title VIII of such Act is amended to read as follows: "PART H—ANNUITANTS RECALLED, REINSTATED OR REAPPOINTED IN THE SERVICE OR REEMPLOYED IN THE GOVERNMENT".

SEC. 41. Section 871 of such Act is amended and a heading is added thereto as follows:

"RECALL

"SEC. 871. Any annuitant recalled to duty in the Service in accordance with the provisions of section 520(b) or reinstated or reappointed in accordance with the provisions of section 831(b) shall, while so serving, be entitled in lieu of his annuity to the full salary of the class in which he is serving. During such service, he shall make contributions to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 811. When he reverts to his retired status, his annuity shall be determined anew in accordance with the provisions of section 821."

SEC. 42. A new section 872 is hereby added to such Act as follows:

"REEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 872. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the Service, who has retired under this Act, as amended, and is receiving an annuity pursuant thereto, and who is reemployed in the Federal Government service in any appointive position either on a part-time or full-time basis, shall be entitled to receive the salary of the position in which he is serving plus so much of his annuity payable under this Act, as amended, which when combined with such salary does not exceed during any calendar year the basic salary such officer or employee was entitled to receive under sections 412 or 415 of the Act, as amended, on the date of his retirement from the Service. Any such reemployed officer or employee who receives salary during any calendar year in excess of the maximum amount which he may be entitled to receive under this paragraph shall be entitled to such salary in lieu of benefits hereunder.

"(b) When any such retired officer or employee of the Service is reemployed, the employer shall send a notice to the Department of State of such reemployment together with all pertinent information relating thereto and shall cause to be paid, by transfer or otherwise, to the Department of State funds necessary to cover gross salary, employer contributions, and gross lump sum leave payment relating to the employment of the reemployed officer or employee. The Department of State shall make to and on behalf of the reemployed officer or employee payments to which he is entitled under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, and shall make those withholdings and deductions authorized and required by law.

"(c) In the event of any overpayment under this section the Secretary of State is authorized to withhold the amount of such overpayment from the salary payable to such reemployed officer or employee or from his annuity."

SEC. 43. (a) So much of paragraph (a) of section 881 of such Act as precedes subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any participant may, at his option and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, deposit additional sums in multiples of 1 per centum of his basic salary, but not in excess of 10 per centum of such salary, which amounts together with interest at 3 per centum per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1960; semiannually as of December 31, 1960; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of his retirement, including all contributions made during or for such period, shall, at the date of his retirement and at his election, be—".

(b) Paragraph (c) of section 881 of such Act is amended by deleting the word "annually" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section", and by changing the words "withdrawal from active service" at the end of such paragraph to "separation from the Service".

SEC. 44. Section 912 of such Act is amended by changing the heading thereto to read "LOAN OF HOUSEHOLD FURNISHINGS AND EQUIPMENT" and by inserting between the words "with household" the word "basic" and by inserting between the words "household equipment" the phrase "furnishings and".

SEC. 45. Section 913 of such Act and the heading thereto is amended to read as follows:

"TRANSPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES

"SEC. 913. The Secretary may, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, transport for or on behalf of an officer or employee of the Service, a privately owned motor vehicle in any case in which he shall determine that water, rail, or air transportation of the motor vehicle is necessary or expedient for all or any part of the distance between points of origin and destination. Not more than one motor vehicle of any such officer or employee may be transported under authority of this section during any four-year period, except that, as a replacement for such motor vehicle, one additional motor vehicle of any such officer or employee may be so transported during such period upon approval, in advance, by the Secretary and upon a determination, in advance, by the Secretary that such replacement is necessary for reasons beyond the control of the officer or employee and is in the interest of the Government. After the expiration of a period of four years following the date of transportation under authority of this section of a privately owned motor vehicle of any officer or employee who

has remained in continuous service outside the continental United States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) during such period, the transportation of a replacement for such motor vehicle for such officer or employee may be authorized by the Secretary in accordance with this section."

SEC. 46. (a) Section 1021 of such Act is amended by inserting the phrase "the Department including" immediately prior to the phrase "the Service" wherever it appears in this section.

(b) Section 1021(a) is further amended by striking out the phrase "if recommended by the Director General" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "at the discretion of the Secretary".

SEC. 47. Section 11 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 890), is hereby amended by inserting after the phrase "Government-owned vehicles" the phrase "or taxicabs", and by inserting after the phrase "public transportation facilities" the phrase "other than taxicabs".

SEC. 48. Paragraph (4) of section 104(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 104(a)(4)) (relating to the exclusion from gross income of compensation for injuries and sickness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(4) amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Public Health Service, or as a disability annuity payable under the provisions of section 831 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1081; 60 Stat. 1021)."

SEC. 49. The following headings and sections in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 442 of such Act and the heading thereto.

(2) Section 525 of such Act and the heading thereto.

(3) Section 576 of such Act and the heading thereto.

(4) Section 577 of such Act and the heading thereto.

SEC. 50. Any person who occupies a position in the Department of State to which he was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, at the time he was an active Foreign Service officer, and who while holding this position has retired for age as a Foreign Service officer, and who on the effective date of this section, continues to hold such position is hereby reinstated, effective as of the date of such retirement, to active status as a Foreign Service officer and shall be entitled to all the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as though he had never retired.

SEC. 51. Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act, existing rules and regulations of or applicable to the Foreign Service of the United States shall remain in effect until revoked or rescinded or until modified or superseded by regulations made in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this Act, unless clearly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or the provisions so amended.

SEC. 52. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any Foreign Service staff officer who accepted an appointment as a Foreign Service Reserve officer in the Department of State during the period beginning September 1, 1958, and ending December 31, 1958, both dates inclusive, shall not be separated from the Foreign Service before the expiration of his original appointment as a Foreign Service Reserve officer, except as authorized by section 637 or 638 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 53. (a) The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, except as provided in paragraph (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, and except as otherwise provided in the text of this Act.

(b)(1) The provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of section 803 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by section 29(b) of this Act, shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, except that any Foreign Service staff officer or employee, who at the time this Act becomes effective meets the requirements for participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, may elect to become a participant in the System before the mandatory provisions become effective. Such Foreign Service staff officers and employees shall become participants effective on the first day of the second month following the date of their application for earlier participation.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (c)(2) of section 803 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by section 29(b) of this Act, shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than three years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) The amendment made by section 31 of this Act, with respect to a contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund to be made by the Department, shall become effective July 1, 1961.

(d) The amendment made by section 39 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) The amendment made by section 48 of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a bill that has 53 sections to it may seem like a long bill to bring before the House under suspension of the rules. The length is deceptive because many of the sections comprise amendments to basic law that are technical, perfecting, or clarifying. Except for a few sections they are intended to improve the organization and administration of the Foreign Service rather than make substantive changes.

The hearings of the subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations that studied this measure total 258 pages. In addition the subcommittee and the full committee considered the bill in executive sessions. I can assure the Members that this is a carefully worked out measure. It does not include everything that the State Department wanted. It does not incorporate all the provisions of the Senate bill which was before our subcommittee. It does not include everything that the subcommittee or the Committee on Foreign Affairs believes necessary for the efficient operation of the Foreign Service.

It is the best that we can bring before the House at this time. We believe the changes made are reasonable and necessary to improve the overall operation of the Foreign Service.

Before I explain some of the changes made by this bill, I want to express my appreciation to the members of my subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations who participated in the lengthy sessions we held. Members on both sides were diligent in their attendance and searching in their queries. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is the ranking minority member on the subcommittee. He is the only former Foreign Service officer in the House. He drew on his knowledge of, and experience in, the Foreign Service to raise very pertinent questions. I regret that he is leaving the committee this year.

The basic Foreign Service Act became law in 1946 when the Service was small and the demands placed upon it were fewer. Some changes were made in the act in 1955 and 1956 as a result of problems created by the integration of departmental personnel into the Service. Most of those changes, however, were confined to the professional Foreign Service officers and left the Foreign Service Staff personnel and other parts of the law untouched. A large number of changes in the bill now before the House reflect the experience of 14 years' operation of the provisions affecting the Foreign Service Staff and the Foreign Service retirement system.

The Staff personnel perform technical, administrative and clerical services. They serve tours of duty abroad. They enjoy the advantages and experience the disadvantages of life abroad.

Most of us maintain an efficiency that is in direct proportion to the efficiency of our own office staff. The efficiency of the Foreign Service is dependent upon performance by the Staff. My own observation is that the Staff personnel are generally hard working, and often unrecognized, employees overseas.

Staff personnel are presently under civil service retirement. In this bill it is provided that after 10 years of service in the staff they will come under the Foreign Service retirement system. After an individual has served 10 years, it may be assumed that he is making the Foreign Service his career. He is subject to the same requirements of oversea service as are Foreign Service officers. Hence it is logical that he is entitled to the same benefits as officers have. The retirement payments made by Staff personnel into the civil service retirement fund will be transferred to the Foreign Service retirement fund after the individual has completed 10 years in the Staff. The cost to the Government will not increase. It will simply be a shift from one retirement system to another.

There has been some concern among a small group of Foreign Service Reserve officers who served for many years in the Foreign Service Staff. Many members, I know, because some of them have communicated with me, have received communications from some of these people through their constituents expressing a concern that they will be removed from the Service before their 5-year period of service as Reserve officers is completed.

They were offered the opportunity to shift from the Staff to the Reserve because of the higher salary scale and because as Reserve officers they remained under the civil service retirement system. In that system they can continue until age 70 whereas under the Foreign Service retirement system they have to retire at age 60. Our subcommittee looked into this matter. In section 52 of the bill we expressly state that they are to continue in service for the duration of their 5-year appointment unless they reach the mandatory retirement age of 70 or, like all other Foreign Service personnel, are removed for some serious charge. Our subcommittee was advised by the Department that there was no disposition to force these officers out before they had completed their appointments. I understand that these individuals are completely reassured on this point.

The rapid birth of new nations since the end of World War II has presented the Foreign Service with a new problem. Briefly stated, it is how we can secure individuals who are familiar with the language and culture of these countries in order that the United States may be properly represented and informed. Our educational system has not yet produced students in adequate numbers who can fill the needs. Most of the candidates for the Foreign Service are young people with no specialized training.

The development of specialists raises difficult administrative problems. In the first place an individual himself must have a desire to specialize in a particular area. To assign an officer arbitrarily to become proficient in Burmese or Arabic when he has little or no interest is a waste of time and money. To provide an incentive for the study of esoteric languages, the committee has included in section 17 authority for within-class salary increases. One of the bases for such an increase will be where an officer on his own initiative becomes proficient in a difficult language.

Section 7 is an expression of congressional concern that our representatives abroad be knowledgeable about the country in which they serve. It is the expectation of the committee that chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers have as good a grasp as is practicable of the language, culture, history, and institutions of the countries in which they are stationed.

We did this in order to avoid a hardship on these people who accepted a contract in the belief they would be entitled to enough time to get in their years for retirement. We thought this was justified, so we put in this provision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Just so we understand this bill, the compression from 20 classes to 10 classes is out. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYS. That is out.

Mr. GROSS. The bonus for learning difficult languages is out?

Mr. HAYS. That is out.

Mr. GROSS. The proposed housing allowance that was in the other bill is out?

Mr. HAYS. That was in the Senate bill, and that is taken out.

Mr. GROSS. The authority for the Secretary of State to give additional pay for so-called hazardous duty to couriers is out of the pending bill; is that correct?

Mr. HAYS. That is out of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question, whether it is the intention of the members of the House committee when they go to conference to oppose these stricken provisions being put back into the bill?

Mr. HAYS. I might say to the gentleman there are some 20 amendments, I believe, that are in disagreement, which we did not put in but which the other body has put in, including I might say a $100 million open end—no restriction items—for buildings which we struck out. I do not propose to go to the other body and take their bill. I cannot guarantee to the gentleman that in trying to reach an agreement with the other body that we will not have to give ground on some amendments. But, the gentleman knows me pretty well and he knows that I do not give ground very easily. I assure the gentleman I will do my utmost to come back with as near the House bill as we possibly and humanly can.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that that would be the case because the gentleman well knows that the Committee on Rules refused to give a rule on the other bill containing the provisions which the gentleman from Ohio now says has been stricken from the bill. I would certainly hope that the conferees on the part of the House would defend to the utmost the position taken by the House with respect to this bill, if it is passed.

Mr. HAYS. I think the conferees would have a moral responsibility to defend the House bill so far as they possibly can, and that is exactly what we will do.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the rapid birth of new nations since the end of World War II has presented our foreign service with a new problem. Briefly stated, it is—how can we secure individuals familiar with the languages and cultures of these countries in order that the United States may be properly represented and informed? Our educational system has not yet produced these students in adequate numbers. Most of the candidates for foreign service are young people with no specialized training. The development of specialists raises difficult administrative problems. In the first place, an individual must have a desire to specialize in a particular area. To assign an officer arbitrarily to become proficient in Burmese or Arabic when he has little or no interest in those languages is a waste of time and money. To provide an incentive for the study of esoteric languages, the committee has included section 17 and provided authority for these salary increases for merit.

Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that this is not the section that he was talking about. This is an ingrade increase for meritorious service. We do not say that they shall do it, if a man studies an esoteric language, but in the report we point out that in this age when it is necessary to have specialists, if they are going to give any ingrade promotions, which they will have authority to do, this would be a good thing to give them for.

We struck out the section to which many Members objected, which gave automatic bonuses. But, we do believe, and I am sure the gentleman will agree, that if you are going to get a man to study Arabic, you are going to have to hold out to him some incentive because we think an individual in the Foreign Service is not going to study an esoteric language on his own time unless he thinks it is going to result in some gain to him in his professional occupation.

I will say to the gentleman and to other Members, I have been as critical of the Department of State with reference to some of its actions as anybody in the House of Representatives. But, this is the only State Department—regardless of the name of the next President—this is the only State Department that we are going to have. I am not so sure that the next President is going to keep the peace of the world as I am sure of the proposition that the actions of the Department of State as a whole, as it presents the face of America to the other nations of the world, is what is going to win this cold war for us. I am interested in getting the best kind of Foreign Service that we can possibly produce. I am interested in enticing into our Foreign Service the best kind of people we can get. That is why I supported this recruitment program so that they could go out into these small colleges and universities all over the country as well as to the larger universities in the East and lay before these students what the Foreign Service is and try to get the cream of the crop. These are some of the reasons we come before you with this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, in section 7 we expressed concern that our representatives abroad be knowledgeable about the country in which they serve. We felt that they have not been in the past. It is the purpose that our chiefs of mission and our Foreign Service officers have as good a grasp as is practicable of the language, culture, history, and institutions of the countries in which they are stationed.

While the new language of the section is not mandatory, neither is it hortatory. It is the firm desire of the committee that the Department give increased and sustained attention to this problem. Career planning should include provision for specialized training.

Many of the senior officers of the Department entered the Foreign Service at a time when specialization was frowned upon. They rose through the ranks as generalists and tend, even today, to favor the all-around officer over the officer who has devoted himself to intense study of a particular field of knowledge. The result has been that younger officers with specialized training have felt their careers to be jeopardized. In section 18 the committee makes clear that specialization shall not inhibit or prejudice the promotional opportunities of officers.

No other Government service demands as much of the wife as does the Foreign Service. She must play a real part in representational work as well as in numerous other functions at posts abroad. She can discharge her responsibilities better if she is conversant with the language and has some orientation about the country in which her husband is stationed. Under the language of section 27, authority is granted the Secretary to provide such training on a "space available" basis. The facilities of the Foreign Service Institute here in Washington or such facilities as exist at oversea posts may be used.

I might say that it seems logical to me that if they have a class available, that they put those people in it. Let them have the benefit of this training, because in many cases they play an important part in the success or failure of the mission.

Sections 29 through 43 overhaul the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

I am going to include a complete résumé of what this does in my remarks, but in the interest of saving time I will say that among other things it puts people on the same basis as the civil service retirement system.

I am sure many Members who are worried about the cost will be glad to know that it raises the contribution of the employee from 5 percent to 6½ percent.

As Members may recall, Foreign Service personnel have their own retirement system. While improvements and modifications have been made in other Government retirement systems, the Foreign Service retirement system has been almost unchanged since 1946. The amendments covering it are necessarily technical. It occurred to me that Members could more readily grasp the changes made by this bill if there were a table that compared the civil service system with which they are more familiar with the Foreign Service system as it is and as it will be amended by this bill. Such a table starts on page 25 of the report. Glancing down the last column of that table will show that almost all the changes will result in a retirement system that is identical with or very similar to the civil service retirement system. One significant change is to increase the compulsory contributions of participants from 5 percent to 6½ percent—the same as civil service.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched upon what I believe to be the principal provisions of this bill. I do not say that this bill corrects all the shortcomings or fills all the deficiencies in our Foreign Service. It does not contain all of the changes that I or my colleagues on the committee want. But it does make substantial improvements in that Service. It does provide some of the tools and guideposts that in the hands of competent administrators can make the Foreign Service what it should be—a nonpartisan career service of topflight men and women.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand this is the recommendation of the administration?

Mr. HAYS. This is the administration's bill, with a few deletions that the committee made, but what we are presenting is 100 percent the administration's request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware that Foreign Service employees benefited from the pay raise bill of 7½ percent?

Mr. HAYS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman turn to page 63. Does this mean page 63, section 625, that there are built-in pay increases in addition to the 7½-percent pay raise?

Mr. HAYS. No. This is not any built-in pay increase. The committee had considered the bill and the restrictions in the bill, and the in-grade pay increase was considered before the pay increase bill was passed. I was happy to strike that out. This was passed out of committee a few days before the other bill was passed.

Mr. GROSS. This gives the Secretary the authority to make certain in-grade promotions. That authority will not be used except in a few exceptional cases? Is that true?

Mr. HAYS. That is true, and we have instructed the Department accordingly, that we do not expect them to grant those indiscriminately.

Mr. GROSS. Page 68, subsection (b), would the gentleman's response to the same question be the same? Would that constitute a built-in pay increase?

Mr. HAYS. No. I would not say so. I am glad to put that in the RECORD, that we do not expect it to be used that way. The situation was that this was to be used only in case of meritorious action, in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed in part to meet the situation on U.S. representation abroad which has occurred theoretically in the book "The Ugly American." Some Members have been concerned about those actions cited in the book "The Ugly American."

Members would do well to look over the bill and the report and you will see that it does forestall situations of that type occurring. For example, I like particularly the emphasis on foreign language training, likewise training made available to wives and families of people who represent us abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I merely wish to correct one statement I made. I said to the gentleman that the original bill included a provision for $200 million for housing. I was in error; it was $100 million. I will correct that when I revise my remarks before they are printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat coincidental that when I came here 8 years ago I came from the Foreign Service and that on the eve of my departure from the House I should be speaking on a bill designed to strengthen and improve the Foreign Service.

I want to pay my own tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio, and to express my appreciation of his kind remarks about me. One of the many regrets I have upon leaving the House is that I will not be here next year to assume the chairmanship of the State Department Subcommittee and have the gentleman from Ohio as my ranking minority member.

Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio, has explained this bill very adequately. Very briefly, it contains three particular parts. There is, of course, legislation with respect to the strengthening of the Foreign Service Staff Corps. There is legislation also for the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund; and there is legislation for the overall improvement of the Foreign Service.

The gentleman from Ohio referred to an earlier bill which had been passed by the committee and which because of objections was changed. As the House is aware we are now considering the Senate bill 2633, with an overall amendment, which is the bill presently before us.

In addition to the $100 million authorization for Foreign Service buildings which was included in the original Senate bill, the specific items which have been taken out by the Foreign Affairs Committee from the Senate bill include, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio, the reorganization of the Foreign Service staff, reducing it from 22 classes to 10 classes which arrangement had been somewhat outmoded by the recent 7½-percent Federal pay increase; the hazardous duty pay for couriers; the housing differential pay to Foreign Service officers assigned to Washington and the special incentive program in foreign languages; the travel expense item for dependents of persons attending international conferences, and the payment of salaries and expenses of participants in exchange programs.

Those items, Mr. Speaker, as originally included in the bill, with the exception of the housing provision which was never considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs as a legitimate part of this bill, would at that time have made the overall cost of the bill $1,869,642 annually. Since we have now removed all of those provisions and since the only two items in the bill to represent any cost are the five-year language training program and the very small amount for the benefit of interclass promotion of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, the cost of

the bill presently before the House is estimated to be not more than $271,831 annually.

In addition to that, the various changes in the legislation which affect the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund are, I believe, expected to represent a total liability to the fund of not more than $190,000 per annum.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the very small figures contained in this bill can, indeed, be justified for the purpose of strengthening and improving our Foreign Service. We do not pretend to say that the State Department or the Foreign Service is completely satisfied with this bill because, naturally, they would have liked to have included the provisions that were taken out by the committee. But I can say categorically that the State Department, the Foreign Service Association, and the administration is very desirous of having the bill now before the House passed at the present time without change insofar as the House is concerned and, whether or not a conference with the other body will ensue, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, we in the House will try to maintain the position of the House if, indeed, a conference is requested.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two at this point about the Foreign Service of the United States which basically comprises three categories—Foreign Service officers who are nominated by the President and require Senate confirmation; the Foreign Service Reserve, very analagous to the Active Reserve of the armed services; and the Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are almost a forgotten category but who make up the clerical and technical personnel that give so much backbone to our Foreign Service. Without the Foreign Service staff and corps, the Foreign Service would be composed of a good many chiefs and very few Indians.

Just as we are interested in trying to make the career Foreign Service an attractive profession from the standpoint of encouraging the recruitment of our finest caliber of men and women, we must at the same time also take steps to make the Foreign Service staff corps, the technical and clerical corps, equally attractive, equally desirable. That is one of the main purposes for bringing this bill before you today.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a cold war with the Soviet Union that is being fought on a great many fronts, indeed. It is being fought on the ideological front, the economic front, the cutlural front, and many other fronts. The only front it is not being fought on at the present time, and pray God that may never occur, is, of course, the military front. In all of these other fronts of our cold war struggle with international communism and with the Soviet Union, our Foreign Service, the Foreign Service of the United States, is indeed our frontline shock troops. Whether in Cuba, whether in the Congo, whether in the Middle East, whether in Berlin or the Far East or any of the other farflung parts of the world, the men and women of the Foreign Service are the ones who take the brunt of the cold war. They are the first line in our great conflict and struggle with international communism at this time. As desirous as we all are to maintain a strong armed force, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and other components of the armed services, because we believe in maintaining a strong Military Establishment to best guarantee peace, it would be the height of folly, it would be the height of shortsightedness not to do everything within our power to strengthen the Foreign Service of the United States whose contribution to victory in the cold war, whose contribution to the peace of the world and the security and safety of this country is equally as important as the contributions made by our Armed Forces.

I urge sincerely and earnestly that the House pass this bill without a dissenting vote, and let the people of our country, the people of the world, and the people of the Foreign Service know that we are united in wanting to strengthen and stabilize and improve our Foreign Service. Certainly we can make improvements in it. We can get more efficiency, we can get a better quality of people, we can get a higher class of administrators, we can do many things, but we cannot make those improvements by refusing the modest requests they have asked to make the Foreign Service what we would all like to see, and that is the finest Foreign Service that any country can boast of. So, on the basis of my experience in the Foreign Service, and on the basis of my experience with the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I hope this bill will be passed with no dissenting vote, with no opposition, but with a strong indication on the part of the House that we recognize the importance of the international crises we are going through today, and that we recognize at the same time that these crises have problems and that our successful solution of such problems will depend on the strength, the efficiency and the adequacy of our Foreign Service that has already done such a wonderful job.

I believe very sincerely that this bill will contribute to making all of these things possible.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, for some time the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have been very much interested in doing all that could be done legislatively to strengthen the Foreign Service. In the midfifties some steps were taken to amend the act of 1946, and those steps, I think, were constructive and helpful.

The proposal today, in my opinion, is another such forward-looking, beneficial step, and I urge that this proposed legislation be adopted. I think each of us is anxious to do everything that we can in these troubled days to give us the strongest possible Foreign Service. We want to encourage properly prepared people to enter the service, and we want to give them inducements to remain there once they are in that Service. This legislation will contribute to that end. It will, I repeat, strengthen our Foreign Service and make it more attractive. It will assist in building a strong body of Foreign Service people who will represent our country abroad and thus contribute to the cause of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this proposed legislation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. It seeks to bring our Foreign Service into line with the realities of our present world situation. In the more leisurely days of the quiet past, which seems such a long time ago, the Foreign Service officer was trained to observe and interpret and report to his Government regarding events in a foreign country. He transmitted messages, carried on a certain amount of entertainment and in general upheld the prestige of his country. Now we are living in a world where a chief of mission not only has to do all of these things, but he is responsible in many countries for the operation of a foreign aid program that involves the management of as much as $100 million or $200 million or $300 million worth of aid each year. How many are there in the United States even in the business world qualified by training or experience to manage efficiently, economically, and successfully that big an operation? We simply have got to raise the Foreign Service to a higher level—in its training, in its emoluments, and its attractions, and in its rewards—if it is to do what the country needs and expects of it.

As the gentleman from Michigan has correctly said, this bill is to strengthen our first line of defense. It is only when that first line is not successful in protecting the interests of our country in its relations with other countries that we have to call on the armed services. We spend billions of dollars on the armed services without hesitation, but we have not become accustomed to giving the attention and thought that the times demand to making the Foreign Service adequate for the responsibilities we place upon it.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked recently to learn that when a man retires from the Foreign Service, even though he may have served our country brilliantly for 30 or 35 years, yet he is not given a citation or a plaque or a certificate or an honorable discharge or anything from the President or the Secretary of State showing that he has served in the Foreign Service of the United States for a given length of time, or in such and such countries, in such and such positions, with great distinction and honor to his country. This is a shortcoming that should be promptly remedied.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very modest step. It requires very little additional money. I think it is long overdue, and I hope that the various provisions will induce the very ablest and most ambitious, if you wish, and most patriotic men and women in our country to enter the Foreign Service.

England knew she was an island for hundreds of years, and almost every great statesman in England's history for centuries had served an apprenticeship in its oversea activities—a consul on the

Gold Coast, a magistrate in Hong Kong, an executive with the East India Co. or the Hudson's Bay Co. Therefore the British thought in world terms, to their great advantage. In contrast, we in America had almost a whole continent to occupy our attention. Our best youth were challenged to become engineers, railroad builders, scientists, industrialists, to develop this vast, virgin continent. Now, belatedly, we are waking up to the fact that we, too, are just an island. And, in the end, America will survive, let alone progress, in direct proportion to our skill in handling our relations with the rest of the world. This bill is designed to make more effective the body of men and women who will handle this most vital function.

I am glad that we are making some headway in legislation to improve the Foreign Service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the contribution on the part of the Foreign Service employees is being increased under the terms of this bill?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is, their contribution to the retirement fund.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. What has it been?

Mr. JUDD. I understand it has been 5 percent and that this bill increases it to 6½ percent, which brings it into line with the contributions of other groups of Federal employees.

Mr. GROSS. So at long last they are attaining some equality with the rest of us in payments into the retirement fund; is that correct?

Mr. JUDD. I think that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am curious to know why this bill was handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. I cannot give the gentleman a categorical answer, but it is my impression that it has been because the Foreign Service is such a specialized body. Its duties have been so different in many respects from those of the main body of Government personnel and it works under such a variety of conditions abroad. These conditions are studied and legislation dealing with them formulated and sponsored in the Congress by the Committee on Foreign Affairs which has the most direct responsibility in this field.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will recall that the 7½ percent increase pay bill came out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. I know that. And I was one who voted reluctantly to sustain the President's veto of that bill, not because of the amount of money involved in raises for postal employees, but because I did not feel that this was the way to deal with pay and employment conditions of other employees, especially those in the Foreign Service.

Mr. GROSS. I am curious to know why there is this divided jurisdiction.

Mr. JUDD. One would have to go to the Speaker of the House of Representatives for an answer to that, I suppose. But this is the traditional way in which legislation dealing with Foreign Service personnel has been handled.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put it on record that I believe we have the best Foreign Service in the world. The U.S. Foreign Service officers, the staff personnel, the reserve officers, our U.S. wives and families in Foreign Service, and indeed they are, as well as our many efficient employees who come from beyond our U.S. borders, constitute the finest Foreign Service team assembled anywhere, any time, and by any country. I know it from my long years of experience in Congress, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and as a U.S. delegate at the United Nations, and it should be firmly and openly stated, so all American citizens know of it, and view our U.S. Foreign Service with pride, respect, devotion, and honor.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate the members and families of our U.S. Foreign Service on their courage and competence because, in many fields and in many places all over the world, they have been rendering very fine and dedicated service to the American people—partiotic service. We hear so much criticism that I think we should have on record the feeling of the Congress, and especially the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who see the Foreign Service quite a bit, and work with them, that we do have this confidence in them.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have tried exceedingly hard in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and particularly in the subcommittee having to do with matters concerning the personnel of the Foreign Service, to bring to you a bill which is a just bill even though we should have liked to have included other items.

We feel strongly that there is a very real need for the changes this bill brings to you. So, Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that recognition of this kind may be given to the Foreign Service officers and staff. They have served us well, and they will continue so to do. This is a moment in history when demands are being made upon them daily that demand training, knowledge, and ever increasing experience topped by a deep loyalty and courage. We feel that this bill may do much to encourage them, to give them the certainty that we here on the Hill know that things are not always easy for them and that we want them to have definite recognition from us.

I trust that this bill will be passed, and as the gentleman from Michigan so well said, that it will be passed without a dissenting vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 2633, with an amendment?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I heard no "noes" on the vote. Can it be entered on the RECORD that the bill was passed by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary question.

BILLS FROM COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO BE CALLED UP UNDER UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce to the House that the Committee on Ways and Means have reported out 12 bills that we shall consider later on this week or sometime later in this session; I should say probably this week. The chairman of the committee will ask unanimous consent for the consideration of these bills, a list of which I make part of the RECORD at this time:

H.R. 11266, prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations.

H.R. 6292, authorization of acceptance by the Government of gifts to reduce the public debt.

H.R. 9000, provision that only one retail liquor dealer tax need be paid by any State and political subdivision operating liquor stores.

H.R. 10960, determination of retail price for purposes of excise tax on cigars.

H.R. 6066, limitation on deduction in case of contributions by individuals to certain charitable organizations.

H.R. 3176, imposition of tire tax on tires delivered to manufacturer's retail outlet.

H.R. 12536, exclusion of local advertising charges from manufacturer's sales price.

H.R. 11681, amendment of section 902(b) of Internal Revenue Code.

H.R. 12329, gift and estate tax treatment of relinquishment of certain powers.

H.R. 12036, dividends-received deduction for dividends paid by a foreign corporation from earnings and profits accumulated by a domestic corporation.

H.R. 3392, certification of quotas on certain Philippine tobacco.

H.R. 11584, import taxes on lead and zinc.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2575) to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government, as amended.

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 this Act may be cited as the "Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used is this Act—

(1) The terms "employee", "Government", "member of family", and "Commission" have the same meanings, when used in this

Act as such terms have when used in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

(2) "Health benefits plan" means an insurance policy or contract, medical or hospital service arrangement, membership or subscription contract, or similar agreement provided by a carrier for a stated periodic premium or subscription charge for the purpose of providing, paying for, or reimbursing expenses for hospital care, surgical or medical diagnosis, care, and treatment, drugs and medicines, remedial care, or other medical supplies and services, or any combination of these.

(3) "Retired employee" means any person who would be an annuitant as that term is defined in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 if the contribution and enrollment provisions of that Act had been in effect on the date the person became an annuitant, but does not include any person who was a noncitizen whose permanent-duty station was outside a State of the United States or the District of Columbia on the day before he became an annuitant.

(4) "Carrier" means a voluntary association, corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental organization which lawfully offers a health benefits plan.

GOVERNMENT-WIDE PLAN

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or any other provision of law requiring competitive bidding, enter into a contract with a qualified carrier for one uniform Government-wide health benefits plan for retired employees. Such contract shall be for a period of at least one year and shall be automatically renewable in the absence of notice of termination by either party. The carrier shall, if the Commission so directs, cede reinsurance to such other companies which regularly issue group health insurance as may elect to participate or shall allocate its rights and obligations under the contract among such of its affiliates as may elect to participate in accordance with an equitable formula to be determined by the carrier and approved by the Commission. The contracting carrier, if an insurance company, shall be licensed to issue group health insurance in all the States of the United States and the District of Columbia and shall, in the most recent year for which data are available, have made at least 1 per centum of all group health insurance benefit payments in the United States.

(b) The contract under this Act shall contain a detailed statement of the benefits offered and shall include such maximums, limitations, exclusions, and other definitions of benefits as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable. No person may be excluded because of race, sex, health status, or age, and the contract may not deny or limit benefits because of any preexisting condition.

(c) The rates charged for the health benefits plan described in subsection (a) of this section shall reasonably and equitably reflect the cost of the benefits provided. Rates determined for the first term shall be adjusted for subsequent terms on the basis of experience. The Commission shall prescribe the extent to which reserves due to favorable experience may be retained by the carrier. Such reserves shall in any case be retained for the benefit of retired employees enrolled thereunder, and members of their families.

CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) If a retired employee enrolls in the health benefits plan provided for by section 3 of this Act, the Government shall contribute toward his subscription charge such amounts as the Commission by regulation may from time to time prescribe. The amount so prescribed, if the employee is enrolled for self only, shall not be less than $3.00 monthly or more than $4.00 monthly. The amount to be prescribed for a retired employee enrolled for self and family shall be twice the contribution for one enrolled for self only. A retired employee may not receive a Government contribution for more than one plan, nor may a retired employee receive a Government contribution if he is covered under the enrollment of another employee or retired employee who is receiving a Government contribution toward his enrollment.

(b) In addition the Government shall contribute an amount, as prescribed by the Commission, up to 2 per centum of each contribution authorized by subsection (a) of this section of the Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund, for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act.

WITHHOLDING

SEC. 5. There shall be withheld from the annuity or compensation of each retired employee enrolled in the health benefits plan provided for under section 3 of this Act so much as is necessary, after deducting the contribution of the Government, to pay the total charge for his enrollment.

OTHER HEALTH BENEFITS PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) Subject to subsection (b) of this section a retired employee who elects to obtain a health benefits plan, or to retain an existing health benefits plan, other than the plan provided for under section 3 of this Act, directly with a carrier, shall be paid a Government contribution to the cost of his health benefits plan which shall be equal in amount to the appropriate Government contribution established by the Commission pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act, but may not exceed the cost to him of the health benefits plan in which he is enrolled or which he retains or, if the plan combines health benefits with other benefits, shall not exceed the cost to him of the premium fixed by the carrier for the health benefits portion of the plan in which he is enrolled or which he retains. A retired employee may not receive a Government contribution for more than one plan, nor may a retired employee receive a Government contribution if he is covered under the enrollment of another employee or retired employee who is receiving a Government contribution toward his enrollment.

(b) A retired employee who enrolls in a plan shall be entitled to the Government contribution provided by this section only if the carrier of the plan (1) has been providing health benefits for at least one year and (2), if an insurance company, is licensed to issue individual or group health insurance in all the States of the United States and the District of Columbia. Clause (2) of the immediately preceding sentence shall not apply to enrollment in a plan sponsored by an association or other organization more than 50 per centum of the members of which are Federal employees or former Federal employees.

(c) In addition, the Government shall contribute an amount, as prescribed by the Commission, up to 2 per centum of each contribution authorized by subsection (a) of this section to the Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund, for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act.

ELECTIONS

SEC. 7. Each retired employee shall, within such time after March 1, 1961, as the Commission shall prescribe, notify the Commission of his election (1) to enroll in the plan provided under section 3 of this Act, (2) to enroll in or retain another health benefits plan and receive Government contributions under section 6 of this Act, or (3) not to participate in the program offered under this Act. If the retired employee elects to enroll under clause (2) of this section, his election shall be accompanied by a certificate of the carrier certifying the fact of his enrollment and the cost to him of the health benefits plan, or of the health benefits portion of the plan.

RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

SEC. 8. (a) The withholdings of retired employees under section 5 of this Act and the contributions of the Government under sections 4 and 6 of this Act shall be deposited in the Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund, hereinafter referred to as the "Fund", which is hereby created and which shall be administered by the Commission.

(b) The Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all payments on account of the health benefits plan negotiated under section 3 of this Act, for payment of the Government's contribution provided for by section 6(a) of this Act to agencies of the Government which administer a retirement system for civilian employees of the Government, and for payment of expenses, not to exceed the Government's contributions authorized by sections 4(b) and 6(b) of this Act, incurred by the Commission in administering this Act.

(c) Any dividends or other refunds made by the carrier under section 3 of this Act shall be set aside in the Fund as a contingency reserve for the Government-wide plan. Such contingency reserve may be used to defray increases in future rates of or to reduce the retired employees' and the Government's contributions to, or to increase the health benefits provided by that plan, as the Commission may from time to time determine.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest and reinvest any of the moneys in the Fund in interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the purposes of the Fund. The interest on and the proceeds from the sale of any such obligations shall become a part of the Fund.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall administer this Act and prescribe such regulations as are necessary to give full effect to the purposes of this Act.

(b) Such regulations shall fix minimum standards to be met by the carrier and the plan under section 3 of this Act, including extensions of coverage to be provided. The Commission may request all carriers to furnish such reasonable reports as the Commission determines to be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act. The carrier shall furnish such reports when requested and permit the Commission and representatives of the General Accounting Office to examine such records of the carriers as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Commission's regulations may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) exclusions of retired employees from coverage;

(2) beginning and ending dates of coverage, and conditions of eligibility;

(3) methods of filing the elections required by section 7 of this Act and other information;

(4) methods of making contributions authorized by section 6, and withholdings required by section 5 of this Act;

(5) changes in enrollment;

(6) questions of dependency;

(7) certificates and other information to be furnished to retired employees;

(8) contributions and withholding during periods of suspension of annuity payments and in other extraordinary situations;

(9) when, and under what conditions, an election not to participate in the programs offered under this Act may be withdrawn; and

(10) under what conditions and to what extent the cost of a plan shall be considered a cost attributable to the retired employee.

(d) Each agency of the United States or the District of Columbia which administers a retirement system for annuitants shall keep such records, make such certifications, and furnish the Commission with such information and reports as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this Act.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be expended from the Employees Life Insurance Fund, without regard to limitations on expenditures from that Fund, for any fiscal years from the date of enactment through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, inclusive, such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses incurred by the Commission in carrying out the health benefits provisions of this Act. Reimbursements to the Employees Life Insurance Fund for sums so expended, together with interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be made from the Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund which is hereby made available for this purpose.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 10. Any employee organization under this Act or as defined in section 2(1) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3003(3)) shall be exempt from the provisions of the Fire and Casualty Act (54 Stat. 1063; D.C. Code 35–1301 and the following).

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 11. The amounts authorized by this Act to be contributed by the Government shall be paid from annual appropriations which are hereby authorized to be made for such purpose.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The Commission shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the operation of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. The health benefits program provided for by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1961. The contributions and withholdings provided for by this Act shall take effect on June 1, 1961, with respect to annuity or compensation accruing for periods beginning on and after that date.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will provide a health benefits program for 415,000 retired Government employees and survivor annuitants who are not eligible to enroll under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959—Public Law 86–382—because they became annuitants before that act took effect in July of this year.

The committee amendment to the Senate-passed bill substitutes the language of Congressman LESINSKI's bill, H.R. 12495. It represents a compromise on which, in the judgment of the committee, there can be general agreement in the interest of assuring that there will be a health benefits program for former Government employees and their survivors who were on the retirement rolls prior to July 1, 1960.

The primary requirement for eligibility is that the individual must have been retired on an immediate annuity with 12 or more years of service or for disability. Survivor annuitants will be eligible if the persons from whom their annuities derive would have been eligible in their own right had they lived.

The committee amendment requires the Civil Service Commission to contract with a qualified carrier for a single, uniform, Government-wide health plan for retired employees and survivor annuitants. The carrier will reinsure with other qualified carriers if the Commission so directs. The committee amendment contains substantially the same conditions now stated in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to insure that the contract represents the best possible bargain for the Government and for the beneficiaries.

The Government will contribute in an amount—fixed by the Civil Service Commission—which is not less than $3 nor more than $4 monthly for a person who enrolls for self alone. That amount will be doubled for a person who enrolls for self and family. This double contribution for family enrollment is particularly appropriate, since most retirees' families consist of two persons.

There would be withheld from the annuity or compensation of each enrollee the amount required to pay the premium for such enrollee after deducting the Government contribution.

An alternative plan is provided which will allow retirees to select a qualified commercial health plan other than the single Government-sponsored plan if desired. An eligible person would have the option of retaining an existing health plan or of enrolling in another plan. The Government contribution in this case will be paid directly to the individual as an increase in his or her annuity check.

This is a voluntary plan and the retiree may elect to participate under this legislation or not, as he desires. If he elects to participate, his notice to the Commission shall specify his preference as to type of health plan desired—that is, whether he prefers to enroll in the single Government-sponsored plan under section 3 or to retain or obtain a different plan as provided in section 6. Any selection of such a different plan must be accompanied by a certification of the carrier of the fact of his enrollment and of the premium cost.

This legislation corrects an inequitable situation that has arisen under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. Participation of a major organization of Federal employees under that act—which was intended to be permitted when the act was approved—has been denied to the organization because of a technicality in the provisions of the Fire and Casualty Act—54 Stat. 1063; D.C. Code 35–1301 and the following. Section 10 will permit the intended participation by this organization in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 by exempting the organization from the technical provision of the Fire and Casualty Act.

This legislation will take effect July 1, 1961. This leadtime in the effective date is essential to permit negotiation of a contract for the Government-sponsored plan which is in the interest of the Government and the retirees, to advise the retirees of their rights and of the necessary procedures, and to carry out all of the administrative responsibilities and duties imposed on the Civil Service Commission.

I believe this represents the best possible solution of the pressing health and medical problems facing our retired employees and survivor annuitants and hope that it will be approved.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which has the unanimous approval of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, will provide a health benefits program for the 415,000 Government employees who retired before the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 became effective in July 1960. It will not provide any benefit for any employee or official presently employed or serving in office.

This legislation offers two methods of coverage. It will permit the Civil Service Commission to establish a single Government-wide health plan, or permit an annuitant to elect to continue the plan he now has or to obtain a commercial plan. Enrollment in any of the plans is strictly voluntary.

Another important factor dictates prompt approval of this legislation. Many of the Members will recall the serious situation which arose after enactment of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, when many employees and retirees faced loss of their life insurance because groups in which they were insured were forced out of business due to creation of the Government program. A similar situation now faces many thousands of retired Federal employees and survivors who have attempted to provide their own medical and health protection through individual or group health plans.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 will cause the immediate or early collapse of a hundred or more health and medical benefit groups whose policies represent the only health protection for these retirees and survivors. When all of the active employees in such groups enroll under the Government program, the existing groups will expire through lack of new memberships. Only the active employees will be protected. The retirees and survivors on the annuity rolls will have to seek individual protection at prohibitive cost because of their advanced age group.

I think it is generally acknowledged that the promotion of positive and long-range health programs for people in older age groups will benefit everyone by increasing the capacities of these older people to live active and meaningful lives in their later years. The sharply rising costs of medical and hospital care in recent years has been felt by people of all ages. The impact of these rising costs has been particularly harsh and unfortunate with respect to those who have completed active service and earned a few years of life in retirement. Their medical and hospital care needs are far greater than similar needs for younger people. As a group they require nearly

three times as much general hospital care, on the average, as is needed by active workers as a group. The retirees also have special need for long-term or extended medical and hospital care.

Unfortunately, to meet their extraordinary medical and hospital expenses retired workers and surviving widows as a group may look only to incomes which are considerably lower, on the average, than the incomes of active workers. In many cases the retirees' incomes are either fixed or are declining in amount and hardly suffice to maintain a reasonable standard of living even without the misfortune of illness or injury to which they are so susceptible. By approving this legislation, the Government of the United States will be taking an important step in assisting its former public servants to achieve full and meaningful lives during retirement.

It is for these reasons that I voted for S. 2575, as amended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and support this legislation today. It is my earnest belief that this legislation is necessary to prevent real hardship for a great many retired workers and their widows. I hope and believe that the legislation will be approved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

I would like to stress the point that the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee emphasized, that this applies to 415,000 persons and dependents who retired from the service prior to July 1 of this year. This is a genuine example of temporary legislation, because it deals with a limited group and the category that is covered will ultimately pass from the picture, and this particular program will terminate with that event.

I support this legislation because on this matter as with the health program for Federal employees enacted by the Congress last year, the Government and the Congress are acting in the role of employer, in an employer and employee relationship. I hope that the example which is being set by the Federal Government in this matter will stimulate similar activity in the field of private enterprise, and if there can be more done in that field there will be less demand for massive intervention in these areas of medical care for the aged, in which the Government does not have the employer-employee relationship.

I urge the enactment of this bill, which was voted out unanimously by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, like the others who have preceded me, I rise in support of this meritorious legislation. The parliamentary situation in this session is such that this is the best bill that can be secured at this time. If we are going to get this program under way by next July 1, it becomes essential that this plan be adopted today.

We recognize that for the 415,000 retirees who will benefit from this act, that we are doing in large measure what many private industries have done for their employees, and we hope others will do the same.

Very definitely the retirees are the victims of the inflation which has occurred, and certainly for this Congress to go along and recognize the medical care needs of those retired employees is a right and proper thing to do.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I am supporting this bill, but I would like to ask, Is it true that the Bureau of the Budget opposed this bill and, notwithstanding the opposition of the Bureau of the Budget, the full committee recommended that it be passed?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman is right in the latter statement, that the committee recommended the bill unanimously, but I was under the opinion that the Civil Service Commission had approved of the bill with the Senate amendment. I cannot say whether the Bureau of the Budget has approved it or not.

Mr. SANTANGELO. On page 11 of the report is a letter from the executive officer of the Bureau of the Budget in which he indicates the administration opposition to the bill. Is that a fact?

Mr. CORBETT. I am now informed that the Budget Bureau expressed opposition to this measure primarily because it was not a budget item in the original message. However, I will say to the gentleman that he and others, including myself, have often acted on their own responsibility and not yielded to the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. It seems fair and necessary.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a statement by the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JAMES H. MORRISON, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, ON S. 2575, AUGUST 1960

Last year the retired employees were very greatly disappointed that they were not included in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. They felt that they were discriminated against and, I think, rightly so. This is particularly true with reference to employees who were going to retire between the time that act was enacted on September 28, 1959, and July 1960, when the health plans went into effect. Any employee who retired before July 1960 is not covered by the 1959 act.

The committee was advised last year that it was actuarily unsound to attempt to include such an older group of retired employees in the bill with the employees who are covered. This bill establishes a separate fund, the retired employees health benefits fund. The fund will be used to pay the expenses of a program for persons of this older age group, which will provide health benefits at the best possible bargain obtainable.

The program is designed to give persons who retired prior to July 1, 1960, a somewhat similar program on a somewhat comparable basis, as will be enjoyed under the 1959 act by employees who retire after July 1, 1960. The conditions of eligibility are the same. The former employee must have retired on an immediate annuity with 12 or more years of service, or due to disability.

The Civil Service Commission has estimated the cost of the committee amendment for the first year as between $15 million and $25 million, which will decline rapidly in future years as the number of retirees in this advanced age group diminishes. The contribution to the cost of the program of the retirees who choose the Government-sponsored plan will be withheld from their monthly retirement check. The retiree who chooses to retain an existing commercial health plan, or to procure a new commercial plan, will receive the Government contribution by means of an increase in his annuity check. The Government contribution will be by annual appropriation to the fund.

I think this is a very beneficial bill and it will help the majority of Federal employees who retired prior to July 1, 1960. I urge the approval of the reported bill so that our retired Government employees may be assured of the establishment of a health program at the earliest practicable time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply interested for quite some time in legislation to provide a health benefits program for Federal employees and introduced legislation for this purpose as early as the beginning of the 85th Congress.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 provides a health benefits program for employees and persons who retire after the effective date of the act in July 1960. But employees who retired prior to July 1960, were not included because we were told last year that it would cost 2 to 3 times more to give the retirees the same schedule of benefits planned under the 1959 act.

S. 2575 as passed by the Senate would provide a health benefits program for retirees and survivor annuitants not covered by the 1959 act. However, that bill was strongly opposed by the administration and certainly faced a possible Presidential veto. The program proposed was too complex and offered too many different choices of programs by directing the Commission to contract with all of the 38 carriers approved under the 1959 act and such additional carriers as may be approved by the Commission.

After passage of the Senate bill I immediately conferred with representatives of the Civil Service Commission and retired employee groups. In my opinion, the best possible compromise was reached and I introduced a new bill, H.R. 12495, embodying the compromise. The amendment recommended by the committee to S. 2575 contains substantially the same language as contained in my bill, H.R. 12495.

This legislation will direct the Commission to contract for a single plan as

contrasted with many plans and provides for only two types of enrollment—for self only or for self and family—as compared with the five types of enrollment under the Senate passed bill. Retired employees who prefer can obtain private commercial plans or continue plans they now may have and they will be entitled to a Government contribution toward the cost of the program.

In my judgment, this legislation will not be vetoed because of the simplicity of the program now offered and because it is becoming more and more apparent that the health and medical groups which are the only source of protection for the majority of the retirees will soon collapse for lack of new membership since the active employees are enrolling under the Government program.

Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that the committee amendment offers a solution to the very complex and difficult problem of carrying out our obligation to help protect the health of the hundreds of thousands of men and women who devoted their productive working lives to our Government.

Both the total cost and the expense and difficulty of administration will be kept within very reasonable bounds. I urge the approval of the committee amendment.

At this time, I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES DAVIS, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his untiring efforts in holding hearings and getting the bill on the House floor. His fairness in acting upon this legislation has made its passage here today possible.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is my understanding correct that the National Association of Retired Civil Service Employees supports this bill enthusiastically?

Mr. LESINSKI. One hundred percent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am certainly very pleased to see the action of the committee in reporting the legislation. I have been a supporter of legislation along this line. I strongly urge favorable action by the House upon the bill.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. As a member of the committee I rise in support of the bill S. 2575. I want to commend the leadership of the committee for bringing it to the floor. It remedies an inequity that exists at the present time and provides a very feasible and constructive health and welfare program for our retired civil service employees.

Mr. LESINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. During the recess I took occasion to talk to retired civil service employees in Florida. They pointed out their need and also their willingness to pay a portion of health insurance as provided in this legislation. I want to commend the committee for taking action at this time. I hope this bill can become law this session.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for his untiring work on this legislation and to be recorded in hearty support of this bill.

This legislation, as has already been stated, is long overdue and well deserved.

As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] well stated, these retirees have been waiting most patiently for some action by Congress. I am glad the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has seen fit to take unanimous action on this legislation and I wish to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Georgia and his fine committee for their thought and study and report on this bill which merits the praise of the Members of Congress.

I know that the beneficiaries of this bill appreciate their sincere work.

Mr. LESINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALFORD. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman and the committee for the work they have done on this legislation and to point out specifically that it preserves the voluntary system, the traditional American system of free enterprise, and private enterprise through the voluntary efforts of the retired employees themselves. I am glad to see this extension of benefits to retired Federal Government employees, and I want to point out that this legislation in particular has had the full support of all the various health groups including physicians throughout the country.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan and the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service for reporting this bill to the House for our consideration. As a former member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I appreciate the difficulties which this problem presented. This bill will take care of a great many retired Government employees who desperately need care but who were losing their chance for private insurance and their benefits because the Federal Government had entered the picture and destroyed the efficacy of employee plans which were practically destroyed by the elimination of all source of potential members of the plan.

I commend the gentleman and the committee for the vigorous way they have attacked this problem and the solution they have brought us.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable EDWARD REES for granting me this time. I also want to express my deep personal regret that our good friend, ED REES is retiring from the Congress this year. To have the privilege of having served here with him is an honor for which I shall always be grateful. We shall all miss him and I know we each extend to him our every good wish for many more years of good health and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, the retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960, S. 2575, is of special concern to many retired Federal employees in my Congressional District and the adjoining district represented by my distinguished colleague the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN. Some years ago employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base set up a plan of health insurance. It was operated by a civilian welfare fund council at the base under the chairmanship of Mr. F. S. Allen. This plan was available to all employees and could be continued on retirement at the same general rates.

At the time the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 was being considered, the Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., carried a group contract with 11,606 employees at WPAFB. Some 600 of these employees had been retired but were still covered by the plan.

The local group applied to the Civil Service Commission to have the Paul Revere plan included under the new Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. The application was denied on the contention that the plan in effect was not national in scope. Mr. Allen appeared before the Civil Service Commission at a hearing on March 21, 1960, but the earlier decision was reaffirmed.

Those Federal employees in current Government employment were eligible for coverage under the new health benefits law, but the 600 retired employees were, of course, ineligible under the law's provisions.

This has created a great hardship on the retirees in this group since they must now shop for insurance on an individual basis. Not only are the rates much higher but many found that they were no longer able to get insurance at all.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman BROWN joins me in urging the approval of this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] for the statement he has just made. I not only approve of it, but I join with him in urging the passage of this bill in order to correct a very evident injustice which has been worked on the people of Ohio in connection with this retirement insurance matter.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee reporting this bill I rise in support of the legislation which was carefully considered and unanimously reported, as has been said. I also agree with the expressed opinion that we in the Congress do have an obligation to correct an injustice to those loyal former employees who have rendered such a fine service to their Government, and who have not been accorded equal treatment, in terms of health and medical benefits.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join in the request for the passage of this legislation and hope that it will be enacted unanimously.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2575. I am very pleased that the committee has brought this bill before the House today. Of all the groups I feel that these retirees are probably the ones who need a program of this type the most, because they are dependent upon a fixed and limited income, and when they have a serious sickness and run up a big hospital bill or a big medical bill of any type, very frequently that presents a very serious financial problem to them. This, I believe, will solve that problem, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of S. 2575, to provide health benefits for retired Government employees. I know of no group more deserving. In my district for many years I have met with the retired Government employees, and they have shown me to my own satisfaction that they badly have needed a health benefit plan of this kind. I want to thank the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing this legislation to final passage, and I want to emphasize that this is very essential legislation. It will help many needy retired people into whose pensions inflation has cut very deeply.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse this legislation. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that heard the testimony and recommended the legislation to the Congress. It certainly is deserving, and I hope that the measure will be passed overwhelmingly. Our retired employees are entitled to this health insurance program, and I might add it is one of the finest programs of group health insurance available today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, S. 2575 is a much needed and worthwhile measure. It will provide a modest but helpful health benefit program for retired Federal employees. These employees served their Government well during the years of their employment and are entitled, it seems to me, to the same consideration which we gave to currently employed Federal employees when we approved a measure providing health benefits for them. I trust that the House of Representatives will approve this proposal by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support and recommend the passage of S. 2575 to provide a health benefits program for retired Federal employees.

We have 415,000 individuals now on the retired rolls of the Federal Government who are not eligible to participate in the active employees program under Public Law 86–382 called the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. We therefore must pass this legislation in order to be fair to our Federal retired employees who have given long, loyal, and dedicated service to our American people and I strongly recommend that we pass it overwhelmingly.

I have been thinking about it, and I do not know of a more loyal, uncomplaining and wonderful group of people in the United States of America than the retired Federal employees and postal workers. Their work and devotion are a good example for us today. Retired or not, they are certainly entitled to their place in the sun, and should not be forgotten. Let us in Congress always protect our retired Federal employees and postal workers, in their pensions, their health programs, and their well-earned benefits.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2575, as amended by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. This legislation seeks to correct the existing inequity by extending health insurance benefits to former Federal employees who retired before the effective date of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, entitling them to the same coverage enjoyed by the now employed civil servants.

I feel that the legislation proposed would effectively correct the injustice that has been done these approximately 415,000 individuals now retired, and ineligible under Public Law 382 of the 86th Congress. It is extremely important that these people, the majority of whom are living on fixed incomes, have their medical bills covered in this age of soaring prices. This is not intended to be a handout to our retired employees. It will, however, assure each one of them the opportunity to pay a fixed sum comparable to that paid by the now working civil servant, and thus be guaranteed against undue hardships as a result of overwhelming medical bills.

This matter of medical care for retired civil servants is one in which I have been very much interested for some time, having introduced H.R. 9103, the Federal Annuitants Health Benefits Act of 1959. I am happy that the bill under consideration today embodies in effect my proposal, as I feel very strongly that those who have served so well and faithfully in the service of their country deserve this opportunity. I hope that this measure will be enthusiastically adopted by the House and I wholeheartedly recommend it for your favorable consideration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is not at all difficult to understand why so many of my colleagues are in favor of this bill. This is an election year. It is said to be necessary to correct an inequality. The thing that is strange to me is that we always correct it upward. Everyone knows, of course, that the cost of living has increased, that there are many, many people in this country in need, but in my judgment this is the wrong way to go at the situation. What the Congress should do, Members should take a cut themselves and force all other Federal employees to take a cut. We are never going to solve this situation by giving ever increasing numbers more and more and putting ever increasing burdens upon an ever increasing minority. All right. I know you will pass it, but that is it.

If we continue the present policy of appropriations without regard to our ability to pay just how long can the taxpayers bear the burden?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2575 to provide a health benefit program for certain retired employees of the Federal Government. As has been indicated heretofore, there are a number who have retired in the past who are not eligible to come under the Health Benefits Act for our Government employees. I strongly recommend the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of this legislation and wish to express my gratification that we have the measure on the floor today for action. Because of need for medical assistance for Federal workers already retired and those who will retire before Public Law 86–382 goes into effect, I supported the original bill authored by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and last year introduced a companion to his bill. This legislation, although modified, will deal with this inequity and I urge that we act directly and pass S. 2575 today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the original legislation in the House of Representatives and a member of the Civil Service Committee which reported this bill in its present revised and improved form, I felt a particular obligation to rise in its support on the floor of the House.

This bill, S. 2575, to which my bill, H.R. 8994, introduced last year was a companion, forestalls an inequity by providing a much-needed health benefits program for the already retired Government employees who were ineligible for the benefits of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 because they retired before it came into effect.

It is clearly a grave injustice that a person should be penalized because he or she retired after many years of faithful Government service in 1958 rather than in 1960. The number of persons involved is about 415,000. The cost to the Government in this bill will inevitably drop year by year and eventually vanish. It is the clear obligation of the Congress to provide equal treatment in terms of health and medical benefits for all its former employees no matter when they retired.

The justice of this bill is clearly shown by the fact that it received the approval of each and every member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The bill is technically an improvement over last year's Federal Health Benefits Act in that it consolidates the numerous and various health benefits plans into a single program.

Likewise, we in the House committee have provided a more simple and more favorable Government contribution structure than that provided in the Senate bill.

Thirdly, in order to meet the varying needs of retired persons and insure freedom of choice in the traditional American way, the committee has granted the option to retirees of retaining health benefits coverage they now have or of enrolling in a health benefits plan of their choice.

Proper care of our elderly retired citizens and equality of treatment for all are the principles necessitating this legislation. I am proud to have been one of those who introduced it in the House. I trust that we will approve it expeditiously.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy that my colleagues and I will have an opportunity today to work our will on S. 2575, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. I am confident that in doing so we will erase the discouragement and disappointment of those 415,000 individuals now on the retirement rolls who were not included under the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Act of 1959. They were not provided for in the bill passed last year because Congress was informed that such a move would be actuarily unsound. I am thankful, as I know many of my colleagues are, that a sound program has now been devised, and that we can support it with no qualms.

It is imperative that we recognize our undeniable obligation to provide equal treatment for these former employees. We owe equal treatment to these loyal persons who have given so many years of their lives to Government service. I am thankful for the opportunity to eliminate this discrimination. I urge your support of this vital legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the act granting certain hospitalization benefits for active Federal employees, inclusion of Federal retirees was purposely omitted because it was felt that the problems incident to the retirees were quite different and that consideration should be given them in separate legislation. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, has given careful thought and study to these problems, and their conclusions are embodied in S. 2575, now under consideration. I know that the National Association of Retired Civil Employees is very earnest in its efforts to obtain this legislation and it is in full accord with the provisions of this bill.

This association has its own hospitalization program, under which 54,000 policies are in operation. Without the enactment of this legislation, these policyholders would sooner or later be jeopardized in their holdings because Federal employees who now retire will, for the most part, take with them into retirement the policies which they purchased as employees. For this reason, among others, it is highly important that S. 2575 be enacted and I earnestly support the legislation.

Retired Federal employees are on a fixed income and are, therefore, in a much more difficult position when hospitalization disaster strikes than is the case among other groups. I am always glad to lend my support to any reasonable legislation which tends to relieve them of their financial burdens.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A GEORGIA COMMUNITY TAKES STEPS AGAINST OBSCENE MATERIAL

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, I spoke briefly before this body, calling attention to the growing menace to the morals of our youth created by the widespread circulation of obscene literature on magazine racks and through the mails, and urging action by the Congress to curb this vicious practice. On the same occasion, I also paid tribute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, for the untiring efforts she has already made to combat this serious problem on the national level, by fostering legislation to strengthen our Federal antiobscenity statutes and by awakening the American people to the enormity of the half a billion dollar pornography trade now flourishing in this country.

Shortly after my remarks on this urgent subject appeared in the RECORD, I received the following letter from Mr. Bert Harsh, vice president of the comparatively new Parents' League of Moultrie and Colquitt County, Ga.:

JULY 21, 1960.

DEAR MRS. BLITCH: I have read with a great deal of interest your speech before the House of Representatives on the subject of obscene literature and I was particularly interested in the reference to a suggested program which communities might use in cleaning up local newsstands. Two years ago Moultrie and Colquitt County formed a Parents' League which has been assisting in combating adult and youth delinquency. The youth have taken great steps forward in combating youth delinquency, but adult delinquency still continues to be a frustrating problem. The type of literature on the newsstand in Moultrie is a good example of this delinquency on the part of adults. Any information or assistance you may be able to offer us in combating this problem will be appreciated. Enclosed is a copy of the Teen-Age-Adult Goals which the youth of Moultrie and Colquitt County drafted about 1½ years ago. It is doing a very fine job and provides those young people without proper parental guidance with a standard to go by. Also attached is a pamphlet on the Parents' League which you may find interesting.

Yours very sincerely,

BERT HARSH,
Vice President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it happens that the writer of this letter, Mr. Harsh, is not a resident of my district, his home town of Moultrie, Ga., being located in the Second District of our State. And, on this occasion, I would like to congratulate my colleague, Congressman J. L. PILCHER, who so ably represents that district, on the fine work being done by the citizens of his home area to protect their children and teenagers against a problem which they alone are powerless to cope with completely.

Mr. Harsh's letter and the pamphlets he attached, describing the work of the Parents' League of Moultrie, clearly reflect, I believe, the aroused interest and serious concern which parents and youth leaders all over the Nation now feel regarding the ever-growing rash of filthy literature spread before our young people.

Despite the work which, in Mr. Harsh's opinion, yet remains to be done to clear the news and magazine stands in Moultrie of obscene literature, the steps already taken by the progressive citizens of this forward-looking Georgia community are a heartening example of what can be accomplished on the local level when parents and civic leaders bestir themselves and make up their minds to put a stop to undesirable influences affecting their children, young people, and adults.

The plans and program of their newly formed Parents' League, as set forth in the pamphlet sent me by Mr. Harsh, are so inspiring that I would like to enter them in the RECORD. I do this not only as a tribute to these enlightened citizens in my home State of Georgia, but with

the belief that the practical steps which they have taken to safeguard the morals of youth may serve as a helpful guide to parents and leaders of young people in other American communities, who may wish to mobilize their efforts in similar fashion. On a later occasion, I will enter the second pamphlet sent me by Mr. Harsh, "Teenage Adult Goals," written by the students of Moultrie Senior High School. The bold action of the parents and community leaders of Moultrie and Colquitt County, Ga., make me proud, as always, to be a southerner.

Here is their program:

DEAR FRIEND: In every community throughout the United States, parents, teachers, teenagers as well as "just plain adults" are concerned over what is commonly referred to as "juvenile delinquency." Some communities have recognized the problem and have taken corrective action toward curbing them, while other communities have, as yet, done nothing.

Fortunately, the people of Moultrie and Colquitt County have been aroused to the challenge and have taken steps to abolish or at least curb delinquency by a multipronged attack against all problem areas.

One may ask, "But how did this movement get started," and "What brought Moultrie to realize that action was necessary?" The following story answers these and many more questions regarding what has taken place in this Georgia community.

Late in 1957, the Junior Woman's Club of Moultrie sponsored a series of talks before civic clubs and high school groups by Dr. Edwin Hartz, chaplain of Florida State University in Tallahassee, Fla. Dr. Hartz also talked to parents of children in the subteenage group as well as to parents of children in the upper teenage group. In addition, many private counseling periods were conducted by Dr. Hartz with teenagers regarding personal problems at home and otherwise.

As a result of Dr. Hartz's talks, interest grew rapidly in the problems which were daily confronting our teenage children and so great was the interest, that Mr. M. S. McDonald, senior high school principal, was invited by the civic clubs and other organized groups to speak and elaborate on the community's problems. Mr. McDonald's talks were frank, honest, and presented to the people of Moultrie a factual evaluation of existing conditions.

Following Mr. McDonald's series of talks, the question on everyone's lips was the same: "What can be done to correct these influences in Moultrie which are demoralizing our youth?"

First of all, a movement was started to develop a code of behavior for parents, teenagers, and teachers. Hundreds of hours were spent by teenagers, teachers, and parents in the development of a code of behavior for all people in the community. "The Code" as it is familiarly referred to, is a simple but exacting statement of "what we believe" concerning daily human behavior.

It was during the drafting of the code of behavior that it was realized that the code, by itself, could not easily stand up against some of the evil influences in the community. Specifically, there was no control over showing of questionable movies to teenagers; inadequate control over sale of alcoholic beverages to teenagers; nor was there any control over the sale of questionable literature on the newsstands. Further, it was realized that some sort of educational program should be developed to emphasize the responsibilities of adults and parents toward the children of the community.

This realization led to the meeting of all civic club and organized group presidents in an effort to determine an effective course of action. An outgrowth of several of these meetings was the founding of the Parents' League, a nonprofit organization with no outside affiliations or political purposes, but whose prime goal was "to promote and foster in Moultrie and Colquitt County a healthy and moral atmosphere in which our youth may properly develop their minds and bodies."

In organizing the Parents' League, the following steps were taken:

(a) Establishment of a steering committee made up of two civic club presidents, the juvenile court judge, a merchant, a county schoolteacher, a city schoolteacher, a minister, a housewife, the senior high school principal and the youth center advisor. (All but one are parents of children in a broad age range.)

(b) Immediate steps were made to secure support from every individual adult and parent in the community, as well as support from civic clubs and organized groups. Dues for membership were set at $1 per year for individuals and $10 to $25 per year for sponsoring organizations depending upon size and financial capabilities.

(c) Talks outlining the story of the Parents' League were scheduled before all interested groups, soliciting their moral and financial assistance. Civic clubs and other organized groups were requested to establish parents' league committees to work with the steering committee in working out problems.

(d) Method of operation was to take whatever action was necessary to apply pressure, publicize and condemn influences in the community which served to make the code ineffective. Use of newspaper advertising, television, radio and personal talks were to be the means for effecting the desired results.

It is believed that the people of the community are faced with a real challenge in that the youth played a big part in the establishment of the code and the burden now is upon the parents and adults to make it possible for the code to operate.

Today the youth of this community believe in the code and they believe the Parents' League will make it possible for the code to work. The youth in Moultrie, as in other communities are aware of the bad influences which confront them daily. If adults and parents close their eyes to these poor influences and refuse to confront the problems of our community, will not the youth do likewise and thereby be demoralized even further by this indifferent attitude?

INCLUDING FLOATING DRYDOCKS UNDER THE TERM "VESSEL"

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 107) to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance, in order to include floating drydocks under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title.

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 section 1101(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by striking out "and fishing vessels" and inserting in lieu thereof "fishing vessels, and floating drydocks" which have a capacity of thirty-five thousand or more lifting tons and a beam of one hundred and twenty-five feet or more between the wing walls.

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 1104 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1274), is amended by deleting the word "or" before clause (d) of paragraph (8) and adding the following new clause at the end of paragraph (8): "or (e) with respect to floating drydocks, in the construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, or repair of vessels."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 1104 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1274), is amended by deleting the word "or" before clause (d) of paragraph (2) and adding the following new clause at the end of paragraph (2): "or (e) with respect to floating drydocks, in the construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, or repair of vessels."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to include floating drydocks among the type of vessels eligible for Federal ship mortgage insurance in order to facilitate their construction through private financing.

Mr. Chairman, this bill passed the House in a previous session of the Congress but failed of passage in the Senate. The Senate has passed this bill, in an improved form, in this session of Congress. Now it comes to the House.

The bill would set a minimum limit as to the size of floating drydocks to be built under this bill. There is not one on the west coast at the present time able to take care of vessels of 45,000 tons. So, Mr. Speaker, to save my soul I cannot see why anybody would have any objection to this bill. It is my guess that the gentleman who demanded a second had in mind a different bill.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is this bill the same as H.R. 5383?

Mr. BONNER. This is S. 107.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. It is not the same as H.R. 5383?

Mr. BONNER. No.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House should know that the administration opposed this bill and submitted an unfavorable report. The Navy indicated that there was no need for these floating drydocks. On the other hand, it is only fair to say that if someone wanted to get one of these floating drydocks without going to the Federal Government for mortgage assistance, he could get one built abroad and towed here, pay the duty, and get it a lot cheaper.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman knows that you cannot build a vessel abroad and bring it in here.

Mr. PELLY. I think they could bring in a floating drydock and still save money. Therefore I do not see why we

should not pass the legislation and I am not going to oppose it, on that account. I think it could be built in Japan or Germany and towed to this country, at a total cost less than it could be built in this country.

Mr. BONNER. That is the case with any vessel today. It can be built cheaper abroad. But we have tried to protect labor in this country.

Mr. PELLY. That is exactly what I have in mind.

Mr. BONNER. And we have tried to protect other things in this country. Certainly I do not advocate taking our capital out of this country and depriving labor of its earning capacity in order to do construction work in foreign countries. Drydocks of this size would be very essential if an emergency should arise and commercially at the present time they are necessary on the gentleman's own coast.

Mr. PELLY. I will say to my distinguished chairman that at the present time I do not believe there is any need for any more floating drydocks or any drydocks of any kind. We do not have enough ship construction going on to utilize the drydocks we have now.

We are not going to have enough ship construction going on to utilize the drydocks we have now. Nevertheless, I am not going to oppose this bill, because I believe if there are any floating drydocks they should be built in this country. Therefore, I am simply taking this time to have the record straight to show that while the administration opposes it, I am not going to oppose the bill myself.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply amends existing law which provides for insured loans for new vessel construction. The amendment simply adds the words "floating drydocks" to present law.

It was testified in the hearings of the committee that there are not sufficient drydocks to take care of the new large vessels which are being constructed. I think there is only one large drydock on the east coast sufficiently large to take care of some of the new tankers that are being built.

The House should note that this bill costs the Government nothing. It simply provides for insured mortgages. The Government simply insures mortgages which are given to the financial institutions, so there is no cost to the Government whatsoever. As a part of the premium, ½ percent, I think, is charged by the Government to take care of any possible losses which might come about as the result of the program.

I would urge the committee to approve this measure even though there has been some administration oposition to it. I urge you to do so first on the basis that it does not cost the Government anything, and second, that I believe in the future as these larger vessels are being built we will need this extra floating drydock as a defense and emergency facility.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation. I should like to point out that the Navy in their report say:

> As there may be a possible mobilization deficiency of floating drydocks in a future emergency, this Department would favor legislation which would encourage the building of additional floating drydocks.

This is from their report, which appears in the committee report.

Personally, I know of no opposition to the legislation. I feel that this legislation should be enacted promptly.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 107?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETERMINING STATUS OF PERSONNEL AT MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5383) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes.

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 section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126), is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"SEC. 216. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to establish and maintain the United States Maritime Service as a voluntary organization for the training of citizens of the United States to serve as licensed and unlicensed personnel on American merchant vessels. The Secretary is authorized to determine the number of persons to be enrolled for training and reserve purposes in the said Service, to fix the rates of pay and allowances of such persons, and to prescribe such courses and periods of training as, in his discretion, are necessary to maintain a trained and efficient merchant marine personnel. The ranks, grades, and ratings for personnel of the said Service shall be the same as are now or shall hereafter be prescribed for the personnel of the Coast Guard. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe, by rules and regulations, the uniform of the Service and rules governing the wearing and furnishing of such uniform of persons in the Service."

(2) By adding at the end of the section, two new subsections to read as follows:

"(e) To effectuate the purposes of this section, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to employ professors, lecturers, and instructors and to compensate them without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(f) On such date as may be fixed by the Civil Service Commission with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, not later than one year from the date of enactment of this subsection, persons then serving as administrative enrollees shall be brought into the competitive civil service or excepted civil service in accordance with the Civil Service Act and rules, and shall thereafter be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except as otherwise authorized by subsection (e) of this section or other provisions of law, and shall be subject to other laws of general applicability to civilian employees of the United States, subject to the following exceptions and conditions, notwithstanding any other provisions of law:

"(1) The rate of basic compensation of any person serving as administrative enrollee on the date immediately preceding the date specified in the first sentence of this subsection (f) shall upon conversion provided for in this subsection be fixed at a rate which is not less than the combined basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances received immediately preceding conversion, or the value of such allowances when furnished the person in kind at the rate and in the amounts theretofore authorized by regulation for such allowances. In the case of any such person whose combined basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances, or value thereof when furnished in kind, exceeds the entrance rate of the grade or level in which his position is placed, the basic compensation of such person shall be fixed at that step in the grade or level which is equal to, or if none be equal, which represents the next higher regular or longevity step or level over the person's combined pay and allowances, as specified above, received immediately preceding the date of conversion. In any case in which no such rate exists in the grade of his position, his rate of basic compensation shall be fixed at the next regular salary rate which is not less than his combined basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances, or value thereof when furnished in kind. For the purposes of determining eligibility for step increases following conversion, the basic compensation as an administrative enrollee prior to conversion shall be considered as the total amount or value of basic pay, subsistence, and quarters allowances. Any adjustment in compensation required by this subsection shall not be considered to be an equivalent increase in compensation for the purpose of a periodic step increase, nor an increase in grade or rate of basic compensation for the purpose of a longevity step increase.

"(2) The rate of basic compensation authorized by this paragraph shall continue until the person is separated from his position or receives a higher rate of basic compensation by operation of law or regulation.

"(3) Any person who, as a result of the action required under the first sentence of this subsection (f), becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2061 and the following) shall be credited under that Act with all annual leave remaining to his credit as an administrative enrollee, at the rate of five-sevenths of a day of leave chargeable under the Act (5 U.S.C. 2064) for each calendar day of leave remaining to the credit of the enrollee, without regard to the limitations on maximum leave accumulation provided by the Act, and shall be credited with thirteen days of sick leave in addition to any leave recredit to which the employee may otherwise be entitled.

"(4) Active service of any administrative enrollee performed prior to the date specified in the first sentence of this subsection (f) shall be considered creditable as civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for all purposes, except that in computing length of service for the

purpose of title VII of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, continuous service immediately preceding the date established under the first sentence of this subsection (f) shall be counted either (1) toward one step increase under section 701, or (2) toward one longevity step increase under section 703, as the case may be.

"(5) Persons converted from their status as administrative enrollees to positions by or pursuant to this subsection (f) shall not be entitled, upon conversion or subsequent separation from such position, to payment of travel and transportation expenses which otherwise may be authorized under the joint travel regulations on separation from the United States Maritime Service; nor shall such persons upon conversion to positions by or pursuant to this subsection be entitled to free medical, dental, surgical, and hospital care under section 322(6) of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 696; 42 U.S.C. 249)."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, a great many people are interested in the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. Some of these people live within the immediate vicinity of Kings Point and then there are others within the State of New York and in other States who are greatly interested in the Academy. I think the history will show that I have been tremendously interested in the Academy. I am interested in seeing it made a permanent Academy and so expressed myself when effort was made to do away with the Academy. My feeling here is that I want to help the Academy which has been wallowing around in a status of uncertainty long enough. The staff at the Academy has been in a state of flux long enough. This bill would provide a definite status for the faculty of the Merchant Marine Academy. At the present time, the majority of the faculty are employees of the Maritime Service and wear the uniform of that service. At the same time, by rulings of the Civil Service Commission, a great many of their rights are governed by regulations of the civil service. This bill places them in a full civil service status without the loss of any rights. Faculty members would be placed under the exempt clause in the same status as the civilian instructors at the Naval Academy and it places the Kings Point Academy in the same academic status, or at least in line with the status of the Naval Academy. It would give greater freedom to the administration in recruiting qualified instructors. That has been a question for some time.

Mr. Speaker, this has the approval of the Academy Advisory Board which board consists of prominent educators throughout the United States. They have expressed the view that the establishment of a permanent status would be most beneficial to the educational standards of the institution. When this bill was up for consideration in the committee, great interest was shown by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], by the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] as well as other members of the committee. This bill was reported out unanimously by the subcommittee and was unanimously reported out by the full committee. I realize there are differences of opinion as to how this Academy should be run. There are many people who want all the instructors to wear a uniform and to be retired "to the service" as they call it. But there is no place to retire them to. There is no regular status of the merchant marine that wears the uniform. So this is the finest and best solution we have been able to come up with.

This bill, as was the previous one, is intended to contribute to the strength and efficiency of the American merchant marine. It will do that by putting the staff of the Merchant Marine Academy on a sound and orderly basis. These objectives are in strict accord with the Democratic platform in which it is stated that:

A strong and efficient American-flag merchant marine is essential to peacetime commerce and defense emergencies.

I am surprised that the Republican platform does not take similar cognizance of this important segment of our national security and commercial transportation system. Be that as it may, no partisan issue is involved in this bill for it was unanimously reported from the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by the able membership of that group who know and understand our needs in this vital field.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill at the request of the administration comes from the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce together with the Civil Service Commission has worked on this legislation before submitting it to the House. They have worked out a plan under which they feel the administration of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point will be improved considerably. Heretofore—and I do not suppose the word "hodgepodge" would be an accurate word to use in connection with the present administration setup—but there have been a number of questions raised over the years by the Civil Service Commission and by the Department of Commerce and also by the General Accounting Office. As a result of those questions, this legislation was proposed. The legislation, if enacted, will place the faculty at Kings Point in exactly the same status as the faculty of the Naval Academy. The committee felt that this was a fair manner in which to deal with the faculty, and also a fair manner in which to deal with the other employees of the institution. As the chairman has said, there has been a tremendous amount of interest in the legislation. There has been some opposition to it, mostly, however, off the committee by Members of the House who did not hear all of the testimony. Appreciating that these differences of opinion do arise, our committee felt that we wanted to support the request of the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission.

I urge that the House approve the measure.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, everything the distinguished chairman of the committee has said about helping the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy is true, and we are indebted to him for this service. I seem to be one of the few in opposition to the bill. It happens to be in my congressional district, and I know most of the personnel involved. I do know that running one of the great academies from a bureaucratic civil service desk in Washington is not the way to run a Federal academy. This is going to be the effect of the bill. It is true that the Academy has had its ups and downs. There has been some dissension among the faculty. In fact, the faculty almost unanimously oppose H.R. 5383 and recommend the bill that I advocated before the committee. The committee did not see it that way. I say again that this being the fourth arm of our national defense, we should have an academy that has a military aspect to it for discipline. It should not be just another civil service department, as I think H.R. 5383 would make it. For that reason I am opposed to the bill, and I shall vote against it.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I also oppose this bill. My colleague from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] is not alone in his opposition. The United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point is one of our fine institutions. We all agree with that. We have lived with it for many years. We have had an opportunity, as other Members have, to appoint many fine young men to this Academy and to see them graduate and go, not only into the marine service, but also the U.S. Navy as Reserve officers. There is no question they have done an exceptionally good job under the type of administration they have been operating.

It is quite true, as the distinguished chairman of the committee has said, there has been some trouble over the faculty at Kings Point, but it is also true that the faculty at Kings Point is absolutely unanimous against being placed under Civil Service, and I cannot blame them one bit. There has never been a question in the faculty properly instructing the youth in that Academy, nor has there been any question of the type of student graduated from that Academy. That has never been denied by anyone. If that is true, then why should we place the Academy under civil service jurisdiction? I say that putting those men under military discipline is the best type of operation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I want to point out to the gentleman, and call his attention to the report sent down by the Secretary of Commerce. I want to read to you his own language:

The view was expressed that the wearing of the uniform was necessary as an element in the system of discipline at the Academy.

However, this practice does not prevail at the Naval Academy nor at a number of military schools throughout the country and it is the view of the committee that while uniforms should be worn by those members of the staff concerned with cadet discipline, the wearing of uniforms by instructors solely concerned with the educational aspect of the institution is not a necessary requirement for the proper functioning of the institution.

Mr. BECKER. I, too, agree with that in part, but actually they have worn the uniforms ever since its inception.

Mr. BONNER. The disciplinarian work of the Academy will be handled by those in uniform.

Mr. BECKER. That may be quite true, I would say, but to me it does not work. The fact of the matter is, it has been operating very satisfactorily with the faculty wearing uniforms for the past 20 years. I subscribe to the fact that this Academy has been one of the finest, one of the best operated. I have been very close to it for many years. I have attended functions there; I have seen the operation of the Academy, know its personnel and the parents of men who have been trained there. I would say that the passage of this bill would be a disservice to the Academy. I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman expresses concern that the transfer to civil service status would not work out. Is it not true that the civilian faculty members of the Naval Academy are under civil service? And has not that worked out?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Some are, but to put all members of the faculty under civil service will not work out in this instance.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. MAILLIARD. It seems to me the essential discussion here has not yet been touched upon; that is that under the present system the officers of the Academy at Kings Point, which we all agree is a very wonderful institution, wear the uniform of the Maritime Service which has not been required except in time of war. The result is that they get all the benefits of the military service with none of the obligations of military service. In other words they secure the advantage that we give to our military people because of their being subjected to orders all over the world. We give them certain tax benefits, certain retirement benefits, but in return they have this function. So they get all the benefits we give the military yet they cannot be ordered to go to any other place of duty. I do not blame them for wanting it. But wearing a uniform leads to the conclusion that they are entitled to this preferential position. It seems to me quite clear they are not entitled to it.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California let me say I have not intimated that there is nothing wrong with the way the Academy is being run. There are remedial measures that could be taken, but why abolish the whole present system instead of correcting it?

If these men do not have sufficient military obligations let us put military obligations on them; let us not just wipe out the whole structure and expect civil service job descriptions and a bureaucratic procedure from Washington to take care of things that are best handled on a person-to-person, man-to-man basis.

Again I urge that H.R. 5383 be defeated.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the Ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided and the Speaker reported that there were ayes 52, noes 14.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 291, nays 90, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—291

Abbitt	Corbett	Hardy
Abernethy	Cramer	Hargis
Addonizio	Curtin	Harmon
Albert	Curtis, Mass.	Harris
Alexander	Daddario	Harrison
Alford	Daniels	Hays
Andersen, Minn.	Davis, Ga.	Healey
Andrews	Delaney	Hechler
Ashmore	Dent	Hemphill
Aspinall	Denton	Herlong
Auchincloss	Diggs	Hiestand
Avery	Dingell	Hogan
Bailey	Dixon	Holland
Barr	Donohue	Holtzman
Barrett	Dorn, S.C.	Horan
Bass, Tenn.	Dowdy	Huddleston
Beckworth	Downing	Hull
Bennett, Fla.	Doyle	Ikard
Blatnik	Dwyer	Inouye
Blitch	Edmondson	Irwin
Boggs	Elliott	Jarman
Boland	Everett	Jennings
Bonner	Evins	Johnson, Calif.
Bow	Fallon	Johnson, Colo.
Bowles	Farbstein	Johnson, Md.
Boykin	Fascell	Johnson, Wis.
Breeding	Feighan	Jonas
Brewster	Fenton	Jones, Ala.
Brock	Fisher	Jones, Mo.
Brooks, La.	Flood	Judd
Brooks, Tex.	Flynn	Karsten
Brown, Ga.	Flynt	Karth
Brown, Mo.	Foley	Kasem
Broyhill	Forrester	Kastenmeier
Buckley	Fountain	Keith
Burke, Ky.	Frazier	Kelly
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	Keogh
Burleson	Fulton	Kilday
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Kilgore
Canfield	Garmatz	King, Calif.
Carnahan	Gary	King, Utah
Casey	Gathings	Kitchin
Celler	Gavin	Knox
Chamberlain	George	Kowalski
Chelf	Giaimo	Kyl
Chenoweth	Gilbert	Lane
Chiperfield	Granahan	Langen
Clark	Gray	Lankford
Coad	Green, Oreg.	Lennon
Coffin	Green, Pa.	Lesinski
Cohelan	Griffiths	Levering
Colmer	Gross	Libonati
Conte	Gubser	Lindsay
Cook	Hagen	Loser
Cooley	Haley	McCormack
	Halleck	McCulloch
McDonough	Perkins	Sisk
McDowell	Pfost	Slack
McFall	Philbin	Smith, Iowa
McGinley	Pilcher	Smith, Miss.
McGovern	Poage	Spence
McIntire	Porter	Staggers
McMillan	Powell	Stratton
Macdonald	Preston	Stubblefield
Mack	Price	Sullivan
Madden	Prokop	Taylor, N.C.
Mahon	Pucinski	Teague, Calif.
Mailliard	Quigley	Teller
Marshall	Rabaut	Thompson, Tex.
Martin	Rains	Thomson, Wyo.
Matthews	Randall	Thornberry
May	Ray	Toll
Merrow	Reece, Tenn.	Tollefson
Metcalf	Rees, Kans.	Trimble
Meyer	Reuss	Tuck
Miller, Clem	Rhodes, Pa.	Udall
Mills	Riley	Ullman
Moeller	Rivers, Alaska	Vanik
Monagan	Rivers, S.C.	Van Pelt
Montoya	Roberts	Van Zandt
Moorhead	Rodino	Wallhauser
Morgan	Rogers, Colo.	Wampler
Morris, N.Mex.	Rogers, Fla.	Watts
Morris, Okla.	Rogers, Tex.	Weis
Moss	Rooney	Whitener
Moulder	Roosevelt	Whitten
Multer	Rostenkowski	Widnall
Murphy	Roush	Wier
Natcher	Rutherford	Williams
Nix	Santangelo	Willis
O'Brien, Ill.	Saund	Winstead
O'Brien, N.Y.	Saylor	Wolf
O'Hara, Ill.	Scott	Wright
O'Hara, Mich.	Selden	Yates
Osmers	Shelley	Young
Passman	Sheppard	Zablocki
Patman	Shipley	
Pelly	Sikes	

NAYS—90

Adair	Derounian	Moore
Alger	Derwinski	Mumma
Allen	Devine	Nelsen
Anfuso	Dooley	Norblad
Arends	Dorn, N.Y.	O'Konski
Ayres	Dulski	Ostertag
Baldwin	Fino	Pillion
Barry	Ford	Pirnie
Bass, N.H.	Frelinghuysen	Poff
Bates	Goodell	Quie
Becker	Griffin	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Halpern	Riehlman
Bennett, Mich.	Henderson	Robison
Bentley	Hoeven	St. George
Berry	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Betts	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Bolton	Holt	Schneebeli
Bosch	Hosmer	Schwengel
Bray	Jensen	Short
Broomfield	Johansen	Siler
Brown, Ohio	Kearns	Simpson
Budge	Lafore	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Laird	Springer
Cahill	Latta	Taber
Cederberg	Lipscomb	Utt
Church	Meader	Wainwright
Collier	Michel	Weaver
Cunningham	Miller, N.Y.	Westland
Curtis, Mo.	Milliken	Younger
Dague	Minshall	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—50

Anderson, Mont.	Hess	O'Neill
Ashley	Holifield	Oliver
Baker	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Barden	Kee	Smith, Kans.
Baring	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Baumhart	Kirwan	Steed
Bolling	Kluczynski	Taylor, N.Y.
Brademas	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Cannon	McSween	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
Dawson	Magnuson	Thompson, N.J.
Durham	Mason	Vinson
Fogarty	Miller, George P.	Walter
Forand	Mitchell	Wharton
Glenn	Morrison	Wilson
Grant	Murray	Withrow
Hébert	Norrell	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Kirwan and Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Baumhart against.
Mr. Oliver and Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Magnuson and Mr. George P. Miller of California for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Ashley and Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas, against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, and Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Forand for, with Mr. Wharton against.
Mr. Machrowicz and Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Withrow against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Durham with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Jackson.
Mrs. Kee with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Baker.

Mr. DENTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ANFUSO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FENTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. UTT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1937

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12341) to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill as follows.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof after "grapefruit," the following: "shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND].

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937. To put it in simple words, this bill will require a quality inspection on imported walnuts and dates, the same type of inspection that is required on walnuts and dates grown in the United States of America.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act has already been amended so far as the following agricultural products are concerned: tomatoes, avocados, mangoes, limes, grapefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers, and eggplant. This bill will just add walnuts and dates to the list.

All the bill requires is a quality inspection. It does not attempt to restrict imports or to place any import quotas on dates and walnuts.

All it requires is a quality inspection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUND. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Would that quality inspection mean that these dates thus imported would have to stand the same quality test that domestic dates have to stand? Is that about it?

Mr. SAUND. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. WILLIS. What is wrong with that?

Mr. SAUND. I do not see anything wrong with it. I have been talking to Members on the floor of the House, and I have not found one Member who says he is opposed to it. All it will be is a protection to the consumers. The consumers will get good clean products because it has been inspected by the Department of Agriculture. If there are any objections raised against the bill and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will give me some more time, I will answer those objections.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is directed toward the application of grade and size restrictions in effect in walnuts and dates to imported walnuts and dates of and when marketing orders are in effect. All it does is simply say that when producers impose upon themselves by means of marketing orders certain grade restrictions, then imports must meet the same standards. It is as simple as that. It places no limitations on volume of imports. It simply says when producers domestically are imposing grade limitations on themselves, then the imports shall meet the same grade regulations as those the producers impose upon themselves.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee that heard the testimony on this matter, this is meritorious legislation. There has been a whole lot of misunderstanding about it, but the gentleman in the well of the House has very well described the reason for the legislation. It is quite simple. It is not new. It is entirely sound and has my full support. I associate myself with the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12341. This bill simply continues the principle this Congress established many years ago when it recognized in the case of quite a number of other commodities, that if the domestic producers in this country take the time and trouble to establish marketing orders under which minimum standards of quality and size are established, they should likewise have the same assurance that similar standards of quality and size shall be applied to any imports of the same commodity.

This Congress in previous years has applied this principle, as has been mentioned before, to tomatoes, avocados, mangoes, limes, grapefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers, and eggplant.

The growers of both walnuts and dates have established each year domestic marketing orders, which orders state that if domestic growers cannot produce walnuts or dates that meet minimum standards of quality or size, the walnuts or dates involved cannot be marketed in this country. Since these growers, as a matter of stabilizing the market and as a matter of protecting the consumers, have taken these steps, certainly the same limitations should be applied to imports from overseas. The consumer has become accustomed to getting a certain quality product in the sale of these commodities, and if the consumer is accustomed to it, certainly we should protect him so that he can get that same product whether it comes from domestic producers or overseas producers. That is the sole purpose of this bill, to recognize a principle that has already been recognized repeatedly by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bill will be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, growers of certain crops throughout this country have seen fit to impose standards upon their commodities by way of marketing agreements which are designed to protect the housewife who buys these products. In that connection there has been written into the Agricultural Commodity Agreement Act a proviso saying that any foreign product of the same kind and character shall meet these quality standards in the case of certain named commodities. All this bill does is seek to add two products to that list, to wit, walnuts and dates.

It is true, as may be alleged by someone here, that the Food and Drug Administration does conduct some inspection of imports, but it is only a hit and miss sampling; it is not a total inspection. Even then the only standard applied is that of minimum wholesomeness. For example, in the case of walnuts, which are involved here, with respect to shrivel in the kernel, the Food and Drug standard is 5 percent tolerance and the USDA standard is only a

2 percent tolerance. On the issue of mold, the Food and Drug tolerance is 5 percent and the USDA standard is 2 percent. On the issue of rancidity, the Food and Drug tolerance is 5 percent and the USDA tolerance is 2 percent. Thus it is apparent these industry standards guarantee the housewife a higher quality of walnuts than she would get under the test applied by the Food and Drug Administration, so that this service which we are asking for is a very valuable addition to the protection that the U.S. housewife will receive. It has been estimated that it will not cost the taxpayers in excess of $25,000 and possibly less.

Marketing agreement programs have been used as a means of providing more orderly marketing of agricultural commodities. They are not the panacea to all the problems of agricultural producers who use them, but can be an effective marketing tool.

Under the present Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act when a marketing agreement or marketing order is in effect for tomatoes, avocados, mangoes, limes, grapefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers or egg plants the importation of these commodities may be regulated. No regulation of imports of these commodities can occur unless regulations under a marketing order are in effect governing the size, grade, quality or maturity of any of the above named commodities produced in the United States.

If any of these type regulations are in effect on these commodities the importation of the commodities into the United States is prohibited unless the imported commodities comply with the same grade, size, quality and maturity regulations issued under the marketing order.

If there are two marketing orders in effect in the United States regulating the same commodity the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to establish regulations which will come the closest to the imported products. The Secretary also has authority to establish regulations which are equivalent or comparable to those imposed upon the domestic commodity if there is a difference.

This legislation would add shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed and products made principally of dates to this list of agricultural commodities in the Marketing Agreement Act that require imported commodities to meet the same or comparable grade, size, quality and maturity provisions as those in effect under a domestic marketing order. I do not believe it is unreasonable to require that commodities imported into this country meet the same quality standards that our domestic producers impose upon themselves under a Federal marketing order program. If lower standards exist for the imported commodities they tend to defeat the purpose of the quality control and orderly marketing programs which the marketing order program was designed to establish.

To my knowledge the use of this requirement for those commodities for which such authority is now provided in the Act has worked well. I have no reason to believe that it will not work in the case of dates and walnuts. I do not believe that it will establish any particular hardship on the importers of these commodities.

I believe these commodities should be added to the Marketing Agreement Act. I urge the passage of H.R. 12341.

I would like to read this telegram as a conclusion of my argument:

Hon. HARLAN HAGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 12341 scheduled for consideration today under suspension rules. Would add dates and walnuts to list of commodities requiring imported products to meet domestic grade and quality standards when marketing orders are in effect. Believe it is reasonable to require that commodities imported into this country meet same quality standards as our own producers impose upon themselves under a Federal marketing order program. Farm Bureau favors H.R. 12341 and urges your suport.

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director,
American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL].

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12341 which would provide quality controls on the importation of dates and walnuts. This legislation is a matter of simple equity and protection to both the consumer and the farmer of this country.

The legislation under consideration would amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. That section provides that whenever a marketing order is issued regulating the grade, size, quality, or maturity of certain specified agricultural commodities, imports of these commodities shall be prohibited unless such imports comply with the grade, size, quality, and maturity provisions of the marketing order. The commodities now covered by this section are tomatoes, avocados, mangoes, limes, grapefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers, and eggplants. The amendment simply seeks to add shelled walnuts and dates to this list of commodities. This bill originally would also add citrus fruits and figs and fig products but it is understood that the latter products have been dropped and are not before this committee for consideration.

Similar legislation was before the House in 1958 and received a strong majority vote but failed of passage because of the two-thirds vote required under the parliamentary situation. The two-thirds vote will also be required today for the passage of this legislation.

I am the author of H.R. 1018 and H.R. 1019 which would provide quality controls for imported walnuts and my bills were incorporated into H.R. 12341, when reported by the House Agriculture Committee.

The elimination of substandard walnuts from the market tends to stabilize prices for the standard walnut packages which are acceptable to the consumers and also tends to increase demand for the product.

Under the existing marketing order American walnut shellers are required by law to grade and ship only such classes of shelled walnuts as meet the standards established pursuant to the marketing-order regulations.

Consumer and manufacturers responded dramatically to the improved quality of the domestic shelled walnuts with consumption here in the United States increasing by 6 million pounds after 1 year of operation under the quality controls. Sales of domestic shelled walnuts are still trending upward so there is no doubt in our mind that this quality control is extremely beneficial to the industry.

However, the purpose of the marketing order breaks down if the imported walnuts are allowed to come in and be marketed in substandard grades.

It would appear only fair to use the same quality standards for competing imports as are now being used on domestically produced walnuts and I urge your favorable vote on this legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that has taken place thus far, because this is the same old bill and the same old story that we have had before this House several times in the past. A bill similar to this was defeated in the House, as you well know. The bill has been taken off the Consent Calendar several times by the objectors. It has been brought before the Committee on Rules and tabled there.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Very briefly.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman tell us when this bill was defeated on the floor of the House?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A bill similar to this.

Mr. COOLEY. When was that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. About a year or so ago. Just look up the RECORD. The gentleman ought to stay here and he would be amazed at what goes on.

Mr. COOLEY. I do stay here. I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

Mr. COOLEY. No such bill has been defeated. If the gentleman will look up the RECORD, he will find out.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will find out that there has been such a bill defeated. I think the memory of most Members of the House is pretty good.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do? Let us talk facts for a little while. This bill is designed for one purpose and one purpose only and that is, of course, to restrict the importation of two particular commodities; primarily dates and secondly walnuts. It restricts these importations by setting up certain standards through the Department of Agriculture that only American products could meet as the standards are drawn.

Nothing has been said here about the testimony that was given in connection

with this bill. If you look at your RECORD and your report you will find that three great departments of this Government are opposed to this legislation. The State Department is opposed to it, the Department of Commerce is opposed to it, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is opposed to the enactment of this particular legislation.

Why is this bill before us? It is before us because only in one section of this country, as I understand it, are any amounts of dates produced. That happens to be in the very dry desert air around Indio, Calif. I cannot blame anyone from California who wants to protect his particular industry. But the proposal here is to do something to protect one industry or one business in the country; perhaps two, if you include walnuts, which are included under this bill. If we are going to do such a thing to protect an American industry from foreign competition, why not pass a general law to protect all American industry? We have industries in our own district that would like some protection.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN of New York. Would not this put an enormous number of importers on the East Coast out of business?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I want to come to that point, if I may, in just a minute.

Mr. Speaker, California dates are wonderful dates. They are good to eat. But they do not keep in the ordinary process of manufacture. The dates that come from the Far East are a different type entirely. When they are dried they will keep for as long as 2 or 3 years on the shelf. They are used by all the baking industry of this country to make cakes, cookies, cake mixes, and different food products. Why? Because American dates cannot be used by industry unless refrigerated and usually spoil within 90 days. As a result, practically all of the producers of our cakes and cookies and cake mixes and all the different foods in which this product is used as a dried material, use the foreign imports and they oppose legislation of this type. That is the reason why legislation of this same type was defeated in this House and not too long ago.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio for calling to the attention of the House the fact that this bill was defeated on previous consideration. But I wanted to ask him in particular concerning the statement, in the committee report, of Mr. True D. Morse, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, who, while he says he does not object to the passage of the bill—which is certainly mild commendation to say the least—does go on to say,

> The Departments of State, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare do not concur with the position taken by this Department on the proposed legislation. Enclosed are copies of letters from the abovementioned Departments in which their views are set forth.

However, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that nowhere in the committee report do we find those reports which are opposed to the bill. Is that not an odd fact? Can the gentleman tell me if it is not the usual custom to include all Department reports, favorable or unfavorable?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is a very well drawn report to actually favor a bill that the departments do not favor. I do not know the reason the report was drawn as it was; but I want to hasten on, if the gentlewoman will permit me.

It was stated here on the floor a moment ago that the Department of Agriculture approved this bill. It did no such thing. If you will read that report, the Department of Agriculture said they simply did not object, but pointed out that all the other departments and agencies did object.

The statement has been made here, and it has been whispered all around, about how impure these dates imported from abroad might be. They are checked, of course, and all tested by the Food and Drug Administration, just as our own dates produced in this country are checked before they can be sold for human consumption.

Let me say just a word or two in the best of good humor. We have heard a great deal in this House about payola. We have had a committee investigating payola. It is a shocking, terrible thing about payola. I would not charge for one moment that we have had payola here in the House of Representatives this afternoon, but somehow or other we have had three or four boxes of dates suddenly appear in the cloakrooms.

I hope that all the men who ate the dates will think it proper to vote against this bill, regardless of what kind you may have eaten. I say that because you had two kinds of dates put here suddenly this afternoon when this bill came here, one California-produced dates and the other one from the Near East. If they were as rotten, as bad, as some people told me they were, I hope none of you die tonight of ptomaine poisoning from eating any of those imported dates, because I happened to get a wrapper off a box of these dates that were put here for the use, not of payola—oh, my, no—but just having them here for the pleasure of the Members of the House the first day we happened to go to work in earnest. These happen to be imported dates, fancy, pasteurized, grown in Iraq, distributed by Calavo Growers of Los Angeles. There is your racket. In other words, they import these same dates that they say are so terrible in quality and they sell them like the same group that is telling you you ought to pass this bill. They are distributing and selling them out in California. What a terrible thing that is. My goodness, if that is right, if we ought to have restrictions to protect the American consumers, why do not our friends in California start right at home and have this Calavo—or whatever the name is—Growers of California, start selling California dates and not distribute these dates from abroad.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. Is it not a fact that it would increase the price almost 50 percent to the American housewife if this bill passed, if this competition were prevented?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would be the American housewife who would be unable to get dates, cookies, and food mixes of any keeping quality unless they bought foreign dates perhaps through Calavo Growers of Califoria, Inc., of Los Angeles.

So why not just leave it all alone as it is; let the natural law of competition work. Let us do what we have had to do, what American industry has had to do for many years, get the kind and type of dates we must have for the production of cakes and cookies and all these food mixes that will keep from the place they can get them, not get a kind of dates just because they are produced at home.

Let me conclude by saying this: If we are going to do this, if we are going to pass special legislation for the protection of one particular product in America, then in the name of fairness let us pass legislation that will protect every other product that may be manufactured or produced in your district and my district, because we are all faced with foreign competition. Let us be sensible. Let us either do what we have done in the past, kill this bill—or let us get a bill up here that will include all of the different products of America, whether they be from the farm or the factory, that run up against foreign competition.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question of the gentleman from Ohio: Am I correct in deducing that the primary objection you have to this legislation lies in the field of dates rather than walnuts?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I do not know anything about walnuts, but I do know a lot about dates because I have had many dates of my own. But, we do not produce dates in Ohio. We have a great many people in Ohio and throughout the country who have written to me as a member of the Committee on Rules when this bill was originally up and, also, since that time, explaining the damage that this was doing to American industry and to American consumers by this legislation as far as dates are concerned, and they did not mention walnuts at all. You can take your walnuts and do as you please with them, but I do not think we have to pass this legislation about these dates.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, apparently, the gentleman from Ohio has no real objection to this bill other than that it does not include all agricultural commodities, which might be adversely affected by imports. Actually, the law now covers

tomatoes, avocados, mangoes, limes, grapefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers and eggplants and I can see no objection to including dates that are coming into this country from Iraq and Iran and other places in a very unsanitary condition and being sold in competition with clean, wholesome dates that are produced and packaged right here in our own country. Our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND], passed around pictures so that each Member of the House could see the unsanitary packaging of dates that are coming in in competition with domestically produced dates. If the gentleman from Ohio wants to include some other commodities, I am certain he has had opportunity heretofore to propose such inclusion and, yet, has failed to do so. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate and to commend our colleague, Congressman SAUND of California. He has been untiring in his efforts to protect the American consumers of dates which are imported from far distant countries, not because he is selfish and wants to protect the date producers of his own district merely. The producers of Judge SAUND'S district are not afraid of legitimate competition, but they do not want to sell and to market dates produced in America and harvested and packaged and offered for sale as a sanitary and wholesome food product in competition with dates which are not subjected to inspection and are not free from filth and perhaps even disease. Judge SAUND has not only championed the cause of the date producers of his district, but he has at all times been intensely interested in the welfare of all of the farmers of his district, State and Nation. While he is not a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, he has frequently appeared before that committee and has cooperated with the members of the committee in efforts to solve the many problems of the farmers of America. I am very grateful to him for the help he has given to us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has said that the importation of dates and other products might raise prices. Actually, what this bill is about is a matter of fairplay. We want the products coming in from foreign countries to meet the same high standards that our own products have to meet. That is the issue involved in this bill. The question is—Will foreign products meet our standards that our products have to meet in order to be marketable? Is it anything less than fairplay that the products coming into our country from overseas meet these same standards? This in no way is intended to penalize foreign products being imported, but merely to upgrade their standards so that they will meet our standards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be enacted into law.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because during the debate I heard the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] challenge the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] on his statement that this bill had been defeated on the floor of the House.

On August 4, 1958, volume 104, part 12, page 16096, there was under consideration a bill dealing with the regulation of imported agricultural commodities. The bill mentioned dates, figs and some other items.

The vote was on August 6, volume 104, part 13, page 16419. The ayes were 136; the noes 109, and the bill failed of passage under suspension. So the gentleman from Ohio was eminently correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to reply to the gentleman from Missouri.

As the gentleman knows, that was not an identical bill with the one now before the House.

Since that time our committee has considered the matter and the bill was amended. The author was authorized to introduce a clean bill which now limits the legislation to two commodities. There is an entirely different situation today than there was then, on the bill which the gentleman from Ohio says was defeated on a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point is that this was similar. Certainly dates were involved. I well remember because I participated in the debate and was particularly concerned about the problem. At that particular time dates were involved. So there was a similar situation.

Mr. COOLEY. Dates were in the bill, but with other commodities.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. With some others.

Mr. COOLEY. Now we have two commodities. Why should we permit these dates to come in, in competition with American-grown products?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise merely because the gentleman from Ohio mentioned the fact that Calavo imports dates from Iraq or Iran. I would like to point out to the gentleman that Calavo is a California company not involved in marketing domestic dates. It did not testify for or against this bill, and Calavo is in the same position as any other domestic company.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If these imported dates are so rotten as has been described by Members of the House on the floor, why were they placed in the cloakrooms to be fed to the Members of the House?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I think they were put there that a comparison could be drawn between the imported dates and the domestic dates.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You should have warned the Members if they were so dangerous.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. They did not come from my district.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND], author of the bill.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 3 minutes. The only thing I wish to say is that I put those dates in the cloakrooms and did it for a particular purpose. We are not against importing good dates. We concede that the best dates in the world are grown in Arabia, in Iraq, and Iran. The only difficulty arises when they pack all those dates together with pounds of flies and other dirty materials. When they come over here they are not safe.

I wanted to show that good dates are grown in Iraq and Iran. We want to help those people pack those dates so the good image of the dates which we have had brought into the United States before should be maintained.

I will tell you what we are against. Here is a file from the Department of Agriculture covering a shipment of dates supposedly inspected. Those dates were grown in Iraq, Growth No. 195, and this is what the Department of Agriculture found in it: Foreign material, straw, dirt, and rodent excreta.

That is what we are against, Mr. Speaker.

We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars sending technicians from the United Nations to Iraq and Iran to teach them methods of properly packing their dates. We are only against the dirty dates that come in. With that situation corrected I believe it will be all right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that two-thirds had voted in favor of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided and there were—yeas 172, nays 54.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if he will inform us about the program for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to.

The bill, H.R. 7201, will not come up for consideration tomorrow. It is taken off of the program.

The rest of the program will follow, first the contempt citation in the case of the New York Port Authority and several contempt citations coming from the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of course, they will follow call of bills on the Consent Calendar and Private Calendar. Thereafter, Senate Joint Resolution 170, relating to participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, will come up for consideration.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL SERVICES TO GUAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9866) to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes, as amended.

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 Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and maintain an agricultural program in Guam which will include such programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to as "Department", as are determined by the Secretary will promote the welfare of that island. This authority may be exercised without regard to section 25(b) of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 390; 48 U.S.C. 1421c(b)) or any other provision of law under which Guam may have been excluded from such programs. The Secretary is authorized to provide for such modification of any such programs extended to Guam as he deems necessary in order to adapt it to the needs of Guam. The program authorized by this section shall be developed in cooperation with the Territorial Government of Guam and shall be covered by a memorandum of understanding agreed to by the Territorial Government and the Department. The Secretary may also utilize the agencies, facilities, and employees of the Department, and may cooperate with other public agencies and with private organizations and individuals in Guam and elsewhere: *Provided,* That the number of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture stationed on Guam to carry out the purposes of this Act shall not exceed five at any one time.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The moneys appropriated in pursuance of this Act shall also be available for the purchase and rental of land, the construction or acquisition of buildings, for the equipment and maintenance of such buildings, and such other expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this Act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department, and may be allocated to such agencies of the Department as are concerned with the administration of the program in Guam.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume very much time. I think if you will listen to the reading of this brief paragraph, you will understand the purpose of this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a small program of technical agricultural assistance for the 40,000 American citizens who are natives and residents of the island of Guam. Under the terms of the committee amendment, not more than five employees of the Department of Agriculture could be assigned to Guam for purposes of this act at any one time. The Guam government now has a small extension service working with its farmers but it has no agricultural experiment station, State college, soil conservation service, or agricultural conservation program committee upon which to draw for technical advice and assistance. It is the intention of this bill that the Secretary of Agriculture should organize for the island of Guam a small, technical task force to provide for the Guam extension service and through it to the people of the island, technical agricultural information and advice which is not now available to them from any source.

My recollection is, Mr. Speaker, that there was little, if any, opposition to this bill in our committee. The bill was approved by the Department of the Interior. I have a letter addressed to me signed by Mr. Roger Ernst, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated April 25, 1960, and also a letter from Mr. True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, dated November 20, 1959.

Without discussing the matter further, unless there are some questions, I shall conclude my remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many Agriculture Department employees are presently in Guam?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know that there are any. I am not certain that there are any Agriculture employees now on the island of Guam. Perhaps employees have visited there from time to time on special missions.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say again how many this bill proposes to put on the island of Guam?

Mr. COOLEY. Not to put any on the island of Guam other than those who might be sent there by the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time as needs on the island arise. We have limited the number to five.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any limitation? Is there any number?

How many would the gentleman anticipate would be sent there?

Mr. COOLEY. Not to exceed five under any circumstances, but I would say that perhaps after a team of three or four or five have visited the island and surveyed the situation and had drawn up a program, that most of them, or most all of them, would come back to Washington.

Mr. GROSS. How many farmers are there on Guam?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not certain, but a very small number, a comparatively small number. But, we still have 40,000 Americans there on the island, and most of the population on the island, I think, perhaps are now employed by the Federal Government in some sort of activity on the island.

I appreciate what the gentleman has in mind, that we are perhaps going into a broad, comprehensive program, an expensive program. But, this committee went into the matter very thoroughly, and I agree that 40,000 people, perhaps, when related to the entire population of America or your district or my district, comprises a very small number of people. But, they are isolated, away from the mainland, and the committee believes and the Department of Agriculture believes and the Department of the Interior believes that we should not neglect them but to take some interest in them and give assistance to them.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me that one Agriculture employee ought to be sufficient at any time.

Mr. COOLEY. I said in the committee, I might say to my friend, that I thought one good county agent could go out there and solve the problem.

Mr. GROSS. I think so.

Mr. COOLEY. But we limited the number to five, and it all depends on the wishes of the Secretary of Agriculture who is in office at the time the need arises.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I was in Guam last fall. I believe there are 39 farmers out there.

I believe their gross product is about $200,000. I am not positive that that is the exact figure, but I think it is correct. This seems completely ridiculous to me, to send at least five people from the Department of Agriculture to Guam.

Mr. COOLEY. Not at least five people.

Mr. WESTLAND. If you limit them to five, there will be five, all right. They would go out there to look after 39 farmers with a gross product of about $200,000, as I recall the figure.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that we should not send more people out there than are actually needed. But are you not willing to trust your own Secretary of Agriculture? He is not mine, but he will be your Secretary of Agriculture until January and then we will have another one whom we will have to trust. I say that

advisedly, because I see that your candidate does not want him and we will not have him. So we will have someone else in Mr. Benson's place after January.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is not this the real question, not how many farmers there are on Guam today, but how we are going to provide for the needs of that island to provide its own sustenance as we withdraw our large military establishment? And we are withdrawing a large number of those people. And the people on Guam, as they lose jobs with our military establishment, have got to become more and more self-sufficient.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the whole idea here is to fix up a program which will enable the people of the island to produce at least some of the things that they need to live on, to subsist on, in the years ahead.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Am I to understand from the committee report that the cost of this would approximate $100,000 a year, to take care of this gross of $200,000 a year in agriculture, as suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]?

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot imagine that any Secretary of Agriculture would spend $100,000 a year on the island of Guam. I do not see anything in the report to indicate that the expenditures would amount to any such figure.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Was this program activated by reason of a request from the committee for a program from the Department under date of May 20, 1959? Did the committee make a request setting off such a program?

Mr. COOLEY. I have here a letter to me from the Department of Agriculture saying:

> This is in reply to your letter of May 20, 1959, requesting a draft of legislation embodying the recommendations contained in the Department's report on the agricultural needs of Guam.

Apparently Secretary Benson wrote to me on May 20, 1959. I replied and asked him to send up a legislative draft to carry out his recommendations and on November 20, 1959. I apparently received a draft from the Department.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I refer to the report on page 3 which says:

> On May 20, 1959, the chairman of this committee wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting that the Department draft a bill embodying the recommendations of its study of the agricultural needs of Guam.

Was that initiated by the committee?

Mr. COOLEY. It was prompted by the Department's report. The Department made a report which it filed with us. We asked the Secretary to put his recommendations in legislative form.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say that he does not think this will cost $100,000 a year?

Mr. COOLEY. The Department estimates that the program would not exceed $100,000. I cannot conceive that the Department would spend that amount of money on the island of Guam.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman said that it would not cost $100,000.

Mr. COOLEY. I said that it would not exceed that.

Mr. GROSS. $100,000 is not exactly alfalfa, even if it is spent on Guam.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have followed this discussion with interest. I felt that there is probably some really good reason for this legislation. Just yesterday and the day before we had a big conference out in my State to discuss some of the agricultural problems. One of the things that was discussed and one of the things they wanted, was a conservation reserve program everybody agreed was needed. I suppose that is about as important as the program in this bill. I just wonder if the chairman of the committee is going to get a bill like that out of his committee before we leave here this time.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know whether we will be able to get a bill out of the committee before we leave this time, but I remind the gentleman of the fact that this House and the other body passed at least five agricultural bills that your President has vetoed. We are going to leave that record written here that you cannot erase.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture for his wisdom and his vision in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I say vision, Mr. Speaker, because nothing is watched more closely by the peoples of far away lands than our treatment of our own Guam. This the chairman of the Agriculture Committee well knows. It is understandable to my colleagues why my interest in Guam is so intense. Guam was ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris following the Spanish-American War. Since that war which was fought and won more than six decades ago the Stars and Stripes have flown over the island of Guam. The soil of this small island far in the Pacific is American soil. The men and the women and the children of Guam are Americans.

I would be abashed if a majority of my colleagues here in the House should turn their backs on this little part of the United States of America tucked far away in the Pacific. As a veteran of the Spanish-American War that brought Guam under the Stars and Stripes, I confess I would have a sense of disillusionment.

I appreciate that this bill is brought up under suspension of the rules and that the issue of cost has placed in the consideration of the bill a controversy that was unexpected. I do not think that the cost of the contemplated program would reach anywhere near $100,000, but that is the figure that has been flung at a wearied House at the close of a long legislative day. I trust that despite all this that sufficient of my colleagues will have the wisdom and the vision of Chairman COOLEY to give to the bill the two-thirds vote required when measures are brought to the floor under suspension of the rules.

But if this should prove not to be the case then I trust that the vote will show that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States had taken their place by the side of Guam by voting affirmatively. Under the normal procedure a bill is passed when a majority of the members voting answer "aye." If the required two-thirds vote is not achieved, but nevertheless a majority of the members vote affirmatively, then the people of Guam may have the assurance that come another Congress, and a similar measure brought up in the regular order, the measure will pass.

I am sorry the issue has become so clouded. The simple fact is that agriculture was Guam's major industry and the island was largely self-sustaining in food production until the incident of World War II and the Japanese invasion and occupation brought about a change. The result is that Guam now produces only a small percentage of its fresh fruits and vegetables and virtually none of the meats and poultry on the commercial market. Surely Guam should be provided with help to reestablish its agriculture. Let us not turn our backs on Guam, if we expect to hold the goodwill of the peoples in other faraway lands in a questioning world of change.

I hope that the Members on my side of the aisle, in great preponderence of number, will vote for H.R. 9866. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will leave the little Island of Guam out of the political pot in a presidential election year and will vote, as their good hearts and minds I know would dictate, to do the right thing for this bit of the United States tucked far away in the Pacific.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I had occasion to visit Guam on one occasion. I know they did have a small farm population with a few chickens and a few pigs and a few cows. While I was there I found out that some experts of the Department of Agriculture had sent some cows to Guam. Unfortunately all of the cows were bred at the same time; they came fresh at the same time, and all went dry at the same time, and they had no milk on Guam. We do not anticipate that that will happen again. We do need some advice on developing agriculture there. I hope the bill will pass. A vote against this bill is a vote of lack of confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, and his associates. It is likewise a vote against the Secretary of Interior and his

associates. If you want to repudiate Mr. Benson again, here is your chance. As often as I have disagreed with Mr. Benson, on this occasion I find myself in agreement with his recommendations. The whole idea originated in the Department of Agriculture. The recommendations of the officials of the Department of Agriculture prompted me to introduce the bill; and, I repeat, I hope that the bill will be passed.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take much time at this late hour, but this is a bill which warrants your careful attention. I opposed it in committee. It came out of our committee by a vote of 19 to 11 and the vote was across party lines.

In my judgment this bill cannot be justified at this time. The justification for the legislation, according to the committee report, is that we should get ready for the time when the military installations leave Guam so that the agriculture industry could be revived. For the life of me I cannot see in the foreseeable future why we would suddenly cut down on our military installations in Guam. In view of the world situation and in the Far East, I cannot foresee the military installations leaving Guam for a long time.

What about Guam? It is 30 miles long and 4 to 8 miles wide. It consists of 225 square miles. Of that, 37.5 square miles are devoted to agriculture. Already the government of Guam is using 30 employees of the Department of Agriculture in Guam in taking care of the agricultural needs in these 37.5 square miles. This bill proposes to add 5 more employees from the Department of Agriculture of the United States, which would mean 35 employees operating in 37.5 square miles. This means almost one employee for each square mile. The climate is tropical. The island is located in the typhoon belt. The yearly average rainfall is about 87 inches. The vegetation is largely tropical plants. There is a very small farm population. According to the hearings on the bill there are 243 farmers engaged in the production of various crops.

There are 174 engaged in livestock raising as follows: There are 86 raising cattle and 60 raising hogs and 28 raising poultry and eggs. In spite of the few farmers actually involved we now propose to add five Department employees of the Department of Agriculture to give the farmers expert information. That will be a foot-in-the-door operation which will grow with the years. It is my contention that the 30 employees now in the department of agriculture of Guam are doing all that is needed on 37½ square miles devoted to farming. The operation is already costing the taxpayers of Guam $148,156 per year. Adding the additional five employees will add another $100,000 to the overall cost.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that the gentleman is fair and does not want to leave the Members of the House with a false impression, or at least a misimpression, but I would like to point out the fact that these 30 employees that he is talking about are Guamanians, are they not, and are employed by the government of Guam and are paid by the government of Guam, and they are not sent there by Mr. Benson or the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOEVEN. No, I do not contend that. They are employees of the department of agriculture of Guam.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. And I may say for the information of the House that the 30 employees consist of a director, an administrative secretary, and a clerk. Also in the service and custodial unit, they have a chief caretaker and an assistant to the caretaker, a carpenter, a laborer, and chief mechanic and another mechanic. In the extension service, they have a farm adviser and a supervisor and four advisers and a pest control operator.

In the next division, they have an agricultural entomologist and a gardener and four laborers.

In animal industry, they have a veterinarian, an animal husbandryman, a fish and game warden, and an assistant husbandryman, and four laborers.

This group of 30 people should be enough to take care of all the needs of Guam so far as agricultural problems are concerned in the limited 37½-square-mile agricultural area of the island.

When the committee considered this bill I suggested that if they needed additional and expert technical assistance, such services could be provided by the State of Hawaii where there are USDA technicians and agricultural experts whose services no doubt could also be made available to Guam. Furthermore there is no reason in the world why some of the group of 30 employees in the Department of Agriculture in Guam could not be taught some of the technical know-how instead of adding to the group already there. It is my opinion that this bill is a bit ill advised and premature at this time and should be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 90, noes 51.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 203, nays 151, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—203

Abbitt	Anfuso	Beckworth
Abernethy	Aspinall	Bennett, Fla.
Addonizio	Baldwin	Blatnik
Albert	Barrett	Boggs
Alford	Barry	Boland
Andrews	Bass	Bonner
Brademas	Harrison	O'Hara, Mich.
Breeding	Hays	O'Konski
Brock	Healey	Patman
Brooks, La.	Hogan	Perkins
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Pfost
Brown, Ga.	Holtzman	Pilcher
Brown, Mo.	Hull	Poage
Burke, Ky.	Ikard	Porter
Burke, Mass.	Inouye	Preston
Burleson	Irwin	Price
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Prokop
Canfield	Jennings	Pucinski
Carnahan	Johnson, Calif.	Quigley
Casey	Johnson, Colo.	Rabaut
Celler	Johnson, Wis.	Randall
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Church	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Clark	Judd	Riley
Coad	Karsten	Rivers, Alaska
Coffin	Kasem	Rivers, S.C.
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Cook	Kearns	Rodino
Cooley	Kelly	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Daddario	Kilgore	Rogers, Tex.
Daniels	King, Calif.	Rooney
Delaney	Lennon	Roosevelt
Dent	Lesinski	Rostenkowski
Diggs	Levering	Roush
Dingell	Libonati	Rutherford
Dixon	Lindsay	Santangelo
Dooley	Loser	Saund
Downing	McCormack	Scott
Dwyer	McDowell	Selden
Edmondson	McFall	Shelley
Elliott	McGinley	Sheppard
Everett	McGovern	Shipley
Evins	McIntire	Sikes
Fallon	McMillan	Sisk
Farbstein	Macdonald	Slack
Fascell	Mack	Smith, Iowa
Feighan	Madden	Staggers
Flood	Mahon	Stratton
Flynn	Matthews	Stubblefield
Foley	Merrow	Sullivan
Fountain	Metcalf	Taylor, N.C.
Friedel	Meyer	Teller
Fulton	Miller, Clem	Thomas
Gallagher	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Garmatz	Montoya	Thornberry
Gathings	Moorhead	Toll
George	Morgan	Trimble
Giaimo	Morris, N. Mex.	Ullman
Gilbert	Morris, Okla.	Watts
Granahan	Moulder	Whitener
Gray	Multer	Wolf
Green, Oreg.	Murphy	Wright
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Yates
Griffiths	Nix	Young
Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki
Halpern	O'Brien, N.Y.	Zelenko
Harmon	O'Hara, Ill.	

NAYS—151

Adair	Dague	Keith
Alexander	Derounian	King, Utah
Alger	Derwinski	Kitchin
Allen	Devine	Knox
Andersen, Minn.	Donohue	Kyl
Arends	Dorn, N.Y.	Lafore
Ashmore	Dorn, S.C.	Laird
Avery	Dowdy	Landrum
Ayres	Dulski	Lane
Barr	Fenton	Langen
Bass, N.H.	Fino	Lankford
Bates	Fisher	Latta
Becker	Flynt	Lipscomb
Bentley	Ford	McCulloch
Berry	Forrester	McDonough
Betts	Frazier	Mailliard
Blitch	Frelinghuysen	Marshall
Bolton	Gary	Martin
Bosch	Goodell	May
Bow	Griffin	Michel
Bray	Gross	Miller, N.Y.
Brewster	Gubser	Milliken
Broomfield	Haley	Minshall
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Moeller
Broyhill	Hardy	Monagan
Budge	Harris	Moore
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler	Mumma
Cahill	Hemphill	Nelsen
Cederberg	Henderson	Norblad
Chamberlain	Herlong	Osmers
Chenoweth	Hiestand	Ostertag
Chiperfield	Hoeven	Pelly
Collier	Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin
Colmer	Hoffman, Mich.	Pillion
Conte	Holt	Pirnie
Cramer	Hosmer	Poff
Cunningham	Huddleston	Quie
Curtin	Jensen	Ray
Curtis, Mass.	Johansen	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.
	Jonas	Riehlman

Robison	Springer	Wallhauser
St. George	Taber	Weaver
Saylor	Teague, Calif.	Weis
Schenck	Thomson, Wyo.	Westland
Scherer	Tollefson	Widnall
Schneebeli	Tuck	Williams
Schwengel	Vanik	Wilson
Short	Van Pelt	Winstead
Simpson	Van Zandt	Younger
Smith, Calif.	Wainwright	

NOT VOTING—77

Anderson, Mont.	Hargis	Passman
Ashley	Hébert	Powell
Auchincloss	Hess	Rains
Bailey	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Baker	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Barden	Jackson	Siler
Baring	Karth	Smith, Kans.
Baumhart	Kee	Smith, Miss.
Belcher	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Bennett, Mich.	Kilburn	Spence
Bolling	Kirwan	Steed
Bowles	Kluczynski	Taylor, N.Y.
Boykin	Kowalski	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	McSween	Thompson, La.
Cannon	Machrowicz	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	Magnuson	Udall
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Utt
Dawson	Meader	Vinson
Denton	Miller, George P.	Walter
Doyle	Mitchell	Wampler
Durham	Morrrison	Wharton
Fogarty	Moss	Whitten
Forand	Murray	Wier
Gavin	Norrell	Willis
Glenn	O'Neill	Withrow
Grant	Oliver	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Keogh and Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Baumhart against.

Mr. Oliver and Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Wampler and Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Ashley and Mr. Hargis for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Denton and Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Durham and Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Holifield and Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. George P. Miller and Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Wharton against.

Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Withrow against.

Mr. Kluczynski and Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Magnuson and Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Forand for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Steed and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Siler against.

Mr. Willis and Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Anderson of Montana and Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Udall and Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. Meader against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Smith of Mississippi with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Kowalski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. DOOLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. That is all the legislation for the day.

GRANTS FOR GRADUATE TRAINING IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, ROBERTS, RHODES of Pennsylvania, BENNETT of Michigan, and SCHENCK.

U.S. CONSTITUTION 175TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 784) amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to the Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

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, That section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States", approved July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-650), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Commission shall report to Congress on its activities (including, but not limited to, its recommendations for legislation) not later than January 3, 1961."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in three instances.

Mr. WEAVER in three instances.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts in one instance.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances.

NEW ENGLAND NEEDS MORE FUEL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential order that says New England cannot import all the residual fuel oil that it needs is a form of economic blackmail. In response to the demands of the coal industry, the administration tells the six New England States that it will not let them import enough of the cheaper and more convenient heavy crude oil that they want. The plain intent is to force feed them with coal.

This artificial rationing of oil will increase the price of residual oil that is extensively used by industry, electric plants, housing projects, and many apartment and office buildings. If this order that limits the supply of oil available for the last quarter of 1960 is not rescinded in favor of a more generous quota, the resulting scarcity will be inflationary.

Gardner Caverly, executive vice president of the New England council, has stated that this restrictive oil quota could cost east coast firms and residents millions of dollars. He warned that if New England is not permitted to bring in the quantity of heavy crude oil that it needs for its expanding economy and its increasing population residual oil prices will go up, leading to higher prices for electricity, among other things.

I cannot understand why the administration has decided to place this extra burden on the backs of New England industries and consumers. The needs of the coal-producing States, which the textile States of the Northeast understand because of our shared experience with labor-surplus problems, cannot be solved by compelling us to reconvert to the use of coal. Could it be that the administration is trying to play off the coal-producing States against the textile States of New England in order to split our unity in support of Federal legislation to assist in the industrial redevelopment of labor-surplus areas?

In any case, the administration contradicts itself. On the one hand it professes concern about any action that may inflate prices, but in this instance of the oil quotas it must assume responsibility for the inevitable increase in the cost of this basic fuel.

The administration tries to forestall criticism by saying that these quotas are somehow related to national defense. I fail to see how this contributes to our military security when it will increase the operating costs of the many industries in New England that are working on defense orders. In fact, the Government itself will pay part of the increased costs that it has engineered with so little regard for the ultimate consequences.

The reduction in the quota by 20,000 barrels a day as compared with last year, and 135,000 barrels a day less than the figure sought by the oil industry, will be

harmful to the economy of our area, at a time when the Government should be giving it every possible encouragement to develop.

I am confident that the whole New England delegation in Congress will protest against this unrealistic decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior and prevail upon it to grant us an expanded oil quota to meet our growing needs.

COMPLEXITIES OF OUR AGRICULTURAL ABUNDANCE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by former Governor Thomson, of Wisconsin, to the Republican platform committee at Chicago.

This statement by former Gov. Vernon W. Thomson shows an understanding of the farm problem which is necessary if we are to successfully handle the complexities of our agricultural abundance. But more than anything else I am impressed by Governor Thomson's understanding and realization of the problems of the Third Congressional District which I had the honor of representing for many years. I personally do not recall any other public figure who shows the understanding and who grasps the scope of the varied problems and interests of Wisconsin, and particularly southwestern Wisconsin. I am entirely in agreement with the statement Governor Thomson made.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF FORMER GOV. VERNON W. THOMSON

America must remain a nation of abundance—not only to meet the future demands of an exploding population, but also to provide strength for the free world. To remain a nation of abundance, we must make certain that the Nation's agricultural industry is revitalized and that our farm economy is restored to a healthy, vigorous, and rewarding status in our Nation's economy.

A house divided against itself cannot stand. Nor can our farm economy stand the division of views of our great farm organizations. Their violent conflicts leave the farmer lost and forgotten. For too long, our farmers and their economy have been made a political football. For too long, those who have controlled Congress have sought to perpetuate the farmers' plight as a political "issue" rather than to develop a practical solution.

Certainly a farm program is not good enough when you get less for a dozen eggs than you pay for a dozen angle worms.

For three reasons, I urge this all important committee to incorporate the following six points of principle and policy in the new farm program:

1. Insist upon a Secretary of Agriculture who will fight as vigorously for the farmer and his needs as the Secretary of Labor fights for the workingman or the Secretary of Commerce fights for the businessman.

2. Give the farmer the right of referendum—a right to vote on the kind of program under which he will have to work and live. Let the farmer participate in governing his economy under the time tested American system of self-determination. In Wisconsin and in my home district, this procedure has been notably successful in the tobacco program. Such a step will do much to restore the morale of the farm population; it will give them a strong voice in determining the policies and programs under which they must operate, the degree of controls they feel are needed, and will greatly improve their bargaining power in the marketplace. The right to vote coupled with a realistic parity protection will go a long way toward turning the farm economy toward a future which is more prosperous.

3. The soil bank and conservation reserve program should be expanded. At the same time however the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Government must see to it that this program is not nullified or rendered sterile by the reclamation of marginal lands in other areas.

Provision should also be made to eliminate the loss to local taxing units of the personal property tax base otherwise provided by farms put in the soil bank. This program should pay to the taxing unit the amount of taxes lost by soil banking the land and removing the personal property.

The farmer who stays on the farm should not be required to "pay the taxes or to make up the taxes," lost when the land is soil banked and the farm operator moves away.

Failure to include such a provision will continue to increase the tax burden upon the farmers who remain and continue to operate their farms.

4. An effective, practical and modern program to provide long term, low cost, financing for the capital requirements of farmers, particularly in respect to personal property must be provided. Today, the high cost of getting into business makes it virtually impossible for our young people to start a farm career. At the same time, the inflationary cost-price-tax squeeze prevents established farmers from keeping pace with competition and realizing the growth of which they are capable. Modern financing for our modern farms would include: (A) A long period of repayment; (B) a Government guarantee of the mortgage (such as is provided by the FHA for building homes); (C) a low interest rate, which would be acceptable to the lending institutions because of the Government guarantee. Such a plan would encourage and make possible the expansion and capital improvements which will improve efficiency and productivity of our farmers and stimulate the local business world with the purchases long delayed by the constantly rising costs.

5. We must act to expand America's export markets for our agricultural products. This can be done in part by removal of those price restrictions which hinder the free flow of agricultural products to foreign markets. And by requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell at not less than 105 percent of parity any so-called surplus commodity on the domestic market.

At the same time we must review with care the policy of importing foreign food products—a policy that creates the danger of making our Nation the dumping ground for foreign agriculture products. The very real danger of this situation is best illustrated by the fact that last year the amount of cheese imported into this country equaled the amount of domestic cheese purchased as surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

6. We can and must provide an ample food bank as an integral part of our civil defense survival program. Edible food is as essential for survival in the event of an attack or disaster as weapons and missiles are. Milk, meat, vegetables, and fruit processed for storage would answer this purpose.

The cost of this program is not a part of the farm program and it should not be charged against the farm program. The cost of this program should rightfully be charged to civil defense and placed where it belongs.

Thus, America can remain productive and a land of abundance as it must; for only the productive can be strong and only the strong can remain free. As a nation of strength domestically we can maintain a military strength which will command the respect of the Communist nations. We can with confidence show Chairman Khrushchev that we will never regret, nor apologize, for doing the things necessary to protect the freedom of our Nation and the peace of the world.

While this committee is not the forum for discussion we must mention that the same forces which are forcing the farmer's costs up and up are forcing the costs to the small businessman up and up, and are cutting his margin of profit to the point of despair. We must stop the upward cost spiral not only for the farmer and small businessman, but also for the worker and retired person whose dollars will no longer reach. We must prevent any Federal action which tends to push costs up. We must review our policy which permits the import of foreign goods at prices which steal the jobs from the skilled American labor. In my district you can buy rubbers made in Hong Kong, China, for about one-half the cost of rubbers made right in La Crosse, and zinc is imported at a price which prevents full employment here at home.

A sound fiscal policy which will encourage growth industries is vital.

The development of ports for the maximum use of our greatest river, the Mississippi, is essential. And added research projects specifically aimed at developing programs to take full advantage of our natural resources and industrial potentials will stimulate our economy and provide markets for our land of abundance.

Our times demand a balanced economy which, with our abundance, will provide prosperity for all. It's time we got to work to make this a reality. Let's go.

SO SIMILAR YET SO DIFFERENT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Pantagraph, Bloomington, Ill., of August 10.

The editorial is entitled "So Similar Yet So Different." It points out what constitutes the basic difference between the Democratic and Republican platforms in connection with agriculture.

As stated in the editorial written from the heart of the Corn Belt:

The GOP program recognizes the sickness in the farm economy during this period of the production revolution. It seeks to give curative medicine. * * * The Democratic platform accepts the disease as incurable, prescribes medicine to ease the pain and puts the farmer in a wheelchair forever to be pushed wherever and whenever the Government wishes to push him.

The editorial follows:

SO SIMILAR YET SO DIFFERENT

The agricultural planks in the two major party platforms have much in common. Both pledge:

1. To expand use of food products at home and abroad.

2. To initiate research programs to find new uses.

3. To encourage cooperatives, including REA electric and phone programs.

4. To help the marginal farmer, both to increase his income and to learn new off-the-farm vocations.

5. To strengthen financing facilities for farmers.

6. To encourage more orderly marketing for greater farmer benefit.

7. To help rural communities develop industry to absorb surplus labor.

The purpose, of course, is to raise the farm income level up to that of the nonagricultural part of the economy.

It is in detail that the two planks differ.

The Democrats, for example, make as their basic farm premise "the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living."

This flies in the face of all economics. Suppose someone decides to raise 1,000 acres of hedge apples. Has he a right by Government guarantee to sell these at a return which will give him and his family a decent living? Obviously there should be some relationship between production and need of that which is produced.

This is implied in the Republican plank. It proposes to use price supports at levels best fitted to specific commodities in order to widen markets, ease production controls, and help achieve increased farm family income.

The GOP program recognizes the sickness in the farm economy during this period of the production revolution. It seeks to give curative medicine and offers a crutch during the convalescent period.

The Democratic platform accepts the disease as incurable, prescribes medicine to ease the pain, and puts the farmer in a wheelchair forever to be pushed wherever and whenever the Government wishes to push him.

REWARDS OF COWARDICE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rewards of Cowardice," written by John J. Lacey which appeared in the August issue of the Illinois Farm Bureau magazine, Record.

The editorial raises a very pertinent question: Are we who are privileged to be elected to Congress men of courage or are we cowards?

We know that the most important factor for the stability and security of our country is fiscal responsibility. We know that the overwhelming national debt has depreciated the value of our people's hard earned dollars. We know that our people are overburdened with taxes.

While we know this, do we have the courage to do what we know should be done? Or are we political cowards? Are we so cowardly that we cannot resist the political pressures for new spending programs and the enlargement of existing programs at increased expenditures? Are our own political fortunes as Members of Congress more important than the fortunes of our country?

Let us be men of courage. Let us work together for a stable dollar and a reduction of the national debt in the hope that the day may soon come that we can also reduce taxes.

REWARDS OF COWARDICE

(By John J. Lacey)

There was a time in this country, long ago, when we elected men to public office for their courage; today too many politicians reach office because of their cowardice.

Those who deplore the deterioration of standards in political life from the high level that prevailed when our Nation was young can find the main reason for this unhappy situation in that one fact.

A glaring example is the eagerness of Congressmen to vote to override President Eisenhower's veto of the bill raising the pay of Federal employees.

The salary increases, particularly in the case of postal workers, may have been justified. Where Congress showed its yellow streak was in its refusal to provide the tax money to pay the higher wages.

The administration itself had a wonderful opportunity to strike a telling blow for fiscal soundness by insisting that any postal salary boosts be tied to a bill raising postal rates. Nobody can say surely that such strategy would have been successful; but it is quite likely that it would have had a lot of support. Certainly it would have been worth the effort, even from the political angle.

The administration should have taken courage from the way the people so wholeheartedly backed the President in his great and successful fight for a balanced budget in fiscal 1960. But, this is an election year.

How many men can you remember in the past 30 years who campaigned for election on a platform of reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget and who backed up their campaign promises with effective action after they had been elected? I mean to include candidates for the Presidency in this list.

We are a tolerant people. We have already permitted our public servants to degrade our currency, little by little, until it now has less than half the purchasing power it had only 20 years ago.

The irony—and the tragedy of the situation—is that the unbalanced budgets that have been the biggest factor degrading our currency have been largely the result of measures which our lawmakers piously assured us were for the purpose of "meeting human needs." Many of them, in defending their actions, said that they "put people ahead of money."

Such glib rationalizations fall to the ground when the evils of the resulting inflation fall heaviest on the very people the politicians claimed they were helping. Then the lawmakers, always out to help, use the reduced buying power of the dollar as another excuse for further appropriations so that the beneficiaries can "keep even." It's the old process of the cat chasing its tail.

During the past 10 years, when national income has soared to spectacular levels, there has been no concerned or serious effort to start paying off the Federal debt. The time has not been right, say the spending crowd. But, if we can't pay off some of the debt in boom times, when can we do it?

The spending crowd has an answer for that one: Simply raise productivity by further Federal spending! "Operation Rathole."

The people have only one way out of the mess that has been created: To reward courage and integrity when they vote, then insist that no appropriation be made for public purposes unless the tax money is also provided to pay the bill.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE TOWN OF ORANGE, MASS.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Orange, Mass., is commemorating the sesquicentennial of its establishment as a town in 1810. In actuality, the district of Orange was founded in 1783.

It may not seem important to discuss, in this age of large urban areas, the foundation of a comparatively small American city. However, size is not the criteria for its importance, for the vital contribution made to our initial struggle for independence looms large on our historical past. It is true, that during those days of revolt, the ideals and concepts which were to prove so influential in the establishment of this large and great Nation were nurtured in communities such as Orange. The history of this city is an integral part of our struggle for freedom in the War of Independence.

In 1762, Jacob Hutchins located on the eastern part of a grant of land including 325 acres, and lying on the west line of Athol. This grant was issued by the general court to Rev. Benjamin Ruggles in 1752 and, becoming in March 1762, a portion of Athol was, in 1783, included in the district of Orange. Ezekiel Wallingford is said to have located as early as 1747, and was not long afterward killed by Indians.

The earliest settlement near what is now Orange was probably that of Lewis Barker who took up a farm in 1791. In that year, the names of those who were settled in that community are recorded. To this day, descendants of these early settlers still reside in Orange.

In December 1783, the district raised £30 to defray necessary charges, and in October 15, 1785, Orange was incorporated as a district, having all the powers of a town except that of representation. It could vote for a representative only by joining another town and it allied itself for that purpose with South Warwick. In 1810, on February 24, the district of Orange was incorporated as a town with all the privileges and powers accorded that status under the laws and constitution of the Commonwealth. On April 2, 1810, Amos Woodward, Perley Barton, and Thomas Cobb, the first board of selectmen, held the first meeting of that body.

It is interesting to note that of the 117 families settled in Orange more than half served in the Revolutionary War. One of Washington's guards was Oliver Chain who settled in the new town.

The mills first mentioned in the district records were Metcalf's, Goddard's, and Woodward's.

Katy, daughter of Amos Woodward, born February 1784, was probably the first person born in the district. The first couple married were William Crosbee and Mary Higgins, in May 1784.

Nathan Goddard and Benjamin Mayo were probably the first storekeepers in Orange; one Foster the first blacksmith; Paddock and Barton among the early doctors. David Goddard, Humphrey Mellen, and Benjamin Mayo are said to have been the first hotelkeepers.

The first post office was established at what is now North Orange, in 1816. Lyman Harrington was the first postmaster.

The district, and later the town, was named in honor of William, Prince of Orange, and the first public meeting held under that name was held November 24, 1783. From the early records, it is interesting to note that in 1795 Mr. Forister, agreed in an open town meeting "to erect bars and to let people pass through his pasture in the winter season." In April 1795, the assessors were instructed to make taxes agreeable to a late act of the general court for introducing the dollar and its parts for the money of account.

The first school of any record was held in a barn in North Orange in 1793 and its first teacher Annie Temple.

It is recorded that the pupils sat on sap troughs or buckets hewn from blocks of wood and the teacher used a stump for her desk. This is, indeed, a far cry from the present schools in Orange. In 1780 £30 was raised for schools and in 1781 it was raised to £50, which represents approximately in today's money $150 and $250, respectively. Select schools were opened in 1859 in which the higher branches were taught as well as drawing, painting, and music. One school was conducted by Misses Packard and Giles, and another by Mrs. Maria Eastman. The people of Orange supported these private schools. In 1877 a high school was built.

Orange, too, has had its share of disasters as the tornado of 1821, the blizzard of 1888, and damage caused by an explosion of a barrel of gasoline in 1891. The floods of 1900, 1936, and 1938 caused considerable damage.

In 1849 railroad service was extended from Fitchburg, through South Orange to Millers Falls. The excitement caused by the first trains, which ran from Millers Falls then to Brattleboro, gathered people on the hills to watch them pass. The railroad was called the Vermont & Massachusetts Line.

The first paper was the Journal of Industry, published by Lafayette Stevens on March 25, 1871. The first library, located at the rear of Horton's jewelry store, opened in 1859 with 286 volumes. The first bank was established in 1873, as a private bank. In 1875 it was reorganized into a national bank. The Cooperative Bank was organized in 1888 and the Orange Savings Bank in 1871. Interestingly, the largest factory for steam automobiles in the world was established in 1896 by Grout automobiles.

I have given a brief chronology, Mr. Speaker, of those highlights in the history of Orange to demonstrate its continuous link with our great past. So, down to our day, the growth continues and the devotion to our great Nation increases. In all of our wars, Orange has given her sons to fight for a cause which traces its basic concepts and ideals to that of the War of Independence itself.

Looking forward, Orange is to be the center of international attention in 1962. I introduced a resolution in this House extending an invitation to the Federation of Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world parachute championships at Orange; indeed, an important event in this rapidly growing sport throughout the world. Orange will be pleased to host these sportsmen from all over the world.

I know that my colleagues in the Congress join me in extending to this great American city our congratulations on this their sesquicentennial. Above all, that we recognize its contributions to our noble history and that we know that Orange shall continue to grow, develop, and be a cradle of those ideals which represent these United States. To its citizens, our respectful good wishes for a bright and great future.

VIOLATION OF LAW BY POST OFFICE OFFICIALS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a violation of law and congressional intent by certain officials of the Post Office Department.

I refer to section 401 of Public Law 561, the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1961. Section 401 reads:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress.

Flagrant violations of this section in various parts of the country have been brought to my attention. These involve regional post office officials and postmasters, among others. They concern outright lobbying and propaganda activities, which I shall detail later, designed to cause the defeat of H.R. 12595, now pending before the Senate.

This bill, which would generally require airmail postage for airmail service, passed the House July 2.

I have written the Postmaster General asking whether these illegal actions have been taken with the knowledge of his staff or by the direction of his staff. I have also asked what steps he is taking to stop these illegal activities.

Unless the Postmaster General gives assurance that these illegal actions have been stopped once and for all, I will be compelled to refer this entire matter to the appropriate committees of Congress and the Department of Justice for further investigation.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, being from an agricultural area, I am personally familiar with the vast number of storage bins dotted across the landscape of the breadbasket area of our country wherein is stored America's surplus agricultural abundance.

Having visited some of the have-not nations of the world, I have seen thousands of undernourished children and adults and my heart has ached to find a way whereby these underfed people might be given a new lease on life through America's agricultural productivity.

Early in 1959, I introduced a food-for-peace bill wherein I proposed that arrangements be made through the United Nations to accomplish this purpose. On two occasions, once last year and once this year, I made an effort to attach this proposal as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act.

Much interest in food for peace has been generated since early 1959, and I am thrilled that this proposal now has bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that today I have introduced a concurrent resolution, identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 114, introduced in the Senate by Senator FULBRIGHT on August 14, expressing the support of the Congress for a U.S. initiative in the United Nations looking toward the development of plans whereby all members of the United Nations can work through the United Nations system to provide substantial quantities of available foods to needy peoples in member states. This resolution follows the principle embodied in my food for peace bill, and, therefore, I am happy to have the opportunity to introduce it.

I hope that both Houses will adopt this resolution in this session of the Congress.

The text of the resolution follows:

> Whereas the United States has an abundance of food more than adequate to meet the needs of its own people; and
>
> Whereas the peoples of many less fortunate nations suffer from shortages of food, which cause human suffering and retard economic progress; and
>
> Whereas it is in the tradition of the United States and consistent with its humanitarian ideals to draw upon its resources to relieve

the suffering of needy peoples in other nations and to assist them in their efforts toward a better life; and

Whereas the United States has undertaken a food for peace program and has joined with the other members of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in supporting the freedom from hunger campaign; and

Whereas the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations are in a position to play an important role in the making available of food for needy peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States supports the intention of the President of the United States to express at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly of the United Nations the willingness of the United States to continue furnishing food to less favorably situated peoples and also to join with other members of the United Nations and specialized agencies in developing plans whereby all members able to do so can work through the United Nations system to provide, without disturbing normal markets, substantial quantities of available foods to needy peoples in member states.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but wonder if my colleagues really know what they are supporting. The following editorial is from the July 25, 1960, issue of the Des Moines Register, which by no stretch of the imagination, can be attacked as being in any way pro-Communist. The editorial speaks for itself.

If there is an explanation of the facts set forth, the House deserves to receive it.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Richard Arens, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, gave an astounding speech in Des Moines before the National Conference of Police Associations. It reinforced our belief that this committee, which is now headed by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat of Pennsylvania, should be abolished and whatever useful duties it performs turned over to the House Judiciary Committee.

Arens said that President Eisenhower's patriotism was somewhat questionable because Mr. Eisenhower introduced his grandchildren to Nikita Khrushchev.

He said it was "morally wrong" to invite Khrushchev to the United States last fall and Iowans lacked guts because they did not question Khrushchev about the famine in the Ukraine.

He said a Communist-dominated union controlled the telephone lines out of the Pentagon and attacked the administration for doing nothing about this.

He was angry because, he said, there were 109 employees now in the State Department who had been fired previously as security risks.

He was critical of the Supreme Court for its opinions in several security and passport cases which upheld the rights of individuals against arbitrary Government rulings.

He said the activities of the U.S. Information Service were appalling. He said the American Association of University Professors was not to be trusted. He also said editors of some newspapers which have been critical of his committee were not to be trusted.

Arens' suspicions, fears and undocumented charges would not be worthy of mention if they represented only his personal viewpoint. But unfortunately this isn't the case. This is the approach which the Un-American Activities Committee has taken generally in its investigation of subversive activities.

It subscribes to what Arens told the law enforcement officials: "The leaders of this country—both Republicans and Democrats—with a few exceptions still do not recognize communism as communism and a Communist as a Communist."

The committee seems to think that anyone who criticizes its method of operation is a Communist or a Communist dupe. It is suspicious of individuals or organizations that happen to be in agreement with the Communist position on any question, regardless of the merits of the issue. It supports the view, for example, that the National Council of Churches is a suspect organization.

The committee acts, as a Member of Congress pointed out recently, as a "roving police and prosecuting agency." And also as a court, without the fairness and impartiality of courts. It attempts to punish people, whom it decides under its own peculiar standards are un-American, by intimidation and exposure. It shows little or no respect for constitutional rights of free speech, freedom of assembly or due process of law.

We hope the law enforcement officers after hearing Arens' message, didn't return home convinced that every organization which speaks out for human rights is subversive, or start looking for Communists under every bed.

We trust that the officers have a better understanding of the American way of life than Arens. They should know that protecting the United States against subversion is not the job of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and other professional counterespionage agencies are charged with this responsibility.

The Committee on Un-American Activities engages in un-American activities itself.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES INDICATE ACTION ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION LEGISLATION SHOULD WAIT

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, according to the Democratic congressional leadership, one of the must bills for action in the final days of this reconvened session of the 86th Congress is Federal aid to education.

The Senate has passed a bill providing $1,800 million over 2 years for school construction and teachers' salaries. The House has passed a bill authorizing $1,300 million over 4 years for construction only.

President Eisenhower has urged Federal assistance in the construction of facilities for colleges, universities, and elementary and secondary schools. The President has made it clear, however, he will not accept a school bill unless it meets the firm rules he feels essential. Let us clearly understand he favors a temporary construction subsidy only and opposes aid for paying teachers' salaries because that would mean permanent Federal intervention in the public schools.

The House-passed bill fails to meet one of the White House specifications; namely, the limiting of Federal aid to those school districts which are in need—in other words, the authorizing of funds only to those which lack adequate classrooms and are capable of demonstrating their inability to finance the construction of more school buildings.

I did not vote for this House school construction bill because it provided aid regardless of financial need and this violated the only real argument for Federal aid which should be given only to States that can demonstrate they are unable, due to lack of local funds, to maintain an adequate school system.

In my State of Washington the State gives aid for school building construction to a school district only after a careful study shows it is unable to provide adequate funds itself. The State aid in districts will vary from zero to 90 percent and I am told this plan has worked splendidly and has been given overwhelming support by our State legislature because the standards set up make it easy to operate.

In the congressional district I have the honor to represent, I recently distributed a questionnaire dealing with Federal aid to schools. This was sent to residents who live in a very fast growing area east of Seattle and Lake Washington in what is known as the Bellevue, Kirkland, and Bothell postal districts.

The replies from this questionnaire indicated 56 percent of the people favored Federal aid for school construction.

On the other hand, 71 percent opposed Federal aid to pay teachers' salaries.

Comments accompanying the replies gave evidence of an overwhelming belief that the strength of the American school system rests on its local support and administration.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the American people know that when the Federal Government grants a general plan for school aid to States regardless of needs, local responsibility and interest is bound to diminish. That would spell Federal domination and a dangerous threat of centralized control. By such means it would be possible to condition the minds of young Americans for statism of one form or another. To preserve individualism and personal freedom, local responsibility of education must continue.

Last week a letter reached my desk from the National Education Association. It regretted that the Republican platform adopted at the recent convention in Chicago did not promise Federal aid for teachers' salaries, such as is contained in the Democratic platform.

The NEA is for aid for salaries and for permanent Federal aid to schools. I think this organization is wrong and most assuredly its thinking is contrary to the opinion of the people of my congressional district as regarding salaries.

My questionnaire had one question asking for a "yes" or "no" as to whether or not each citizen favored Federal aid for school construction. A second question asked for a "yes" or "no" on whether he or she favored Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries. These were sent to persons whose names appeared in local telephone directories.

My purpose in taking this poll in this fast growing residential and shopping area, where extra school taxes and levies have been regularly necessary, was to compare what pressure groups advocate with grass-roots opinion.

In this instance, I found the National Education Association did not reflect the majority thinking of my constituents. A majority of the people support temporary Federal aid for school construction where localities cannot meet the need themselves. The people, however, firmly believe in local responsibility and oppose aid for teachers' salaries or any Federal aid without a showing of actual need.

The position of the Republican Party platform is well taken in limiting Federal school aid to construction and then only on a basis of retaining local school management and demonstrated need for additional help.

If this school issue is taken to the American people, general Federal aid will not have their support. Meanwhile, neither the House- nor Senate-passed bills, nor any legislation that fails to meet President Eisenhower's specifications, should be enacted into law. Action on an education bill should wait.

QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS WIDE DIVISION IN PUBLIC THINKING ON MEDICAL AID FOR AGED

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has reconvened. The House has spent a fruitless and frustrating week doing nothing. The Senate is in the process of catching up with us. From now on let the membership forget partisan politics and the forthcoming elections. The best thing for the Nation would be for us to wind up essential business and go home.

The Democratic leadership has declared that before adjournment we must pass certain bills. One of these "must" measures on which it places a high priority is legislation to provide medical aid for the aged. The House passed a bill providing for a State-option health benefits program for the aged, which represents the conservative Republican position. The American Medical Association supports this kind of plan. Under it, eligibles could participate or provide their own protection with private insurers. The liberal labor group views this measure as inadequate and the Democratic platform has committed that party to fight for legislation resembling the Forand bill.

The main issue here is whether benefits should be linked to the social security system by increasing payroll taxes as the Democrats propose, or whether there will be a program of matching Federal-State grants, as President Eisenhower has recommended.

The discussion of medical care for the aged has produced violent controversy both in and out of Congress. Physicians generally are most fearful that any programs will lead to socialized medicine. The Republican administration has taken the position that any legislation passed should provide for a voluntary health program so that those who wish to take one of the many hospital plans available may do so. Also, President Eisenhower has taken the position that individuals should exert some financial effort toward meeting their health needs of future years. He also believes that the county and State should control and participate financially in any Government-sponsored program, with the Government providing a generous share. On the other hand, the Forand bill proposes that the medical care plan be handled by the social security system and that everyone start paying immediately regardless of age. This of course would mean that out of the 16 million persons over 65 today, 4 million not covered by social security laws would receive no protection.

Social-security payments under present law will take 9 percent of all wages by 1969. The Forand type measure would require withholding taxes so that every worker would contribute almost 30 percent of his earnings to the Government when including income tax deductions.

The provisions of the House-passed bill are for a Federal-State plan to take care of those who cannot afford their own medical care and while the Senate committee did not report a Forand type of bill, the Democratic Senate leaders are committed to fight for that kind of legislation.

Like other Members, Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of mail and of course pressure-group organizations have been very active. When the House passed the moderate State-option health plan recently, because of a conflict of interest on account of my association with a private health insurance company, I followed the rules of the House and voted "present." However, my personal responsibility did not cease there and I was constrained to determine the opinions of my constituents.

In March of this year, I sent out a questionnaire in which I asked the following question: "Are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include medical expenses, the increased cost to be paid by employees and employers?" The response showed 51.8 percent in favor and 48.2 opposed.

In July to get a fresh insight I sent out a second questionnaire. This was sent to 10,000 residents in my congressional district who reside in and about the Bothell, Kirkland, and Bellevue areas. The inquiries were addressed to names found in the respective telephone directories of those cities.

The questionnaire stated that Congress was meeting again to complete its unfinished business and that in the final session consideration would be given to Federal medical aid for the aged. I asked for "yes" or "no" answers to two questions: "Do you favor a moderate State-option plan?" and "Do you favor including medical protection under social security?"

Of the replies received, 54 were marked "yes" as favorable to the moderate State-option plan and also the plan under social security, indicating that these individuals favor Federal legislation of either nature. Adding these 54 to each of the two classifications resulted in 356 replies favorable to a plan under expanded social security and 303 favorable to the moderate State-option plan. Question marks in this latter classification indicated some who answered lacked information as to this latter program; 338 replies opposed both of the plans.

Thus, based on this survey of my congressional district, it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that public opinion is divided and certainly the comments included in my questionnaires show there are strong opinions on both sides of the issue. My concern is as to whether in these last few days of the 86th Congress, and with the elections very much in the minds of the Members, we should not delay this controversial matter. After all, there is a White House conference on problems of aging scheduled for next January.

I think we have plenty of facts, but I wonder if they have been fully weighed. Why not give public opinion a chance to jell and work its will. It seems obvious that the details of the House-passed bill are not generally known and by the same token, while the Forand bill by title has had strong support, its provisions certainly are not widely understood except in general terms. The fact that it discriminates against 4 million senior citizens and leaves them out completely, it seems to me, calls for a reevaluation.

Mr. Speaker, in this session we should act only on essential bills, such as appropriations, and close up shop, go home and discuss issues like medical plans for the aged with our constituents. Then next year, when the Congress is not under such pressure, the debate could be carried on under conditions more conducive to good legislation.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON HUNGARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, October 23 of this year will mark the fourth anniversary of the start of the Hungarian freedom revolution.

November 4 of this year will mark the fourth anniversary of the cruel Russian aggression against the Hungarian people which robbed them of their newly won freedom and national independence.

This November and December will also mark the fourth anniversary of the enactment of a series of United Nations General Assembly resolutions on Hungary which, first, condemned the Russian aggression against Hungary; and, second, called for the immediate withdrawal of all Russian military, political, and economic elements from Hungarian soil.

The most significant resolution passed was that of December 12, 1956, because it summarized actions taken on prior resolutions and therefore represents the concerted action of the overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations on this historic question. It is significant to note, in this connection, that the vote taken on this resolution in the General Assembly on December 12, 1956, was 55 to 8. Only the Russians and the quisling regimes they have imposed upon the captive nations voted against this resolution.

These are important and meaningful anniversary dates. All the world knows and will never forget the inspiring actions taken by the Hungarian people, beginning on the afternoon of October 23, 1956, when they made their all-out bid for freedom and national independence. Since 1948 the Hungarian people have been under the ruthless and heartless control of a regime imposed by the Russian Communists except for the 5 days of freedom they won in 1956. The Russians, following the end of hostilities in Europe, had permitted a national election in Hungary in which non-Communist parties could put up a slate of candidates. These elections were by no means free, becaue the Russian Army in occupation of Hungary harassed the non-Communist parties and their candidates while providing every possible support for the Communist Party and its candidates. Nevertheless, the Hungarian people, by an overwhelming majority, decided that the Smallholders Party—a thoroughly democratic voice of the Hungarian people—should govern their affairs. The Russians refused to accept the majority voice of the Hungarian people and destroyed self-government in Hungary within 10 months after those national elections. A Communist regime, headed by one notorious Rakosi, was put in power by the Russians. This situation prevailed from 1948 up to the outbreak of the freedom revolution. During this 8-year period the Hungarian people had experienced such exploitation, degradation, and injustice that the nation had reached a breaking point. This accounted for the spontaneous freedom revolution which broke out on the afternoon of October 23, 1956.

History records the Hungarian people, without one bit of support or encouragement from the United States or other nations of the free world, drove the Russian occupier from their beloved homeland. This they did by sheer courage and the thoroughly aroused wrath of all the Hungarian people—from teenage children to aged grandmothers. So determined were the Hungarian people to rewin their freedom and national independence, no matter what the sacrifice to them, that by October 28, five days after the revolutionary started—the Hungarian people were in control of their own affairs and once again masters of their destiny. A revolutionary committee was established which began the rebuilding of their national culture, economy, and free way of life. Freedom-loving people the world over were inspired by this great victory won by the people of Hungary. The myth of invincibility which had been built up around the Red army was shattered and broken beyond repair. No longer were the Russian Communists the symbol of the wave of the future. In all the other captive non-Russian nations behind the Iron Curtain the cause of human freedom received a powerful stimulant. Hopes ran high among the other captive people that soon they too would be rid of the oppressive and degrading Russian yoke.

The revolutionary committee which governed Hungary during its 5 days of freedom and independence proclaimed the neutrality of Hungary, the withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Military Pact, called upon the United Nations to recognize the new freedom status which applied in Hungary, and to give formal recognition to this status through appropriate action in the United Nations.

Then, early in the morning of November 4, 1946, the imperial Red army reinvaded Hungary. This new aggression against the Hungarian people represented a full-scale Russian military operation against the Hungarian people. The conscience of all civilized mankind was shocked by this ruthless, inhuman, and criminal action taken by the imperial Red army against the Hungarian people in violation of the spirit of international law and the letter of the United Nations Charter, killing many thousands of loyal Hungarians and robbing all the Hungarian people of their hard-won liberty, freedom, and national independence.

This criminal action of the imperial Russian Army against the Hungarian people caused a worldwide reaction by the common man, demanding that justice be done for the Hungarian people. At that time the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly were in session. The agenda was taken up with consideration of the so-called crisis in Suez. Preoccupied with the Suez crisis, the Security Council delayed action on the urgent pleas of the revolutionary government in Hungary until after the imperial Red army had reinvaded that country. It was not until the shocked conscience of the world cried out for action on the Hungarian case that the U.S. representative joined with others to introduce a resolution in the Security Council which would permit consideration of the Hungarian case by the General Assembly. As the full truth of the criminal Russian actions in Hungary began to reach the news media of the free world, the demands for action in the United Nations reached a pitch which could not be denied. Then, and only then, was the case moved to the General Assembly for action. A series of resolutions were then adopted by an overwhelming vote. The most significant action taken by the United Nations General Assembly was that of December 12, 1956, which summarized the actions taken hitherto in the General Assembly, crystallized the case against the imperial Russian Army and in support of the human rights of the people of Hungary.

Now, 4 years later, one of the great questions confronting the American people and all freedom-loving people is this: What has been done to cause the Russians to conform with the standing General Assembly resolutions on Hungary? The answer to that question can be put very quickly and simply. The United Nations has not taken a single action against the Russians since the Hungarian revolution. It has confined itself to eloquent words of protest and nothing more. This is a dismal record. It is a record which defies the pleas for action expressed by the common man the world over. It is, in every sense of the word, a victory for the Russian imperialists because they have demonstrated it is possible for them to launch military aggression against a newly independent nation and to go unpunished for such aggression.

We have witnessed within the past few days the Congo crisis, a situation in which the Russian imperialists forced the United Nations to take action against the Belgian nation under the clear threat that unless the United Nations acted to intervene in the Congo, the Russians would take unilateral action. The United Nations Forces thus went into the Congo under the direct threat that unless they did so, the military forces of Russian imperial communism would intervene in the Congo crisis. What a contrast this is to the dismal failure of the United Nations to take affirmative action in support of its standing resolutions on Hungary. If this shameful record is allowed to stand, the people of the world, including the Russian leaders, can draw no other conclusion but the following:

That the willingness to undertake the risks of applying force on a unilateral basis by one of the great powers is the only means of enforcing the collective will of the United Nations. While such action is a clear and obvious violation of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter, it is, nevertheless, a practical lesson in international politics and one which has brought significant returns for the cause of imperial Russian communism. Now the question before the people of the United States is whether this record—this shameful record—will be allowed to stand unchallenged and thus become a precedent for the settlement of future disputes in the United Nations.

It should be obvious that if we allow this record to stand the Russian leaders will regard it as an open invitation to become more aggressive and more provocative in using the United Nations as an instrument to advance their plan

of world conquest. The end result will be either the Russians will win the struggle for the world by their demonstrated willingness to use force to attain their objectives, or we will drift into a situation in which war—that is a hot war—will become inescapable. This we must not permit to happen.

What recourse do we have in this situation which demands immediate decision and positive action?

In seeking the answer to this question, I have examined the Charter of the United Nations and consulted with authorities on the charter, including the Department of State, to determine what sanctions can be applied against the Russians for their persistent, adamant, provocative, and contemptuous disregard for the United Nations standing resolutions on Hungary. I am advised that the most powerful sanction within the command of the United Nations is that of membership in that body. By that I mean the suspension or expulsion of a member nation which persistently has violated the letter of the charter and which stands in defiance of the expressed will of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The charter provides, under article 6, that any member of the United Nations which persistently violates the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization. Article 18 of the charter provides that suspension of the rights and privileges of membership and the expulsion of members requires a two-thirds majority of the members of the General Assembly present and voting. Article 12 provides that the General Assembly shall not act upon any dispute or situation while the Security Council is acting on it unless the Security Council so requests. The charter is not clear nor is there a procedural precedent to guide us on whether the General Assembly can take up directly a question of membership leading to suspension or expulsion of a member nation. Of one thing I am certain. That is, while the Russians do have the power of veto in the Security Council, they cannot, under established procedures, prevent a question involving continuing aggression by them from being presented to the General Assembly for consideration. The continued, flagrant, adamant, capricious, and provocative refusal by the Russians to abide by the General Assembly resolution on Hungary enacted on December 12, 1956, is a clear threat to international peace and security. My opinion is that the "uniting for peace" precedent in the United Nations would prevail on this question.

The question of procedure in the United Nations is not the concern of Congress. It is the concern of the executive branch of Government, and more particularly the Department of State. Therefore, it is not for Congress to argue the intricacies of the U.N. Charter, or to speculate on what can or cannot be done from a procedural point of view, or to tell the executive branch how to accomplish a political objective in that organization. However, I believe it is quite proper and in this case most appropriate for Congress to express its concern over the persistent, adamant, provicative, and contemptuous violations of the principles of the United Nations Charter by the Soviet Union and to call for political action to remedy this dangerous state of affairs.

If it develops that the United Nations is powerless to rid itself of a member which refuses to honor its obligations under the charter, then the issue will be clear. As matters now stand the issue is both unclear and untested. Advisory opinions are no test of a given situation and can be used to avert action where action is clearly called for. If, as some people fear, the Russians are in the U.N. to stay and there is nothing we can do to prevent them from using that organization to preserve and extend their empire, the American people are entitled to know that this situation exists. Certain knowledge that this is an established fact will point the way for clear and realistic thinking on the course we must pursue, as a nation, if we are to avert war or peaceful surrender of freedom's cause. We can establish that certain knowledge only through a formal, full scale test of the issue during the forthcoming session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Therefore, I propose that the time has arrived for a test on whether a member of the United Nations, in this case the Soviet Union, will be permitted to continue its membership while persistently violating the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. Allow me to assure you that there can be no reasonable question about the persistent violation of the Charter by the Soviet Union. For those who may have doubts on this question, I refer them to the report presented to the General Assembly by the Special United Nations Committee on Hungary under date of September 14, 1957, which was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 60 to 10. Let me just cite to you a few of the findings of that United Nations committee. I list them from the official report of the Committee as follows:

(a) The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, has deprived Hungary of its liberty and political independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental human rights;

(b) The present Hungarian regime has been imposed on the Hungarian people by the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

(c) The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has carried out mass deportations of Hungarian citizens to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

(d) The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has violated its obligations under the Geneva Convention of 1949;

(e) The present authorities in Hungary have violated the human rights and freedoms granted by the Treaty of Peace with Hungary.

The question before us is whether the United States, as a permanent member of the Security Council, and as the leader of the cause of human freedom, is prepared for a showdown with the Russians on the question as to whether they shall be permitted to remain in the United Nations when the United Nations itself has condemned the Russians over and over again for persistent violations of the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

Moreover the Russians have adamantly and persistently refused to abide by the provisions of the General Assembly resolution on Hungary, and have shown a contemptuous and dangerous disregard for its meaning. Here let me cite you verbatim what Chou En-lai, leader of the Red Chinese, had to say about the United Nations, its concern for Hungary, and the failure of the United Nations to cause the Russians to abide by the finding and direction of the overwhelming majority of the members of that body. Here is what Chou En-lai said:

> The Hungarian people, with the friendly internationalist help of the Soviet Union, crushed the forces of the counterrevolution. The Western states made a big noise about the Hungarian events, they made a big thing of the Hungarian problem and brought it before the General Assembly of the United Nations. And what was the result? The noise subsided slowly. (As reported in Nepszabadsag, February 9, 1958.)

Chou En-lai said, "The noise subsided slowly." What Chou En-lai really means is that the United Nations is impotent to act unless the Soviet Union forces it to act. This stands as a challenge to American leadership, a challenge to all of us on the question of whether we believe the mere survival of the United Nations is more important than human rights and justice in the world.

In recent months a number of Americans who are frequently reported in the news have been calling for the rule of world law as the answer to the perplexing problems of our times. They have overemphasized the prospects of the International Court of Justice in pursuit of this worthy aim. These advocates seem to overlook the hard fact that the United Nations is an international organization with a charter based on the rule of law in international affairs. Membership in the United Nations, like membership in any organization, including the International Court of Justice, involves adherence to its basic rules and to the decisions of the majority of the members therein. A beginning in the use of law as a force in world order must be made somewhere and the logical place is the United Nations. The logical case is Hungary—including the many standing General Assembly resolutions summarized by the action taken on December 12, 1956. If the United Nations continues to allow the Russians to stand in defiance of its solemn resolutions, its authority as a world organization will be permanently impaired and the cause of law as a force in the world order will be destroyed.

The record shows that the United Nations has not taken a single action against the Russian Communists since the Hungarian Revolution. It has, as I have said, confined itself to eloquent words alone. Or as Chou En-lai puts it—a big noise and no action. The time has arrived for action. This action must be initiated and unequivocally supported by the American Ambassador to the United Nations. The action called for is very simply put. The Russian imperi-

alists must be required to abide by the General Assembly resolutions on Hungary or be expelled from membership in that body. A definite date must be fixed for withdrawal of all Russian military, economic, and political elements to insure against the Russians talking this action into inaction. If the Russians fail to abide within the time limit set, they must automatically be expelled from membership in the United Nations. It is time that Congress, representing the will of the American people, expressed itself clearly and unequivocally on this all important question.

I have therefore introduced today House Concurrent Resolution 716, expressing the sense of the Congress that the American Ambassador to the United Nations be instructed by the President of the United States to take immediate action to cause the Soviet Union to forthwith abide by the full provisions of the standing resolution on Hungary, including a set time limit for the withdrawal of all Russian military, economic, and political elements from Hungary under United Nations supervision, or be expelled from membership in the United Nations.

I should like to point out that the General Assembly of the United Nations is scheduled to convene on September 20 of this year. I am informed that the Department of State and the American Ambassador to the United Nations are presently preparing for that forthcoming session. I urge enactment of the resolution which I have introduced today in order to give positive direction and practical purpose to the American delegation for the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations.

During the week of July 17 through 23 of this year, the people of the United States observed officially Captive Nations Week in conformity with Public Law 86–90. During that week leading Americans in all parts of the country pledged their unwavering support to the cause of all captive nations as defined in that law. Hungary stands as a symbol of the cause of all the captive nations. As Hungary goes, also go all the captive nations in terms of human rights, in terms of self-determination, in terms of self-government, in terms of a new world order based upon justice for all nations and all people. The United Nations was organized as an international instrument to secure justice for all nations and all people. The resolution which I have introduced today will afford Members of Congress an opportunity to express the sincerity of our national purpose in making the United Nations an effective instrument to this end.

The able and distinguished Member from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is cosponsoring this resolution, having introduced an identical one.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOLL. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his interesting and timely presentation on the subject of the valiant and courageous Hungarians.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for calling this very important matter to the attention of the House, and I wish to announce I am happy to join in cosponsorship of his concurrent resolution.

I would like to point out to the gentleman that Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has already announced his intention of having the Hungarian matter placed upon the agenda of the forthcoming session of the General Assembly to take place in New York next month. Owing to the fact that the Special Representative of the United Nations on the Hungarian question—I believe his name is Sir Leslie Monroe of New Zealand—has been unable to obtain any cooperation or indeed any evidence of it either from the Soviet Government or the present Hungarian regime. As I say, Ambassador Lodge indicated his belief that this subject is a matter for the General Assembly to take up at the forthcoming General Session.

I should like to point out one thing to the gentleman, if I might, and that is that the responsibility of this Government to press for action in the United Nations on the Hungarian question is twofold, first, as a leading member of the United Nations and, of course, leader of the free world, we naturally have an obligation both legal and moral to see that the edicts, the resolutions, of the United Nations are enforced wherever possible; but we also have another obligation which the gentleman mentioned but did not emphasize in his very fine remarks, and that is that we together with the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union cannot close our eyes to what has happened since the Hungarian Peace Treaty of 1947 which guaranteed the establishment and preservation of the basic human rights and freedoms in Hungary as well as in the pro-Axis satellites of Romania and Bulgaria. We all have seen, I think, overwhelming proof that such freedoms and rights no longer exist in Hungary or in Rumania or in Bulgaria, for that matter.

As I say, as leader of the free world we have at least the moral obligation to raise this question in the United Nations, as Ambassador Lodge has announced our intention of doing.

I thank the gentleman for letting me make these remarks.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for the very constructive contribution he has made. I merely wish to point out, however, that five times already the subject of Hungary has been presented to the General Assembly, but the only result has been eloquent words and no action. But if this Congress goes on record expressing the political judgment that the time has come for action, action which will result in the Russians conforming with the standing United Nations resolution on Hungary or cause themselves to be expelled from membership in the United Nations, then, and only then will we be facing up to the reality of this situation. It is timely to point out that Andrei A. Gromyko, the Russian Foreign Minister, is now insisting that the U–2 and RB–47 plane incidents, created by the Russians, be put on the United Nations General Assembly agenda for debate with the expressed purpose of branding the United States as guilty of "aggressive actions which constituted a menace to general peace."

Mr. BENTLEY. I completely agree in the gentleman's belief that the Congress should express itself, and as I say, that is why I join the gentleman as cosponsor of his resolution.

With regard to putting teeth into the resolution there is, of course, a question in my mind as to whether or not the United Nations charter empowers the General Assembly to put teeth into any of its resolutions. If I remember the United Nations charter correctly, I believe the General Assembly is pretty much limited to its power of merely passing resolutions of strong moral condemnation which, of course, they have already done. The only body of the United Nations that could take action in any effective sense is the Security Council where, unfortunately, the Soviet Union exercises the veto power.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That may or may not be true and certainly the question as to the power of the General Assembly to cause expulsion of a member has not been tested, nor have the procedures in the Security Council been tested for expulsion of a member, including the Soviet Union, which flagrantly violates the principles of the United Nations Charter.

We have had an advisory opinion of the Court of International Justice with reference to the granting of membership to a prospective nation, the question of expulsion of a nonconforming member has not been tested, and I feel it should be decided to determine whether or not the Soviet Union or any other nation as a member nation of the U.N. should be permitted flagrantly to violate all the resolutions of the United Nations, or commit acts of aggression in violation of the principles of the charter as the Special Committee on Hungary has already made a finding which was reported to and accepted by the General Assembly on September 14, 1957, and still maintain its membership.

Mr. BENTLEY. I think it would be useful and helpful to have the matter tested, but I wonder if the gentleman's recollection of history is accurate enough to recall in 1940 or possibly the latter part of 1939 when the League of Nations that was in existence was definitely on its last legs, but nevertheless at that time of weakness on the part of the League of Nations, the League then expelled the Soviet Union from membership in the League of Nations for its unprovoked aggression against Finland.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, my memory is good on that point. The League of Nations did expel the Soviet Union from

membership in the League for aggression against Finland—on December 14, 1939. I do not make a judgment as to whether the United Nations is on its last legs at this point in history, but I will say that unless the action called for in the resolution which we have introduced is taken in the next General Assembly, the United Nations will then be on its last legs and beyond any point of possible redemption.

TARIFF COMMISSION COTTON TEXTILE RULING—THREAT TO AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1960, insult was added to the injury long suffered by our domestic cotton textile industry when the U.S. Tariff Commission ruled that imports of cotton textiles and cotton textile products were in no way adversely affecting the Government's cotton export subsidy program. This action, in effect, rang down the curtain on a sorry farce which had been playing on the administration's hastily constructed stage of concern for almost a year.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this body know exactly what I am talking about. Certainly, my colleagues from the southern and western cotton-producing States and my colleagues from the Middle Atlantic and eastern textile-manufacturing States know fully and in detail that sad story to which I now refer.

For the record, however, perhaps it is best that I review the sequence of events that led up to the Tariff Commission's June 27 decision.

In the past several years, informed Americans in many areas of public and private life have become increasingly aware of a problem which, while not as ostensibly dramatic nor perhaps even as ultimately drastic as the possibility of a nuclear holocaust, is nonetheless a very grave one—and I should say an increasingly large one. It is the problem of the rapidly snowballing imports of cotton textiles and cotton textile products. Spokesmen for the domestic industry which is most directly affected naturally were the first ones to sound the warning of the ultimate portent of the problem. Legislators of those areas most directly affected responded to the call and I know that many of them, like myself, personally researched and assembled all the pertinent facts to see whether there was any basis for the industry's initial alarm. The results of their studies have been voiced in the Halls of Congress frequently this year. This spring, in instances too numerous to cite, Senators and Congressmen from every State along the Atlantic seaboard and the South and representing both political parties spoke in unanimous agreement and concern about the fact that the continuing, excessive importation of cotton goods was creating not just a problem for our cotton industry and textile industry but was a mounting threat to our economy at large.

The press, through editorials and in the columns of eminent journalists, bespoke this danger. In January of this year, for example, Victor Riesel, writing in the New York Mirror, commented on the invasion of imported textile goods which he reported was "costing our garment manufacturers well over $200 million a year—and our needle workers tens of thousands of jobs."

And I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this problem was not one which merely bothered the domestic manufacturer for obvious economic reasons, nor simply bothered the politician for evident political motivations, nor only concerned the professional economist from a strictly academic viewpoint, nor just gave glib inspiration to the news reporter because of the headlines involved. This was—and is—a problem felt, in daily lives and in stinging practicality, by small cotton farmers and mill workers and all the other thousands of Americans whose daily bread is slowly but surely being rationed by a controllable yet sadly uncontrolled force.

As I have already implied, and as is otherwise evident, the plague of excessive cotton textile imports does not exclusively affect the American textile industry and the individuals associated with it. The situation which first hurts the textile manufacturing industry subsequently hurts the whole cotton economy and, in fact, definitely affects in an adverse way the economies of several great regions of our land if not, indeed, the whole economy of the United States. In the South and Southwest, where cotton is grown and later made into fine products of all sorts, as well as in those regions whose economic livelihoods are also based in large measure on cotton textile production and the production of fine cotton goods and apparel, the problem grows more critical by the month.

I am sure I need not point out in great detail why the prices on imported cotton goods, with which our American industries have to contend, are practically out of the range of competition. The wages and general living standard of the American worker—which incidentally I consider to be a tribute to the worker himself, the industry, and the American economic system—as compared with the plight of workers in other lands, and particularly in the Orient whence much of the excessive import problem stems, is answer enough to the question of why the industry cannot take care of the situation with no aid and no consideration from the Government.

Thus it was, Mr. Speaker, that after consultation with many leaders in the American textile industry and in concord with several of my colleagues here in Congress, I contacted the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, on July 2, 1959, to urge him to act favorably on the petition which had just been filed with him by the National Cotton Council. I cited in detail my reasons for believing that an implementation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, which the petition called for and which he must initiate, would work toward remedying the plight of the domestic textile industry and related industries. I asked that he let me know when he had reached a decision on the matter and while he did not see fit to do so, I was nonetheless pleased to learn via the press some months later that the Secretary of Agriculture had asked the President to instruct the Tariff Commission to investigate and advise whether the textile imports situation justified an implementation of section 22.

It is worth noting, I think, that in the official pertinent press release issued by the President's press secretary, under date of November 10, 1959, it was stated:

> The President has asked the Tariff Commission to determine whether a fee on imported cotton textiles, equal to the amount of the subsidy, is necessary in order to prevent cotton textile imports from interfering with programs of the Department of Agriculture.

But the attached copy of the President's letter to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission showed that the President actually only requested the Commission to see if the Government's export program for cotton and cotton products was being harmed or was tending to be harmed. And on that seemingly small difference in phraseology, the subsequent sad events turned. In that letter, Mr. Speaker, the administration publicy indicated concern about the ultimate outcome of the game but, surreptitiously, stacked the deck against our side.

I think it is appropriate here to read section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, in order to make perfectly clear what real and comprehensive remedies the Congress provided to correct exactly the type situation that prevails in connection with our cotton industry today. This section reads in pertinent part as follows:

> SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1933, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

The Commission, of course, was happy to restrict their activities to consideration of this one little phase of the great overall problem, for obvious reasons, and they set out to do so despite the protests of those who had originally requested the investigation, of a number of distinguished legislators who not only know the problem but know the spirit and the letter of the relevant law, and, it appears, despite the protest of two members of the Tariff Commission itself.

The director of the production suggested a departure from the authors' script, and since the proposed new lines were simpler anyway, the actors conveniently ignored the principles involved.

They set out to do just what the President asked them to do and dared not do one whit more and, it is interesting to note, those of the Commissioners who signed the final report spent approximately one-half of the 20-odd pages of their rationale explaining the legalistics which they said precluded them from getting down to the crux of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, what the Tariff Commission was asked to do and what they proceeded to do—despite what they actually could have done under the law and should have done if they were sincerely interested in securing and acting on the facts—is cogently stated in a section of the minority report, signed by two members of the Tariff Commission, Messrs. Walter R. Schreiber and Glenn D. Sutton:

> Although the export subsidy programs have been primary topics in this investigation, the consideration in vacuo of individual programs that are in reality segments of the total extensive national program on cotton is not a rational procedure. This is because all of the individual programs—or segments—are interrelated, interdependent, and operate together to attain major objectives. Hence, the individual programs cannot be viewed as mutually exclusive with regard to either economic influences or purposes. In broad perspective both the total cotton program and congressional policy call for an expanding domestic cotton agriculture with an increasing offtake of cotton in both domestic and export markets. To this end Congress has provided for marketing quotas and acreage allotments, for decreasing minimum annual price supports through 1962 to encourage larger domestic consumption, and for export and other aids. Clearly, developments which limit or thwart the increased disposition of American cotton constitute interference with objectives of the total cotton program to which the various individual programs are oriented.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the little theatrical progresses towards its denouement. Now having set up the painfully rigid guidelines, the Commission moves toward what it considers to be the issue involved and proceeds to render its unsupportable decision.

After superficially examining the facts presented by the Cotton Council, by the Department of Agriculture itself, and by all of us who attempted to make real contributions toward an objective appraisal and an ultimate, happy solution, the Commission rules that the ever mounting increases in imports of cotton textiles and cotton textile products are not in any way rendering ineffective or tending to render ineffective, or materially interfering with, the cotton export subsidy program of the Government.

The injury is complete. But now the insult. The Commission proceeds, with a galling attempt to gain the offensive for the administration and with devastating ill-logic to announce that to restrict these excessive imports of cotton goods would actually be bad for the American cotton export business and the Government's programs in connection therewith.

For rebuttal, I again turn to the minority report of Commissioners Schreiber and Sutton:

> It is also a spurious contention that the restriction of imports of cotton articles would be substantially detrimental to exports of domestic cotton, since foreign users of U.S. cotton who export cotton articles to the United States would retaliate by instituting measures that would discourage the use of U.S. cotton. Such a position ignores certain important facts. It overlooks, for example, that many major foreign users of U.S. cotton are not important suppliers of cotton articles to the U.S. market. It also fails to recognize that certain important suppliers of U.S. imports of cotton articles have not been, and are not likely to be, significant markets for U.S. cotton. The major error in this position, however, is that it obfuscates the realities of international trade. Such trade between two nations is something more than a vendetta, usually covers a variety of products, and actions are usually determined by germane economic considerations. Since retaliatory action hindering the use of U.S. cotton could have no economic value for a foreign country supplying U.S. imports of cotton articles, and since such action might even impair other important aspects of trade with the United States, it would be most unlikely that foreign countries would even seriously consider invoking retaliatory measures.

Thus the play ends, Mr. Speaker. And a tragic thing about it is that, aside from the performance having lacked even a semblance of edification, the results reach far beyond the immediate esthetic distaste. The effects of the Tariff Commission's decision, unless properly and promptly corrected, will be felt by thousands of individual Americans, by hundreds of American industries, and by the overall American economy.

The serious threat of continuing, grossly excessive imports of cotton textiles and derivative products remains, Mr. Speaker. It remains as formidable and as unrelenting as any militaristic adversary with which we as a nation have ever been confronted. It will not fade away. It cannot be ignored.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of death of his mother.

To Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. ANFUSO), for Monday and Tuesday, August 22 and 23, on account of official business.

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from August 22 to September 10, on account of official business.

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. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on Thursday, August 25.

At the request of Mr. MOORE, the following Members were granted special orders:

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 1 hour, on August 25.

Mr. CURTIN, for 10 minutes, on August 23.

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, on August 29.

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, on September 1.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 15 minutes, on August 23.

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, on August 24.

Mr. HUDDLESTON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 20 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, August 30.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, August 24.

Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 2 hours, on Wednesday, August 24.

Mr. SANTANGELO (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, August 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHERER, his remarks on H.R. 12753 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in four instances.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), to include a newspaper article in his remarks on the late Usher Burdick.

(At the request of Mr. DADDARIO and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. MCCORMACK.
Mr. TELLER.
Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. IRWIN.
Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.
Mr. REUSS.
Mr. WILLIS.
Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. FARBSTEIN.
Mr. ZELENKO in two instances.
Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.
Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.
Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances.
Mr. BOGGS.
Mr. LEVERING.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 511. An act for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2917. An act to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3855. An act to increase the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3861. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7263. An act for the relief of Edward Ketchum; and

H.R. 8860. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 23, 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:

2411. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, relative to a communication received from the Honorable Roy A. Taylor, in which certain questions are raised with reference to an attempt to contest his election as a Member of the House of Representatives at a special election held on June 25, 1960, in the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina (H. Doc. No. 450); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2412. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigation and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act are exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2919. An act providing for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R.11917. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 13060. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the donation of surplus property to volunteer lifesaving corps; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 13061. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 13062. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 13063. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13064. A bill to authorize the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to approve a financial contribution for civil defense purposes to the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 13065. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 13066. A bill to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13067. A bill to amend Public Law 86-619, an act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies, approved July 12, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 13068. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 13069. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 13070. A bill to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served for 90 days or more to qualify for certain benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for certain nonprofit clubs organized and operated for the purpose of paying benefits to the members and their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 13072. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 13074. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the recalculation and reaward of annuities which have been paid in a lump sum on a commuted-value basis to take account of annuity increases becoming effective after such payment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H.R. 13075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 27 acres of land at Fort Crowder Military Reservation to the city of Neosho, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 13076. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make additional payments to certain persons whose property is or has been acquired for the Armourdale urban renewal project, Kansas City, Kans., in recognition of and compensation for the investment which they made in rebuilding or restoring such property after the flood which occurred in that area in 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 13077. A bill to provide for a program of Federal loans to assist certain areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.J. Res. 787. Joint Resolution establishing a George Washington Carver Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.J. Res. 789. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.J. Res. 790. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 791. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYL:

H.J. Res. 792. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans,

and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 794. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 795. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.J. Res. 796. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.J. Res. 797. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed, by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Con. Res. 716. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the American Ambassador to the United Nations to cause the Soviet Union to abide by the standing General Assembly resolutions on Hungary or, by their failure to do so, to be expelled from membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 717. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the American Ambassador to the United Nations to cause the Soviet Union to abide by the standing General Assembly resolutions on Hungary or, by their failure to do so, to be expelled from membersip in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. Con. Res. 718. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H. Con. Res. 719. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Con. Res. 720. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for a U.S. initiative in the United Nations looking toward the development of plans whereby all members of the United Nations can work through the United Nations system to provide substantial quantities of available foods to needy peoples in member states; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H. Con. Res. 721. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for a U.S. initiative in the United Nations looking toward the development of plans whereby all members of the United Nations can work through the United Nations system to provide substantial quantities of available foods to needy peoples in member states; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 722. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Res. 603. Resolution to print as a House document certain statements made in Congress relating to the nomination of Abraham Lincoln for President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 604. Resolution to furnish each Member of the House of Representatives with 25 copies of the 1960 Census of Population according to States; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 13078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Wilson and her minor child, George Stephen Wilson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 13079. A bill for the relief of Hsien-Chi Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13080. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 13081. A bill for the relief of Wen Nong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 13082. A bill for the relief of Joe, Catherine, and Francis Tobin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 13083. A bill for the relief of Capt. Jacob Haberle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13084. A bill for the relief of Stephanus H. Kleynhans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 13085. A bill for the relief of Justina Clara Soto-Falcon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13086. A bill for the relief of Victoria Rassami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 13087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pagona Loukakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 13088. A bill for the relief of Eva Anna Marchewka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 13089. A bill for the relief of George Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 13090. A bill for the relief of Guiseppina Mola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13091. A bill for the relief of Domenico Tallarita Pelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13092. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vidrio-Fierro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 13093. A bill for the relief of Alexander Elson and Mrs. Liza Elson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13094. A bill for the relief of Chan Tin Yuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13095. A bill for the relief of Antranic Alexanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 13096. A bill for the relief of James M. Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 13097. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Zondek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 13098. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virjini Mori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rights of the Workingman Under the Landrum-Griffin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many people from my district have asked me for a concise explanation of the rights of the workingman under the Landrum-Griffin bill and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following:

If you are interested in labor and the problems of the workingman, please read the following provisions which state the facts about the Landrum-Griffin (antiracketeering) bill. They will show that this bill, repugnant to labor racketeers, is actually a labor bill of rights, protecting the union members from exploitation.

Under the Landrum-Griffin antiracketeering bill:

First. It is unlawful for a union official to betray his office of trust. The money he collects and uses and the properties he administers are solely for the benefit of the union and its members.

Second. It is mandatory that local union officials are elected by secret ballot.

Third. It is unlawful for unions to raise dues or assessments, except by a majority vote on a secret ballot.

Fourth. It is possible to discipline a union member only after giving him a list of the written charges, a full and fair hearing, and reasonable time to prepare his defense.

Fifth. It is necessary for union leaders to file annual financial reports with the Secretary of Labor. These reports must

show assets and liabilities, receipts for and sources of all funds. They must show and account for all loans to union members or employees.

Sixth. It is necessary for unions to adopt constitutions and bylaws and register them with the Secretary of Labor.

Why was this bill passed? Here are some of the excerpts from the McClellan committee report:

Dave Beck viciously abused the trust of the union's (Teamsters) 1½ million members and shamefully enriched himself at the members' expense.

Dave Beck took, not borrowed, more than $370,000 in union funds from the Western Conference of Teamsters Joint Council No. 28 building fund.

During the same hearings, Jimmy Hoffa made the following statement, exactly as quoted below:

They, the Congress, can pass all the bills they want to and it won't mean a thing. None of the bills worries me.

And to add to this un-American attitude:

To hell with them, the U.S. Senate.

I have been a friend of labor and labor unions, yet not unfriendly to industry. More industry in my areas means more jobs for my people and a better standard of living. I hope the above excerpts from the controversial antiracketeering bill show conclusively that this act is the best protection the individual worker can have. Our workers need organization, but they need organization without exploitation.

I shall continue to be alert to the problems of our workers and will always fight against the infiltration of Johnny Dio's and Jimmy Hoffa's, and others who would misguide and misuse the laboring man, into our areas of the South. Do not forget that Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, our present nominee for the highest office of the United States, said he knew something must be done to protect the workingman from such unscrupulous labor bosses and he, as well as our two Louisiana Senators and every Louisiana Member of the House, voted for the Landrum-Griffin antiracketeering bill on final passage.

Federal Tax Deduction as Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will aid taxpayers in their endeavors to provide education for their children and themselves. No grant or loan by the Federal Government is provided for in this bill. Assistance is provided in the form of an income tax deduction for a taxpayer to the extent of $600 paid by him for tuition for each dependent or himself. This deduction will be available for those taxpayers whose dependents attend private, parochial, secondary school, college, or university, and who are required to pay tuition.

Our country is the greatest in the world in the production of goods and in its material wealth. Our position in the field of education is a matter of speculation. Certain critics, notably Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who studied the Russian educational system, assert that we are falling behind the Russians in this field. In any event, room for improvement exists not only in facilities and curriculum, but also in the availability of education. Reliable reports disclose that some brilliant students are denied higher educational opportunities for lack of funds. Others are denied educational opportunities for lack of facilities. Others are compelled to attend private or parochial schools because public facilities are overcrowded or unavailable. In many instances, taxpayers, because of the high cost of education, cannot afford the tuition for more than one of their children; and, consequently, the younger ones suffer. With the increasing cost of tuition, the burden on the taxpayer has grown heavier. The situation cries for remedy.

My bill provides a remedy. It provides assistance to the taxpayer without resorting to the timeworn remedy of more money. My bill will indirectly relieve municipalities of some of their burdens by diverting some of the students to private schools and will reduce to an extent the requirement of increased taxes to finance education.

Great Challenge to the U.N.—Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend to the serious study of my colleagues and to our policy planners in the State Department an article by Representative CHESTER BOWLES in the August 21 edition of the New York Times magazine, called "Great Challenge to the U.N.—Africa."

Congressman BOWLES is concerned that the continent of Africa is going to become subject to the most disruptive pressures of the cold war. Its galloping problems are grave enough without compounding the seriousness of them by bringing the cold war infighting to Africa.

Therefore, Mr. BOWLES, with his usual clarity of insight, proposes a program that would keep Africa out of the cold war by having the United Nations administer the help that the new nations need. His plan is imaginative; it is highly necessary; and, most important, it is workable. Further, it is not a negative, stopgap program, but rather a positive one of action.

This is a most judicious and statesmanlike article and 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:

GREAT CHALLENGE TO THE U.N.—AFRICA—MR. BOWLES OFFERS A PROGRAM THAT, HE SAYS, WOULD KEEP THAT EXPLOSIVE CONTINENT OUT OF THE COLD WAR BY HAVING THE U.N. ADMINISTER THE HELP ITS NEW NATIONS NEED

(By CHESTER BOWLES)

The recent explosion in the Congo, like a flare in a darkened sky, shows up the extent and depth of Africa's problems and the pressing need for bold American initiative in establishing a new relationship with that continent.

Africa's vast potential would be of enormous importance to the world even if the contest between freedom and communism did not exist. But if Africa, with all its tribal turmoil, nationalistic fervor and political confusion, is allowed to drift into the vortex of the cold war, the world is in for a time of troubles, the dimensions of which are appalling.

The land area of Africa is greater than that that of China, the United States and India together. Although Africa's resources are only partially explored, they probably rival those of both the Soviet Union and China combined. With a highly favorable ratio of population to land and mineral resources, the long-range outlook for African economic development is auspicious indeed. The Communist nations, keenly aware of Africa's promise, have already been moving, as in Guinea, Sudan, and the Congo, to fill the vacuum left by the forces of European colonialism, which are now in precipitate retreat. Meanwhile, American foreign policy is caught uncertainly between fear of offending our European allies and a belated but growing awareness of the powerful economic and political tides which are sweeping Africa.

The difficulties which have faced our allies have, of course been enormous, as they adjusted to changing relationships with their former colonies. There are obvious exceptions but in many instances they have acted responsibly and ahead of events. The British followed their dignified withdrawal from India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon with an equally dignified transfer of power in Ghana and, soon, in Nigeria, Tanganyika and Uganda. General de Gaulle's imaginative offer of freedom to the French colonies in West and Central Africa was a farsighted act of a great European statesman. Therefore, no blanket indictment is justified.

But the truth of the matter is that events in Africa have taken our Government by surprise. As late as 1955, our missions south of the Sahara were still living largely in a colonial dream world. Of the four American consuls general whom I met there in the winter of that year, only one had ever had a black African to dinner. Our African service itself was very nearly nonexistent. Even those few officials assigned to Africa, with some notable exceptions, appeared oblivious to the clearly foreseeable series of explosions that lay ahead.

Thus, when the French suddenly left Guinea in 1958, we could think of nothing more affirmative to do than to await developments. The developments included a rapid influx of Soviet, East German, Czechoslovak, and Hungarian technicians and capital. In all fairness, I must add that our policymakers, however belatedly, are now making rapid progress in creating and training a new and promising African service.

Yet without clear, courageous policy direction, acutely sensitive to the special requirements and hard realities of the emerging new Africa, our ablest representatives will fail.

What then should be the basic ingredients of a fresh and affirmative American

approach to Africa? The first essential is that we know precisely what we seek.

We have no desire or need to control Africa, even if we could. Our national economic and political interests, as well as the long liberal traditions of our democratic society, all point in the direction of a constructive partnership with free, independent, politically stable, prosperous new African nations. Such a partnership would assure open trade and communications with Africa and the friendship and respect of the African people in promoting our common objectives of world stability, prosperity and peace.

What about Soviet objectives in Africa? The leaders in the Kremlin have made it abundantly clear that their end goal is not cooperation but domination. Behind all the blandishments, their objective in Africa as elsewhere is total economic and political control, achieved by whatever techniques of subversion, nuclear brinkmanship or military adventure may appear most effective at the moment.

Now if this is a realistic comparison of American and Soviet objectives, the deep-seated potential strength of our position in Africa comes into clear focus. Our position there can be made strong because what we want for Africa is more or less precisely what the Africans want for themselves. The Soviet position, on the other hand, is inherently weak because Soviet objectives directly oppose the dream of the newly free African peoples for national independence and the opportunity to make their own political and economic choices.

Although the advantage that these common objectives give us is very great, it must be grasped with sensitivity and courage, or the opportunity for creative action will be lost forever. To meet the requirements of the emerging new Africa, it will not be enough simply to stretch policies and procedures that have been proving increasingly inadequate elsewhere.

For instance, both American and African interests will be best served by keeping Africa as free as possible from the tensions of the cold war. Although this will be a formidable task, there are unique circumstances that provide a measure of solid hope that it may be accomplished.

The key lies in the capacity of the United Nations to take the lead in filling the economic and political vacuum in Africa and in the exceptional readiness of most Africans to accept the United Nations in such a role.

Thus the starting point for an affirmative new American policy in Africa should be a dramatically expanded concept of the United Nations' contribution—a contribution that would include not only internal and external security, but also economic progress and orderly political transition. This fresh approach could be dramatized effectively by the introduction of an American-sponsored resolution at the fall session of the General Assembly proposing a charter of conduct for all non-African powers in Africa.

Such a charter should be far more than a negative statement of what the great powers agree not to do in Africa. It would propose that all members of the United Nations agree to a broad-scale course of constructive economic and political action that will assure the independence of the new African nations, encourage their orderly political and economic development, and relieve them in large measure of the pulling and hauling of the cold war.

A commitment of this kind would enable the more developed nations to help meet Africa's vast and varied needs through the neutral machinery of the United Nations, rather than through the dangerously volatile competition of the power blocs, which has kept the world on the brink of war in the Middle East and in southeast Asia.

Let us examine more precisely what some of those commitments might be.

(1) A pledge by all nations to refrain from agitating propaganda within Africa and to end all efforts at direct or indirect subversion. The United Nations could be authorized to investigate all charges of violation and to report to the General Assembly.

(2) A similar agreement not to feed the arms race in Africa. In present circumstances the actual military needs of the new African nations are modest. It is to our advantage and that of the Africans to keep them so. Such a pledge might build on the foundation of Prime Minister Macmillan's presummit proposal for a NATO-Soviet agreement not to ship additional arms to Africa except those minimal amounts clearly necessary for internal security.

(3) An agreement by the great powers to channel the bulk of all economic, technical, and educational assistance to Africa through the United Nations. The essential machinery already exists in the U.N. specialized agencies, the Technical Assistance Administration, the Special Fund, the World Bank, and the new International Development Association. What is needed now is the will to substitute this international machinery to the maximum possible extent for the well-worn path of bilateral aid, which inevitably introduces the competition of the cold war.

The World Bank under Eugene Black and the U.N. Special Fund under Paul Hoffman have a particularly important role to play in Africa in planning national and regional development projects and in raising the necessary funds from public and private sources. Transportation and communications are largely undeveloped in Africa. Resources are plentiful, but precise knowledge is limited and access to them is often poor. Most of the conditions for rational and fruitful economic development are lacking.

The proposed charter would specify that the necessary leadership and coordination should largely be provided by international agencies which, because they have no political axes to grind, would have the confidence of the African governments.

(4) An imaginative and comprehensive effort through a newly created United Nations civil service to meet Africa's overriding need for experienced administrators, technicians, engineers, teachers, and professional men of all sorts—outside the context of the cold war. Although lack of able personnel is common to all underdeveloped nations it is acute beyond all degree in Africa, where such positions have long been filled, almost exclusively, by Europeans of the mother countries.

Precise figures do not exist, but it has been estimated that in 1958 some 30,000 European civil servants occupied administrative and technical positions in the various African governments, colonial and otherwise. Many of these civil servants have already left Africa and others are preparing to leave. Although most of those who may be induced to remain are uniquely qualified through their familiarity with the technical aspects of African problems, they will continue to work under the disadvantage of their former colonial associations.

Yet, for a generation or more, non-African civil servants, working under African policymakers, will be essential to the rapid economic and political development of the African nations. The essential question is, where will those non-Africans be recruited? To whom will they owe their first loyalties? Will they help bring the cold war to Africa? Or will they serve the cause of international cooperation and understanding?

In 1958 the United Nations developed a small program called Operational and Executive Personnel (OPEX) to help supply administrative, technical and operating personnel to underdeveloped countries. On the request of an underdeveloped nation, OPEX attempts to find a person with the necessary qualifications who is politically acceptable to the host country. Once the new employee has been agreed upon, OPEX makes up the difference between the salary and benefits which he would receive in his home country and the salary and benefits normally provided by the underdeveloped country.

This machinery provides the ideal answer to the administrative shortage now existing in much of Africa. The proposed United Nations charter for Africa should call for its immediate and massive expansion. The U.N. civil service could provide an exciting new future for thousands of men and women of all nationalities qualified in industrial development, tax collection, clerical and office management, school administration and teaching, agriculture, village development and police administration. It could bring to Africa the skilled administrators who are urgently needed, free both of political involvement in the new African nations and of direct involvement in the cold war.

(5) The establishment of a permanent U.N. Police Force for use in Africa and elsewhere along the lines of that at present being shaped in the Congo. Such a force now represents the major hope of the new Congolese nation for internal security and national unity. Similar tensions are certain to develop in other areas not only as an aftermath of the withdrawal of European control, but also as conflicts develop among the new African nations themselves.

In West Africa, for instance, colonial access to the sea and a delicate balancing between great powers were the determining factors in establishing borders. This resulted in strips of territory such as Togoland and Dahomey, and enclaves such as Gambia, in which tribal, ethnic and language groups were abruptly severed by diplomatic agreements in faraway capitals.

A map of existing African loyalties superimposed on a map of national boundaries, therefore, produces a crazy quilt of overlapping and intersecting lines. This situation has already led to considerable friction as various federations have been proposed, announced and dissolved.

It is not for the United Nations to decide the outcome of these matters—either to insure the status quo or to promote changes, however wise they may appear to be. This is a matter solely for the Africans themselves. However, it is a proper and essential objective of the United Nations to prevent such situations from exploding into violence and particularly to prevent the great powers from intervening in behalf of one side or the other.

The existence of an adequate U.N. Police Force, recruited largely by the African nations themselves, could do much to reduce the temptation for direct unilateral military intervention from outside.

(6) The proposed African charter might also provide for the setting up of a special African court of justice, perhaps associated with the World Court, and specifically empowered to settle disputes between African nations and between African states and outside nations. Such a court, with its members drawn largely but not exclusively from the African nations, would provide an additional barrier to outside intervention—provided the African powers could be induced to accept its jurisdiction without too many qualifications.

I do not suggest that the United Nations can successfully shoulder all the problems of the turbulent new Africa. However, I believe it can provide by all odds the most effective machinery through which to approach these problems while isolating them from the explosive antagonisms of the cold war.

The sense of vigorous purpose that a bold new leadership role in Africa could bring to the United Nations could at the same time greatly increase the U.N.'s own prestige and effectiveness in speeding orderly development and in settling conflicts in other parts of the world.

Now let us frankly face the question of costs and alternatives.

The charter I have proposed calls for an unprecedented expansion of United Nations powers and responsibilities in Africa. The annual cost would amount to several hundred million dollars annually, much of which would be paid by the United States. The alternative, however, is not isolationist, inexpensive inaction. The alternative is a vast expansion of the cold war in Africa, in which American dollars will be increasingly matched against Russian rubles, American engineers against Russian engineers, and, eventually, American-made tanks against Soviet tanks.

Unless we are prepared to sit idly by while much of the world's richest and most promising continent becomes a bloody political and economic vacuum that ultimately will be filled by the Communists, this means that a major investment of American dollars and energies will be required in any event. The only practical question, therefore, is how can our dollars and our energies most effectively be brought to bear?

How would the Soviet Union react to the comprehensive United Nations charter for Africa which I have proposed? The Kremlin's dilemma in considering this question would be considerable.

The prestige of the United Nations in Africa is very great. By 1962 nearly one-third of the seats in the General Assembly will be occupied by Africans. If the Kremlin accepted our challenge to deal with Africa largely through the U.N., it would greatly limit, if not actually shackle, its program of subversion and infiltration there. If it rejected the proposal, or hedged its acceptance with political counterproposals, its true imperialistic objectives in Africa would become clear even to the most wishful thinkers in Léopoldville, Addis Ababa, Conakry and elsewhere.

In that case, much of the non-Communist world might still agree to proceed with most, if not all, of the proposed charter commitments I have suggested, including the U.N. police force, emphasis on U.N. multilateral development planning and aid the U.N. civil service and the special African court of justice.

If the Soviet Union still chose actively to oppose even these limited United Nations efforts, it would come into direct conflict not simply with America but with most of the non-Communist world. In those limited areas in Africa where the Kremlin was still able to operate unilaterally, it would be struggling—under the most adverse conditions—against the powerful flood tide of African nationalism which, with strong Asian and Latin American support, would be vigorously represented in the General Assembly of the U.N.

This brings me to the final decisive question: Is our own Government prepared to abandon our present inadequate and sterile approach to Africa and embark on a bold new effort in positive international cooperation there? Is it ready to regain the initiative in world affairs that we held in the days of the Marshal plan, to shake off our day-by-day obsession with Mr. Khrushchev's oratory and maneuvers, and to challenge the world through the U.N. General Assembly to a new cooperative beginning in the great African Continent?

If we timidly turn our back on this opportunity, only one thing is certain: Africa will rapidly become an ominous new battleground of the cold war, with explosively uncertain results. Let us hope, therefore, that we act positively, wisely, boldly, and soon.

Louisiana State Winner in National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o Again From Third Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor of representing, has produced for the third successive year the State champion in the National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Bill Vincent, 17, son of Mr. and Mrs. Britton Vincent, of Lafayette, senior and honor student at Lafayette High School, the Louisiana winner for 1960, has been in Washington for the finals of the ninth annual road-e-o. He finished first in the State competition at Ruston where approximately 50 victors in local contests participated. Jimmy W. Carter was State chairman.

Forty-eight State champions took part in the Washington events in which they were tested on their attitudes and their knowledge of road rules, given a driving machine test, interviewed and required to negotiate successfully four tricky obstacle courses in the District of Columbia Armory and a 6-mile run through District traffic. After all scores were compiled, prizes of $2,000, $1,500, and $1,000 scholarships were awarded to first, second, and third place winners respectively during a banquet at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, road-e-o headquarters. The Louisiana champion made a very good showing, placing 16th among the 48 contestants.

Young Price was accompanied to Washington by Donald E. Butcher, also of Lafayette, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Butcher, of that city, a director of the Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce and local road-e-o chairman. Others in the Lafayette group visiting Washington were Mrs. Elden Butcher and Miss Gloria Foreman.

Bill brought with him for President Eisenhower a gold Lagcoe oil hat which had been presented to Bill for this purpose at a petroleum club luncheon in Lafayette by Leo Franques, chairman of the Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition. With the hat, symbolizing the Louisiana oil industry, the exposition, and Lafayette's position as the oil center of the South, was a scroll which read:

The Louisiana oil industry and its biennial exhibition, the Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition, is deeply honored to present this token of esteem to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, accompanied by our most sincere wishes for a long and happy future, and a most cordial invitation to attend the Fourth Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition in October of 1961 at Lafayette, center of petroleum activity in the south of Louisiana, our Nation's greatest producer of petroleum per acre.

The scroll was signed by Chairman Franques; Maurice Heymann, developer of the Heymann Oil Center at Lafayette; and Sidney C. Ory, president of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce.

Through arrangements made by my office the presentation took place at the White House where Bill and Donald were received by Secretary of the Cabinet Robert K. Gray who accepted the hat and scroll in behalf of the President.

The Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce, with a membership of around 40 young men active in community affairs, sponsors numerous civic projects in addition to the safe driving competition which is open to both boys and girls. Cary Moore is president and the other officers, in addition to Donald Butcher, are Lionel Prejean, first vice president; Alvin O'Fleurty, second vice president; Earl Grand, secretary; Scott O. Brame, treasurer; and Tom Rogers, I. J. Mires, and Noel Diuffrida, board of directors. Formed several years ago, the organization meets for a luncheon program on the first Wednesday of each month and gathers for a night meeting on the third Wednesday.

In 1958 Louisiana was represented in the road-e-o finals in Washington by State champion Raymond Albert Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Young, of Centerville, who was accompanied by Ted L. McIntyre, son of Mr. and Mrs. F. P. McIntyre, of Franklin, representing the Franklin Junior Chamber of Commerce as a member of the board of directors.

Last year's Louisiana champion also came from the Third Congressional District. Bill Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. Pierre W. Young, of Lafayette, competed in the Washington finals. Accompanying him was Cary Moore, son of Guilliam Moore and the late Mrs. Moore, who is head of the Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce of which at that time he was vice president and local road-e-o chairman.

Harry D. Strunk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I learned the news on Saturday, August 6, of the passing of my good friend and the great reclamation leader of Nebraska, Harry D. Strunk of McCook.

I have known Harry Strunk for many, many years. During all of this time he was an outstanding and vigorous fighter for the development of sound and practical reclamation projects and flood control in the Republican Valley. His efforts were ceaseless and his devotion to this cause complete.

I suppose it was the great Republican River flood of 1935 which claimed over 100 lives that caused Harry Strunk to strike out so vigorously and so unceasingly for better protection for his neighbors. That may have been the trig-

gering reason; but he had always held a deep and abiding interest in flood control and in the development of sound, economic reclamation projects.

But in the middle thirties Harry Strunk started to wage a war which was still the center of his whole being the day he passed from us to his reward. Many of my colleagues who have sat on the Public Works and Appropriations Committees will remember him well. They will recall the long, lean, and weathered figure which appeared before their committees year after year. They will remember the intense face, the vigorous and eloquent speech. Most of all, though, they will remember the fire which burned throughout his being and the force that drove him, which he could so easily communicate to others.

Harry Strunk grew up in the newspaper business and for many years published the McCook Gazette at McCook, Nebr. He wielded a strong force in his community and his State, and became a potent force in the Nation in his efforts to broaden the concept of reclamation and to further the cause of flood control. Though primarily interested in the Republican River Valley, Harry Strunk worked diligently and hard for reclamation and flood control everywhere. No farmer in the reclamation States nor a single flood-threatened family anywhere in America had a better, truer friend. Their needs were his; their fears were likewise his.

He has created a living memorial to himself in the development of the Republican River Valley. But even at the close of his career he knew that his work was not done and he was still fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say how deeply I will miss the presence of this great man. I cannot express in words my own feelings completely. Let me say only that a great and fighting heart has stopped beating and that his absence will be felt.

Memorial Tribute to Philip B. Perlman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago one of the greatest champions of civil rights that this country has ever known passed away—former U.S. Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman. Over the last two decades Philip Perlman had held many positions of great responsibility and had distinguished himself in all of them.

It was, for example, he who presented the restrictive covenant cases to the Supreme Court in 1947. The subsequent ruling in 1949 constituted an important milestone in the abolition of legal sanction for segregation.

While I had been fully aware of his vigorous and aggressive role for years in the struggle to stamp out racial discrimination and assure all Americans equal rights under the law, it was only recently my great privilege to serve with him on the Platform Committee of the National Democratic Convention in Los Angeles and to watch at close range his brilliant and incisive mind in action as the cochairman of that committee. Little could I know or suspect that this was to be his last contribution to that cause.

Time and again throughout our deliberations and the drafting of the platform, as throughout his entire career, he revealed himself as a prodigious and diligent defender of the downtrodden, as an uncompromising protector of those people who have been the victims of prejudice. I am profoundly humbled by the opportunity and the experience of having shared in so small a way in the creation of that document, so appropriately entitled "The Rights of Man," which is an enduring monument to his memory.

Philip Perlman's passing is an irretrievable loss to the Democratic Party and indeed to the American people.

Camp Wigwam for Boys—A Half Century of Service to the Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 1960 camping season, Camp Wigwam for Boys, located in Harrison, Maine, will have completed a half century of service to the youth of America. Established in 1910 by Arnold M. Lehman and Abraham Mandelstam, this outstanding camp is still piloted under the direction of its founders, and it has deservedly gained an enviable nationwide reputation as one of the leading private camps of our country. The engaging and implementing talents, characteristics, and abilities of "Pop" Lehman and "Mandy" have been sources of delightful jibe and playful comment by Wigwam staff members and generations of Wigwam campers, who have come away from their experience at Wigwam with lifelong respect for these two great educators and the ideas which they have put to work at their renowned Camp Wigwam. I served as a staff member at Wigwam for several years in the 1930's, and I recall my association with the camp as a worthful and many-faceted experience.

By the early introduction of cultural and artistic interests to go hand in hand with the physical and recreational aspects of the camping experience, Camp Wigwam has proved to be in the fullest and truest sense a pioneer that has now grown to be a tremendously important phase in the life of America's youth. It has blazed trails where there were once no trails at all, thus laying the foundation for a movement of national proportions in the field of education. It has taught the importance of active and democratic participation in community affairs. It has encouraged the development of leadership qualities, and it has thereby contributed to the greatness of our Nation and its freedom loving people.

Almost every State in the Union is today represented by the Camp Wigwam's alumni. Included among many others are such persons as Richard Rogers, composer and producer; Frank Loesser, librettist, composer, lyricist, and producer; William Zeckendorf, Sr., of the real estate firm of Webb and Knapp; Arthur Loesser, head of the Cleveland Conservatory of Music; and U.S. District Court Judge Charles Wyzanski, of Boston.

Among Camp Wigwam's staff members have been Mortimer Adler, educator and author; Dr. Leon J. Saul, author and internationally prominent psychiatrist; the late Clyde Fisher, curator in chief of the American Museum of Natural History; and Prof. Richard B. Morris, head of the History Department, Columbia University, and editor of the Encyclopedia of American History. Among the distinguished individuals who have spent entire seasons as honored guests at Camp Wigwam are the late Leopold Godowsky, composer and pianist; the late Josef Hofmann, world famous pianist. Another distinguished person who has visited at Camp Wigwam is former Premier Mendes-France of France. The two mentioned last entrusted their children to Camp Wigwam as campers.

Founded at a time when psychologists such as Freud, Jung, and Adler were drawing attention to the significance of emotional factors in the education of youth and in the moulding of healthy and well integrated personalities, Camp Wigwam has been among the first camps, if not the very first one, harmoniously to balance a boy's physical activities against his need for appropriate esthetic outlets and educational interests. This has been accomplished partly through the introduction of art, music, theater, and other means of esthetic stimulation. In the rustic setting of Camp Wigwam, its founders and directors have been able to inculcate young people with a more sensitive appreciation of those finer values which lead to an integrated life. At the same time, it has provided them with abundant opportunities for thriving physically in a wholesome atmosphere stimulated by closeness to nature. By being fortunate enough to get youngsters at the formative stage of their intellectual and emotional development, Camp Wigwam has been able to guide them into healthy adulthood and to infuse them with a sense of belonging and of sound democratic citizenship. In this manner, it has constantly furthered a tremendously worthwhile national camping movement that today is invested with a broad cultural and educational rather than solely recreational significance, geared to the needs of the individual youngster and his adjustment to conditions prevailing in an ever changing world.

Stockpiling for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting and informative letter signed by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY, and appearing in the New York Times of July 20, 1960. There is no man better versed in the needs and necessities of the agricultural life of our Nation, and in connection with the legislation relating to agriculture, than Mr. COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture:

STOCKPILING FOR SURVIVAL—NIXON FOOD BANK PLAN DECLARED IN PAST REJECTED BY ADMINISTRATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Many newspapers recently have given generous emphasis to the idea of a world food bank administered by the United Nations, and a suggestion that our great stocks of food be stored close to the centers of population, against the emergency needs of our people in the event of a nuclear attack.

This affirmative interest is encouraging to those of us in the Congress who, along with the President and the various executive departments, have the responsibility for developing, and for effective administration of, the Nation's food policy, including the sharing of our abundance with friendly peoples in other countries.

I regret, however, that these propositions of such great meaning had received so little attention in the press until Vice President NIXON, in a recent North Dakota speech, threw them into the political arena. Actually, they have been proposed in the Congress and in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for more than a decade. Both propositions have been rejected by the Eisenhower administration.

U.N. EFFORTS

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization made two attempts, in 1947 and 1949, to develop a world food bank. On each occasion they failed to gather sufficient support among the exporting nations. Subsequently, several congressional resolutions, by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and others, were introduced, proposing a world food bank. A spokesman for the Eisenhower administration testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May of 1956: "We see no need for the proposed world food bank." On June 27 Secretary of Agriculture Benson said: "The already burdened American taxpayer will question the vision of a world food bank which would require Uncle Sam to provide the stocks, the storage, and the cost of carrying the wheat."

In 1957, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I appointed a special subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York, for the specific purpose of examining our food preparedness for civilian survival in the event of war.

This subcommittee, on July 17, 1957, following public hearings, issued a report finding that, "In the event of nuclear war, the United States is utterly without a plan to immediately feed its civilian population, including its territories and possessions." It recommended that the Government move swiftly "to assure that emergency stocks of food commodities will be available at accessible locations as reserves against possible disaster."

ADEQUATE FOOD

Just recently, before Mr. NIXON made his speech, I made inquiry of the Department of Agriculture as to what has been done with respect to stockpiling. On June 7 I received the following from that Department's Food and Materials Division:

"This Department has made a number of studies of the effects that various types of enemy attacks would have on the food situation and has come to the conclusion that there is and would be adequate food in the Nation after an attack without Government stockpiling."

It is surprising that Mr. NIXON now seems totally unaware that his administration has consistently opposed these two propositions he now proposes as his "farm plank."

I hope that, with the help of the Times and of our other great newspapers, large and small, we shall be able to make determinations with respect to a world food policy and to stockpiling for survival, in the best interest of this Nation and the world, and that these undertakings of such moment will not be lost in the confusion and bitterness of partisan politics.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture.

WASHINGTON, *July 8, 1960.*

National Defense in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the July 21 session of the 1960 Pennsylvania State Convention of the American Legion Auxiliary at Philadelphia, Pa., presided over by department president, Mrs. Mary W. Dague, wife of Representative PAUL B. DAGUE of the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. The convention was well attended and reflected the fine leadership furnished by Mrs. Dague in the role of department president.

My address, titled "National Defense in the Nuclear Age," follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

(Address delivered by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, of the 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Pennsylvania State Convention of the American Legion Auxiliary, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 21)

It gives me great pleasure to participate in your 1960 convention and to speak to you on a problem in which we are all vitally interested.

As many of you know I have long been active in organized veterandom with the result that I am conscious of the great work which you do to keep shining and bright the ideals and objectives of the American Legion.

They are ideals for which so many of our brethren have given all they could offer at freedom's shrine—their lives.

The efforts of all of us have been directed toward the creation of a better world for all the peoples of the earth.

Here in this decade of 1960—just begun—we have vast horizons before us—horizons of great hope—and horizons of just as great fear and dread.

It used to be—not so very long ago in time—although far distant in space—that we of America knew no such great fears for our future.

We were able to isolate ourselves from the troubles of the rest of the world.

At that time it appeared to be of no immediate concern to us if European nations were devastating each other—or that whites were enslaving blacks in Africa.

We were above the common herd—shielded from the sounds of battle by our great ocean barriers.

We found more time to work out our own domestic problems, to build our Nation, to dream of the future.

Many of you here tonight saw the first sign that our impenetrable defenses were no longer able to assure us safety in 1917.

Residents of this eastern seaboard of the United States could look out and see ships burning—ships sunk by enemy U-boats at our very doorsteps.

Modern technology had breached the walls of "fortress America."

But it took us longer to learn the lessons that "the war to end wars" could teach.

It even took a war far more devastating, catastrophic, and universal, a war that even more of us remember only to well.

World War II witnessed the deaths of 30 million people and great damage to civilization.

But it really took a bright flash of atomic light at Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, to tell us that, like the French Maginot line, our impregnable defenses were now no more useful than a suit of armor against a bazooka. The nuclear age had dawned, with the horizons of new advances for all mankind.

But we also know that as many people as have been killed in all wars that man has undergone for thousands of years now could be turned back into dust and ashes in the time that it takes to hear a sound, look into the sky, and start to pray.

The atom is a substance of such worth and value to a strife-torn world.

But, in the wrong hands it is a weapon that could truly end all wars because there might no longer be anyone alive to fight.

The advent of nuclear weapons in combination with the fact that aggression, conquest, and war were not ended with the destruction of Berlin and the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have kept us from retreating back into our shell.

The job of guarding liberty and freedom for all mankind has been placed irrevocably on our shoulders.

There is no turning back.

As the guardian of free men everywhere we have witnessed with dismay the Red tide that since World War II has engulfed its neighbors, turned them from free men into slaves, and found one-third of the world behind the curtains of communism.

We are all familiar with Korea, Indochina, Laos, Tibet, Hungary, Berlin, and many more outrages that have been committed in the name of Marxism.

Since Stalin the pace of outright and brawling aggression has slowed a bit because new tactics have been tried.

Premier Khrushchev has posed as the friend of peace but it has been only a shield behind which the plan of world conquest is just as much of a reality as ever.

We have seen this same Premier Khrushchev deliberately wreck the summit meeting when he knew he could get no concessions from the free world in his efforts to trample on the rights and freedoms of men in Berlin.

We can see right now the efforts of Mao Tse-Tung to forestall any chance of real peace in the Far East.

We can see Communist rioting against the freely elected Government of Japan using student grievances and the desire for peace for Communist purposes.

And right at our doorstep we can view the Cuban revolution gone astray, opening wide its arms to the so-called blessings of Communist dictatorship.

We know that our own defense is permanently tied to the defense of our allies; a danger to one of us is a danger to us all.

The attacks of communism are coming thick and fast and in a variety of shapes and forms.

In the days of Stalin the threats were more readily recognizable.

His imperialism was not nearly as subtle as that of the present Red leadership.

Instead of outright aggression and subversion we now have so-called volunteers, aid programs, trade agreements, technical assistance, defense pacts, and insidious propaganda, all these besides old military and espionage activities.

We have learned that in order to achieve the final victory we must meet the challenge on thousands of military, economic, and psychological battlefields at home and abroad.

Now we come to the question of the specific threats that Red aggression presents to the security of this Nation.

First of all we must be prepared to meet the Russians on every level and in every form of large-scale thermonuclear warfare.

The full-scale world wars that may come in the future will not be fought with bayonets and machineguns, foxholes, and tanks.

Numerical superiority of manpower will not be of decisive importance in determining the outcome of such a war.

Instead, I can see these future global wars—if the come to us—being fought from continent to continent with ICBM's and from mobile bases in the seas to targets in the enemy lands.

I can see the cities of our world being laid waste by a single flash on a beautiful morning.

The whole world will be the battlefield and every human being, whether soldier or civilian, whether combatant or neutral, whether man, woman, or child, will be the potential victim.

The Soviet Union always keeping before it the vision of world conquest through nuclear warfare has bent every effort to the task of surpassing the United States in thermonuclear capability.

These nuclear weapons possess for aggressors like the Soviets many advantages not found in conventional methods of warfare.

From a few mobile and stationary bases it is possible to cover the entire globe.

There is a great ability to shift rapidly from one target to another.

Because there are degrees in levels of nuclear power there is great flexibility in the adaptation of weapons to meet specific strategic requirements.

The use of nuclear weapons offers the potentiality of complete surprise, destroying a nation's defenses before it is able to retaliate.

The use of nuclear weapons also has a great psychological impact upon the potential or actual victims of such a disaster.

And, last but not least, nuclear weapons offer the allurement of cheap world conquest.

The Soviets understand very well how nuclear weapons fit into their plans for world conquest.

They have been building fixed missile bases in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries.

Their recent tests in the Pacific show the potential range of their intercontinental ballistic missiles.

At the same time the Soviets have been continually modernizing and augmenting their air force.

But, most importantly of all, the Russians have been equipping a submarine fleet whose missiles point like daggers at every strategic area in the United States.

In order to guarantee our national survival we must be able to control not only the sea but the world beneath the surface of the sea.

The Reds have more than 450 submarines, 10 times the number of German U-boats which devastated allied transport in World War II.

They have launched a nuclear submarine program, with at least five under construction.

Just a few of these subs, equipped with missiles comparable to our Polaris, will place most of our Nation in danger of complete devastation in the event of war.

We must remember that we are far more vulnerable than the Russians to such a full-scale nuclear attack.

Our industries are far more concentrated—43 of our 50 largest cities and 85 percent of our industrial might is located within 500 miles of our coasts.

The Russians, on the other hand, have dispersed their industry from Minsk to Vladivostok, besides the fact that most of their big cities are located in inland locations far removed from the sea.

The ballistics missile has thus added a new dimension to the threat of submarine warfare.

Not only could attack submarines cripple our Navy and merchant marine, but these new missile subs possess the capacity to launch attacks upon our cities at will.

There is no doubt that America is greatly endangered by this ability of the Russians to launch a full-scale nuclear war at the slightest whim of the Soviet dictatorship.

The Communists know that the rest of the free world will surrender automatically if the United States is conquered; they would have no other choice.

What keeps the Russians from starting such a war?

The only defense we at present possess is our ability to retaliate.

The Russians possess far more freedom of decision than we have.

Our Defense Department cannot just blithely push a button and start a war without any responsibility to the millions of people in the United States whom this act might doom.

We must show the Russians that they would gain no advantage from attacking us.

We cannot be sure that it will do any good to appeal to them on the grounds of the Russian lives that will be lost, we must demonstrate that our retaliation would destroy their power.

The Red Chinese, in particular, have never shown the slightest regard for human lives.

Mao Tse-tung has even boasted that even if 300 million Chinese were to be killed in a nuclear war there would be 300 million left.

The leaders of Red China, without any scruples or regard for human beings, actually regard nuclear war as an advantage.

With the atomic weapons that they will almost certainly develop within the next few years the Red Chinese could very easily initiate the destruction of all mankind in order to satisfy their own lust for power.

Besides the dangers of deliberate aggression there is the danger of accidental warfare.

Marshal Malinovsky, the very conspicuous companion of Khrushchev in Paris, has announced that Soviet missile bases will immediately strike with nuclear missiles at any foreign base sending planes over the Soviet Union.

This means that any trigger-happy Russian enlisted man could conceivably be able to start our destruction merely by pushing a button in a moment of panic.

These dangers are great and the United States must demonstrate that nuclear war would destroy the Communist world as readily as the free.

To prepare our defenses against nuclear war does not mean the abandonment of conventional arms.

We must also be prepared to meet the threats of communism on the level of limited warfare.

Every one of the conflicts, wars, and revolutions instigated by the Communists since World War II has been fought entirely by soldiers with conventional nonnuclear weapons.

Whatever the reasons up to this time the Russians have wished no more than we to turn Korea, Indochina, or any other area of conflict into the site for a nuclear holocaust.

Furthermore, as the Russians increase their arsenal of thermonuclear weapons, and as there is an increasing gradation of weapons power they will be able to take advantage of an increasing number of strategic options.

We must remember that the vaunted reduction of manpower taken by the Russion Army, which has been dictated largely by economic, not strategic, reasons will still leave the communist bloc with a marked numerical superiority in manpower over the armies of the free world.

The Reds have more than 11 million men ready to be used for any size or type of war that may be desired by their leaders.

The satellites, especially China, may be used for limited "safe" wars as in Korea, Indochina, Laos, and Tibet.

We have seen how the Russians have used "volunteers" in the past, the success of such tactics virtually assures that they will be utilized even more extensively in the future.

These armies may not even have to be used their threat could be enough to blackmail smaller powers on the Soviet periphery.

As the fear of nuclear power grows, as the nuclear race becomes more deadlocked, such small-scale aggressions grow ever more likely.

Therefore—we need to maintain our dual capability—it is imperative that we have armed forces with the most modern of conventional weapons that can meet the challenge of communist aggression anywhere in the world.

This, then, is the challenge—a challenge of great power in the hands of unscrupulous tyrants—a challenge that we can and must meet.

What have we done and what should we do?

Congress this year voted an appropriations bill for the Defense Department of more than $40 billion.

Included in this is $17,157 million for the Air Force; $12,109 million for the Navy and Marines; and $9,537 million for the Army.

We have attempted to meet all the complex needs of our national defense through these appropriations.

Included in this was $293 million for an aircraft carrier.

This new carrier—in combination with others that have been or are being built—will provide mobile oversea bases for our planes and missiles.

With fixed oversea bases becoming ever more vulnerable to enemy attack, these carriers, in combination with our submarine fleet, will be able to provide a far-reaching line of defense for our Nation.

Also included was $394 million for the construction of five submarines, with partial funds for starts on seven others.

I introduced a bill in 1958 to provide for the construction of 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines during a 5-year period.

This bill was unfortunately defeated, but we are doing some development of nuclear submarines.

At the same time the Navy has been conducting a highly successful series of Polaris missile tests.

When the United States possesses nuclear submarines capable of cruising under the arctic ice, as our *Skate* and *Nautilus* have already done, and able to fire missiles at the heart of Russia, the United States will have obtained a greater deterrent power.

In this bill was also included $190 million more than the administration request for development of the B–70.

The U–2 flights demonstrated the extreme vulnerability of Soviet defenses at heights over 50,000 feet.

The development of the B–70, which would cruise at 80,000 feet, would give us a full range of power.

In combination with our missile program this development will give us a deterrent power not readily ignored by the Soviets.

The B–70 will strengthen the power of our Strategic Air Command, which at the present is the first line of our air defense.

Congress has also considered the need for armed forces capable of fighting in limited wars.

Included in the appropriations bill was $1,537 million for modernization of the Army.

The Russians are equipping their army to fight both conventional and tactical nuclear wars.

We are at the present time equipping our troops with a wide range of the most modern conventional and tactical atomic weapons.

Research and development of new weapons are being continually carried on.

We have also voted funds for the acceleration of the Midas-Samos satellite programs.

It has long been evident that the United States depends greatly upon our intelligence services.

The Central Intelligence Agency has done a fine job of obtaining information from a nation closed to outsiders.

There is no doubt that the Soviet intelligence service has a far easier time of obtaining our vital secrets in our open society.

As our ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge has said: "The Russians have spied at heights far les than 70,000 feet."

It takes little effort of the memory to recall *Alger Hiss*, the Rosenbergs, Klaus Fuchs, or many others.

The Russians have used our freedoms to steal our secrets, subvert members of our society, turn our friends and allies against us, and overthrow our own free government by force.

Then to see the Communists don the veil of injured innocence would be almost comical if it were not such a serious matter.

The U–2 incident gave more emphasis to our need for accurate information if we are to survive as a free society.

Its usefulness is probably ended now but we need new sources of information.

The Midas and Samos satellites, equipped with all kinds of detection equipment, will not only help our intelligence, but will point to future uses in inspection of a possible disarmament program.

By these means we will be able to strengthen our Armed Forces for the struggle against communism wherever it may come.

We must be able to deter any type of attack.

For this task it is imperative that we possess the optimum in flexibility.

Therefore, we need a military organization which will be able to shift and maneuver to meet every strategic situation.

I introduced legislation to streamline the Defense Department and better coordinate its policies and practices.

For the organization must match in efficiency and modernity the weapons it dispatches and the men it controls.

The spectacle of Mr. K. at the summit, the ending of the disarmament talks by the Soviet walkout, demonstrate how important all of this is.

The world needs peace, the world needs disarmament.

But an agreement that we can be sure of must include the international control and inspection that the Soviets have thus far refused to concede.

We have had all too often examples of the bad faith and hypocrisy of the Communists in the past few months to accept their word that they have disarmed.

Until the Reds back up talk with constructive action toward peace we can only know them as the totalitarian aggressors—devoted to the task of world conquest—that they have always been.

But this is not all of our task.

It would be too easy to leave the whole job to the 2,800,000 boys in uniform and confine ourselves to remembering the wars in which we fought.

We must press forward the battle against communism on all fronts.

Military action must be augmented by action in other areas as well.

Just as our military power must be one of active deterrence so must we meet the threats of communism in the economic, ideological, and psychological spheres.

This is not the job for any one group but for all of us.

What we do will determine the future course of all mankind.

A great burden has been placed on our shoulders, the burden of billions of free people throughout the world.

We did not ask for it but it has come to us.

We are not defending our Nation alone but all men everywhere.

We cannot rest until there is peace, and happiness, and freedom for everyone.

For only then will we be really free from fear.

Yes, it was a long, long time ago, it seems, that America could go its own way in peace.

So much has happened since then to change the world.

We have seen it happen.

We saw the beginning of the struggle between communism and liberty and freedom but how will it end?

God grant that it does not end in a nuclear holocaust in which there might no longer be men to be either free or enslaved.

Let us dedicate ourselves in this decade of the 1960's to the horizons of hope that lie before us.

We must be ever vigilant until free men can once again be free of fear.

We can be, we must be, we will be strong.

It is through spiritual and material strength that we can preserve and protect not only our cherished ideals of liberty and freedom but aid in restoring them to many freedom-loving nations now in exile.

Therefore let us dedicate ourselves to America's awesome task hopeful that the day is not too distant when the atom's flash will bring light, not darkness, to the ends of the earth.

Tenth Anniversary of the Repeal of the 10-Cent-Per-Pound Tax on Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, July 1 was the 10th anniversary of the repeal by Congress of the 10-cent-per-pound tax on margarine. The passage of the National Margarine Act of 1950 marked the commencement of a period of fair competition for colored margarine in interstate commerce and in most States.

Production of margarine has increased from 862 million pounds in 1949 to the all-time high in 1959 or 1,611 million pounds. Production for the period January–April 1960 was 6.8 percent ahead of 1959.

The 10-year period since the repeal of the old Federal margarine taxes and restrictions has been marked by a growth in the acceptance of margarine. Per capita consumption, on a national average, has increased from 5.8 pounds per person in 1949 to 9.2 pounds per person in 1959.

During 1958, manufacturers in the margarine industry shipped products valued at $219 million, an increase of 10 percent over 1954, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce. Value added by the manufacturer, as adjusted, totaled $56.7 million, an increase of 29 percent since 1954. New capital expenditures in the margarine industry were reported by the Department of Commerce to be 3.4 million, an increase from 1954 of 127 percent. Figures are not available for other years.

The margarine industry is composed of firms of various sizes and types of enterprises, including small, family-owned firms. There are 32 firms with 60 plants producing margarine in the United States.

The chief ingredients of margarine are highly refined vegetable oils. American-produced soybean oil and cottonseed oil are the major vegetable oils used. Between 1949 and 1959 consumption of these oils almost doubled to reach 1,218 million pounds, refined basis. Further increases are expected. Corn and peanut oils are also used.

By far the largest source of fats and oils used in margarine is the American soybean. Soybean oil used in margarine reached a new peak of 1,094 million pounds—refined basis—in 1959 and constituted 85 percent of all the fats and oils used in margarine.

Ten years after the act of 1950 there are still restrictions on the sale and use of margarine. The consumer cannot buy colored margarine in Wisconsin and Minnesota. Six States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, Idaho, Utah, North and South Dakota—still maintain per-pound taxes. The U.S. Navy cannot buy margarine for table use, although the other branches of the military can. There are various restrictions in State laws on dealers, State institutions' use of the vegetable spread, and use by public eating places.

Major factors in the margarine outlook are continued population growth, plentiful supplies of major farm ingredients, a vigorously competitive industry, and continued increasing consumer acceptance that has raised per capita use levels for several years.

Margarine is 80 percent fat. The principal other ingredient is pasteurized, cultured skim milk. In 1959 margarine used an estimated 240 million

pounds of dry skim milk or its equivalent in fluid milk. Salt comprises about 2½ percent of the finished product.

All margarine is fortified to provide a minimum of 15,000 U.S.P. units of vitamin A. Some margarines add vitamin D also.

Port of New York Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the distinguished Representative from New York [JOHN H. RAY], who in his minority report holds that the majority of the Judiciary Committee is in error in recommending that contempt citations be issued against the chairman, S. Sloan Colt; the executive director, Austin J. Tobin; and the secretary, Joseph G. Carty, of the Port of New York Authority.

I agree with Congressman RAY that the action recommended by the majority of the Judiciary Committee would be unprecedented and unwise as a matter of Federal and State relations, as it is not sanctioned by law and might well be held unconstitutional.

The Port of New York Authority, which was created by the States of New York and New Jersey in keeping with an agreement validated by special legislation of each of those States, has been a great boon to the city of New York and to the surrounding metropolitan area. I mention this not because it affects the legality of the actions of the Port of New York Authority officials, but merely to indicate that the accomplishments of the port authority in solving the complex transport problems of a great city have been most effective.

The three men who are being considered for contempt citations by the Congress are extraordinarily outstanding citizens.

S. Sloan Colt not only has behind him a record of success in business enterprises, but has contributed immeasurably to the well-being of the city by his civic work in a number of areas. He works without compensation for the Port of New York Authority.

Austin J. Tobin, who has been with the Port of New York Authority for many years and is perhaps its most indispensable official, is a man of fine intellect and rare talent. His capacity for business administration is most unusual. His vision and imagination have done much to implement the objectives of the port authority, and New York is a better city because of his presence in it.

I do not know Joseph G. Carty personally, but it is fair to presume that, since he is an official of the port authority, he is a man of fine character and integrity.

When one recalls that Congress did not initiate or create the port authority, but merely gave its consent to the making of the compact, it appears that the Congress is stretching its authority in trying to supervise or regulate the activities of this bi-State agency.

Congress did reserve the right to amend, alter or repeal its resolution consenting to the compact, but it must be remembered that the compact itself can be altered only at the instance of the two States involved.

It must be remembered, too, that the three officials mentioned above appeared before the Judiciary Committee and delivered to that body all the minutes, financial reports, records, et cetera, authorizing official action. It was on the instructions of the Governors of the two States, New York and New Jersey, that the port authority officials declined to furnish the working papers and other internal studies which the committee requested. The Governors were acting in their lawful capacity as heads of two sovereign States.

It appears to me that the action recommended by the Judiciary Committee is in contradiction of the constitutional rights of the States concerned, and the committee therefore appears to be in error.

A Minimum Wage Law Does Not Square With Our U.S. Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, several years ago when the bill that placed the minimum wage at $1 per hour was voted on in the House, I voted for it, but after observing the operation of that law I have come to the conclusion I made a mistake in so doing.

The other body has recently passed a bill to raise the minimum to $1.25 per hour by degrees and to cover, under the law, some 4 million additional employees in private industry of most every nature, all of which in my studied opinion does not square with our free competitive private enterprise system.

From early boyhood and until I was elected to Congress, I worked for wages—as a farmhand, a muleskinner on a bridge building gang, a pearl button cutter, a tile ditch digger with a spade, a grocery clerk, a lumberyard man, and as manager of a retail lumberyard. Yes, and as a soldier for Uncle Sam, and since 46 years of age as a hired man in Congress for the people of the Seventh Iowa District and the Nation.

I know something about working for wages, so it is very natural that in the acid test, you will always find me in the hard working wage earner's corner.

Mr. Speaker, I learned early in life that there was no substitute for work, and that the only right and sure way to get a pay raise was to do a little more each day than the boss expected me to do. This holds true today, just as it has from the signing of our U.S. Constitution, which established our free competitive enterprise system, for not only the boss but for the hired man as well, and which made it possible for all men to be the masters of their own destiny—free to work and progress and enjoy the blessings of liberty; yes, or even to idle, go broke and suffer mental anguish, but not at the expense of the other fellow.

Let us not forget that when we place a floor under wages, by that very act we place a ceiling on wages for millions of employees who deserve more pay, especially in small businesses.

Many, many employers will be forced to make a choice under this new minimum wage law of either laying off the necessary number of lowest paid and lowest producers, or reduce the wages of the highest paid and highest producing employees in order to hold overhead down to the necessary point of enabling them to stay in business or, of course, he has the third choice of closing shop. Even that is still one of our American privileges.

Mr. Speaker, before the conference report on the wage hour bill comes back to the House for a vote, I invite all of my colleagues to ask one or a hundred wage earners who are now getting over $1.25 per hour, and they are in the great majority, if they would be willing to have their wages reduced in order to raise the pay of others now getting less than $1.25 per hour.

Remember, most every American wants to win his own spurs.

Congressman Levering Holds Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of my service in Congress, I have tried in every way possible to maintain a close contact with the people of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, who elected me to represent them.

From the first days of the 86th Congress, I have made regular radio speeches to my people, filling them in on the problems of government from week to week. I have circulated a weekly newsletter to the newspapers of my district so that the editors and the people would be able to understand the issues and the many views relating to them. I have had personal contact with thousands of members of the public from my district. I have corresponded with other thousands.

Last year I sat down with my constituents in every county of our district and listened to their views on national and international problems, as well as those of a personal nature. Because these grassroots conferences were so highly successful, I am again arranging a series of meetings in the courthouses of the

seven counties of the district and I am urging members of the public to come to these meetings and to talk over any and all subjects they choose. I am convinced that only by personally contacting the people I serve, can I do the best possible job for them in the Congress of the United States.

I will be in the courthouses from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. on the dates and at the places set forth in the following schedule:

Tuesday, September 6, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Wednesday, September 7, Ashland, Ashland County.

Thursday, September 8, Coshocton, Coshocton, County.

Friday, September 9, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday, September 12, Delaware, Delaware County.

Tuesday, September 27, Newark, Licking County.

Thursday, September 29, Mansfield, Richland County.

I not only welcome visitors at these conferences, I urge individuals, regardless of political party or how they may have voted in the past, to come to see me. I am striving to represent all the people of the 17th District, regardless of their beliefs about any political or legislative issue, and I know that it is a great help for a Congressman to talk over personal, national and international problems with the people at home—problems on which he must make decisions from day to day that affect the lives of every person in our country.

I also invite the many fine young men throughout my district, who are interested in entering the various service academies, to call on me in order that I might have the opportunity to know them and to discuss their qualifications for appointment to the academy of their choice.

No appointments are necessary. I hope to see a large number of persons. The discussions can help me to serve them better and it can help them to understand my problems in striving to do the best possible job for all of the people in my district.

Paul Cunningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I call the attention of the distinguished members of this House to the death on August 14 of Mr. Paul Cunningham, well-known songwriter and author, past president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) and at the time of his death ASCAP's director of public affairs. As a citizen who has long been interested in the musical arts, and as a strong supporter of the rights of all creators of music, serious and popular, I should like to express my profound sorrow at the loss of this courageous and sincere fighter for the rights of musically creative people.

It was a privilege of many Members of the Congress to have known Paul Cunningham personally over the more than a generation during which he championed the rights of composers, authors, and publishers to the fruits of their creative endeavors in the marketplace. I am sure that I reflect the sentiment of a great many of the Members of the Congress, when I pledge to the memory of Paul Cunningham, and the society which he so ably represented, that the efforts he made for the protection of creative musical property shall not be lost.

A native New Yorker, Mr. Cunningham became interested in songwriting and the theater while attending Manhattan College. With a bachelor of arts degree and experience in staging college shows behind him, he joined the songwriting staff of the Harry Von Tilzer Co. in 1914—the year ASCAP was founded.

In the period immediately following, Mr. Cunningham became an active, triple-threat man—as a singer, songwriter, and song plugger. He collaborated with Mr. Von Tilzer himself on a number of songs, including selections for "The Ziegfeld Follies."

He then began what proved to be a long association with the music-publishing firm of M. Witmark & Sons. During this period, Mr. Cunningham and his wife formed the headline vaudeville act of Cunningham and Bennett.

For several years Mr. and Mrs. Cunningham played the famed Keith circuit, both as performers and as writers. During their days in vaudeville the Cunninghams found themselves called upon to produce and direct stage presentations as well.

In 1928 the duo played the music halls of England and toured the Continent, and Mr. Cunningham wrote some additional material for the English public.

Among the popular songs with a Cunningham credit are "I Am an American," "Please Take a Letter, Miss Brown," "Men of Steel"—(official song of the United Steel Workers of America), "The Shores of Tripoli," "You Can't Make a Fool Out of Me," "Dakota," "Every Night When You Say a Prayer," and "From the Vine Came the Grape."

Among his composer-collaborators he lists Sigmund Romberg, Ernest R. Ball, James Monaco, Joe Burke, Peter DeRose, Earl Carroll, Vaughn Monroe, and Ira Schuster.

Mr. Cunningham became a member of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers in 1921. He was elected a director of the society in 1945, and served as secretary from 1951 to 1953, as president 1956–59, and as director of public affairs 1959–60. He was responsible for producing many of the shows ASCAP members have presented before various organizations, including an ASCAP oversea unit which toured military installations abroad. As a professional entertainer with a bright sense of humor and a gift for song, he was frequently called upon as an emcee and performer himself. Warmhearted, simple in habits, with boundless sympathy for the less fortunate of the musical world, Paul Cunningham's example will long remain in the hearts and minds of all of us who believe that the worker in the creative vineyard is entitled to his just rewards.

Labor-Management Reporting Act Most Important Bill Enacted by 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, of all the legislation enacted by the 86th Congress of the United States, only one law is likely to go down in history as an outstanding achievement, and that is the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—better known as the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The need for this legislation became dramatically apparent because of the hearings held in the Senate, and so obviously necessary because of the hearings held here in the House that its enactment was inevitable.

Since the law became effective, actions by the Department of Labor under the able direction of Secretary Mitchell have provided additional proof that the law was not only desirable but necessary. Mr. Mitchell has undertaken vigorous enforcement of the new law designed to clean out the underworld elements which in some instances have infiltrated and subverted a segment of the labor movement. He has appointed competent men to administer the law. They have functioned well and have in the course of a few months begun to bring order out of the chaotic conditions which once existed.

In the first 6 months of administering the new law, the Department has instituted investigations into 654 cases and has turned 75 cases over to the FBI for further inquiry. Of the 654 cases, 27 involved bill-of-rights violations of individual union members; 7 were embezzlement cases; 27 involved violence; 15 were officer-convict violations; 6 involved Communist-suspect officers; 6 unlawful disciplinary actions against individual union members and 1 involved extortionate picketing.

This is only the beginning.

As the Department speeds up its activities in this field, the investigations will increase and—although it may take more than a few years—the cleanup of the labor movement will be completed.

The law that has made this possible was one of the most bitterly fought bills ever to come before the Congress. It was proposed only after long and careful investigation and was enacted only after weeks of hearings and long hours of

debate. In my years in Congress I have never seen the kind of tension, the bitterness and the heat that the Landrum-Griffin bill generated. I suppose that in years to come the rollcall on acceptance of the Landrum-Griffin substitute will be marked as one of the most dramatic moments in the recent legislative history. I know that it was one of the most tense.

Many who supported the bill were accused of being antilabor. This was not in most instances the case. Personally I supported the measure because I felt strongly that it was in the best interest of the average working man and woman. I do not for a moment believe that the rank and file of labor union members support and believe in the kind of corruption, intolerance and injustice uncovered by the Senate and House hearings. It was to eliminate this, and this alone, which brought so much solid and stanch support to the measure.

Mr. Speaker, this vital legislation has begun to have its effect. With the kind of continued vigorous administration which was begun under Secretary Mitchell, the measure will go a long way toward clearing up the mess which was found in a part of labor's house.

National Conventions Highlight Importance of the House in National Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are back again in this historic Chamber to complete the work of the 86th Congress, and we have returned with a strengthened sense of the importance in the national picture of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a radio address I made over station WIND in Chicago on the eve of the convening of the Republican National Convention and in which I stressed, among other significant matters, that the presidential nominees of both major parties were colleagues together in the 81st Congress and in the 80th Congress that preceded. I also mentioned the circumstances that the chairman of the resolutions committee at the Democratic National Convention and the keynoter at the Republican National Convention are both members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 86th Congress. The radio broadcast follows:

I am speaking on the eve of the Republican National Convention with the Democratic National Convention just behind us, and I am thinking back only 12 years when first I came to the Congress, as the Representative from the Second Congressional District of Illinois. That was in 1949. There for the first time I had met JACK KENNEDY, now the nominee of his party for President of the United States, and DICK NIXON, the probable nominee of his party for the highest office in the world. I was a freshman Member, a first termer, and KENNEDY and NIXON were second termers, with only 2 years more of service in the House.

In this year of 1960, when we are facing perhaps the most serious fight for our survival in our history, one of these two young men who then were beginning only their second term in the House will be elected President of the United States to guide our ship of state and to carry the hopes of mankind in turbulent times with the world in the violent eruptions of dynamic changes. I am presuming of course that, as expected, Vice President NIXON will be the nominee of his party.

Also among my colleagues in the first Congress of which I was a Member were HENRY JACKSON, whom we all called by his nickname of "SCOOP," and THRUSTON MORTON. These are the relatively young men who now as chairmen of their respective parties will call the shots in the great campaign of this fall, a campaign destined for a high place in our national political history.

There were 435 of us in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States when we were sworn in the first week of January of 1949. The star of destiny was hanging over the heads of two in that group of 435 who were to battle for the Presidency in perhaps the most crucial period in our history. Also it was hanging over the heads of two others of that group who were to be the guiding managerial geniuses of the campaign of 1960.

When the 87th Congress convenes next January, I, if reelected, will look about the historic Chamber of the House, now with its 437 Members because of the admission to the Union of Hawaii and Alaska, and I will wonder over which of those 437 heads the star of a future destiny may be hanging.

The importance of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in the making of Presidents is not to be overlooked by students of American politics. The House is very close to the people because its entire membership every 2 years must stand the test of the ballot box.

FROM MAYOR TO PRESIDENT

Grover Cleveland reached the White House from a start as mayor of the city of Buffalo in New York. That was the period when there was a large public interest in the conduct of the municipal chores. Cleveland caught the eye of the Nation and won the approval of the American people when as mayor of a city not as large as Chicago he effected economies, safeguards, and reforms in municipal government that long since have become fairly standard throughout the Nation. That seemed the road most likely to lead to the White House. Johnson and Baker of Cleveland, Pingree of Detroit, and Dunne of Chicago, at a later period, were the last of the era when crusading mayors were national news and national political idols.

Mayor Daley of Chicago has received more national and international news coverage of any chief executive of a city since that period because there has been an awakened interest in the tremendous and fascinating job of rebuilding great urban centers of population to meet modern conditions and an admiration of the herculean way Daley has gone about the job.

The fact, of course, is that nations cannot survive if their cities decay. Hence I would say that inevitably there will be a trend back to the days of Cleveland as regards the importance of the mayoralty in the national picture.

FROM STATEHOUSE TO WHITE HOUSE

The era of the Governors as the focus of popular national interest followed the era of the mayors. This was a natural development since many corrections of abuses manifested in municipalities, and reflected in the "Public be damned" attitude of traction and public utilities interests, required State legislation. Johnson of California, who ran for Vice President with Teddy Roosevelt and the Bull Moose, probably was the greatest of our Governors since he was the pioneer draftsman for much of the State legislation that put an effective check on prevailing evils of unbridled power.

Dunne of Illinois, with whom I served as Lieutenant Governor, must be placed high on the list of great American Governors if for no other reasons, and I think there are other reasons, than that his administration was responsible for the creation of a public utility commission that fixed the price of public utilities services on the basis of cost plus reasonable profit and also was responsible for the start of a program for good roads.

Today we have public utilities commissions in every State of the Union, with the sole exception of Texas, I believe, good roads programs in all of the States. In general, the patterns in State government have been set, and now it is largely a matter of improvement and efficiency. The old days of crusading for new State instrumentalities are gone.

Today the gubernatorial office is largely administrative, an office requiring integrity, high administrative ability and a dedication to the public service. It will continue to furnish a training school strictly on the administrative side for future Presidents, but I would think its glamour in the popular eye, a glamour that could lead to the White House, is on the decline.

There is a marked trend today toward the regional rather than the State approach. This is indicated by the increasing number of compacts among States in the same region to work jointly in common undertakings that Congress is asked to approve. A bill to approve a compact of the Great Lakes States has been held up for months in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs largely because there are three members of that committee from the Chicago area, Congresswoman CHURCH, Congressman MURPHY, and myself and, despite some unquestioned advantages in the compact, we wish more assurance than we have received to date that the other States in the compact would not gang up against Illinois in the Lake Michigan water diversion matter so vital to the people of Chicago.

But the point I wish to make is that in these compacts State sovereignty in limited areas and extent is being surrendered to regional sovereignty, and this is indicative of a trend. It all adds up, I think, to the diminishing attraction of the Executive Mansion for the young man who has set out to reach the White House. But, after all, I suppose destiny will continue to find her child wherever he may have wandered and guide him safely to his appointed spot.

COLLEAGUES IN 81ST CONGRESS

I was very fond of JACK KENNEDY. His simple democracy, his kindly consideration of the people in his office and around him appealed to me. I had heard of his heroism in the saga of the PT boat in the hostile waters of the Pacific. I knew, too, of the wealth of his family, and, perhaps more revealing, I had known his grandfather when "Honey Fitz" was mayor of Boston. Mayor Fitzgerald always will stand out in my memory as a man in public office who was all heart. JACK KENNEDY showed the same traits. Once I said to him, when he had put himself to much inconvenience to appear on a radio program, Quorum Call, I was preparing for my constituents in Chicago: "JACK, you come by this human charm naturally; you get it from your mother's father."

DICK NIXON was on the other side of the aisle, and in his freshman term had served as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee with the late Congressman Vail under the Thomas chairmanship. Once I

clashed with him in debate on the floor of the House. But when we did meet personally, as Members of the House frequently do during a session at dinners of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and similar occasions, the meetings were pleasant. Since he has been Vice President and circumstances have brought us together, there has been the pleasant nostalgia of a reunion of college alumni. After all, we were fellow graduates of the 81st Congress.

I would not have picked him out as likely to be a future nominee of his party for President. I suppose when William Jennings Bryan was a second termer in the 53d Congress—and seniority was much sterner then—none of his colleagues in the House would have picked him out. It would have been different, I think, in the case of McKinley because of his long seniority in the House and his reputation as an authority on the tariff, which then was the great political issue.

THRUSTON MORTON and "SCOOP" JACKSON, now the party leaders in the forthcoming battle for the Presidency, I knew much more intimately. "SCOOP," although only 37, was a fifth termer, having been elected to the 77th Congress at the early age of 29. MORTON was 40 and a second termer. He is of a wealthy Kentucky family and came to the Congress at 38.

Frank Roosevelt, namesake of his father, then a Member of the House and recently a campaigner for KENNEDY in the primary elections, and MORTON were members of a group of barbershop choristers that occasionally met in hours of relaxation during the 81st Congress, singing the classics of the yesterday under the direction of the old master, Congressman LOU RABAUT, and graciously recognizing the presence of one who enjoyed but could not sing by turning in my direction and singing "Irish Eyes."

I would expect both JACKSON and MORTON to conduct hard-hitting, hard-driving campaigns, but, after it all is over and the next President of the United States chosen by the people to lead the Nation in time of grave crisis, to shake hands, each with the feeling that the hand he clasped was as clean as his own.

FROM THE HOUSE TO WHITE HOUSE

I trust that I have not taken undue advantage of the invitation graciously extended me to appear on this program by talking of the Congress more in the terms of men than of measures. What I do wish to emphasize is the growing place in the overall national picture of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and in connection with the two national conventions of this year to bring to the attention of my listeners some significant phases that otherwise might be overlooked.

In the House there are 31 members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 3 from the Chicago area. The present Secretary of State, Chris Herter, is a former member of that committee. It is to be noted that a Democratic member of that committee of 31, Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, was the chairman of the resolutions committee at the Democratic National Convention, and a Republican member of the committee, Congressman WALTER JUDD, will be the keynoter at the Republican National Convention. This is significant. It pinpoints the expanding importance of the House of Representatives in the making of policies and Presidents and one of the principle reasons therefore, the position of the United States as a world power. No longer are we a provincial people, beset only with local problems. What happens now in any part of the universe has repercussions in every American home. For better or for worse, our destiny under Providence has wedded us with world responsibility. The national conventions, as I have sought to interpret their significance, show the change this has made in the political scene.

TERM KEEPS HOUSE CLOSE TO PEOPLE

I would not pass over this opportunity to urge upon this radio audience, the men and women into whose homes my voice is reaching, a stout resistence to any suggestion that the term of tenure of office in the House of Representatives should be lengthened from 2 to 4 years. It is hard on Members of the House to run every 2 years. Of course, it is. But there is no law that compels a person to run for Congress, and once elected he may have an urge of duty to try for reelection, but there is no law to prevent his voluntary retirement if he chooses.

My experiences and observations during the years my constituents, to whose unfailing friendship I forever am indebted, have kept me in the Congress have confirmed and deepened my conviction that one of the greatest strengths of our Constitution is the provision that each member of the people's branch every 2 years must go back to his constituents for a new commission.

I doubt very much if the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States would be in its present enviable position of expanding influence if its members were elected for 4 years, contrary to the concept of the wise men who wrote our Constitution, the concept that one branch of the Congress, the House should be kept very, very close to and immediately responsive to the will of the people, and the other branch, the Senate, its Members serving for 6 years, acting as a check.

If ever the gulf between the people and their Congress is widened from 2 to 4 years we will have been started on the way to rule, not by the people, but by government itself.

I am proud to have been a Member of the 86th Congress. There still is much to be done, and it will be done, advance in housing to bring a decent roof within the means of every family, broadening of the minimum wage concept that even the humblest are entitled to decent subsistence for their time and toil, medical care to save our aged from the tolls of pain and death they do not deserve. These are among our legislative objectives when we reconvene in August. But what already has been accomplished by the 86th Congress constitutes a page of brilliancy in the legislative history of our country.

A World in Turmoil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I would like to introduce into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the latest issue of my newsletter "Report to the People" for August 10, 1960:

A WORLD IN TURMOIL

Since my last newsletter report to you, the world has been in turmoil—in turmoil to such a degree that developments abroad have to a considerable degree overshadowed congressional activity.

Congress, of course, has been busy and has been in session since January except for the recess declared July 3 for the national political conventions. Much important and vital legislation was acted upon before the recess and much more is awaiting action before final adjournment.

I have delayed writing you this newsletter for several reasons, among them the fact that I had hoped before doing so to be able to report on the final actions of Congress on all major legislation. But with Congress ending its recess, a later issue of the newsletter will report on unfinished business of the House and Senate.

Then, too, I hesitated about writing this newsletter while developments abroad—one after another—kept the world seething. These developments, starting with the U–2 spy plane incident and including the summit collapse and the critical situations which arose in Korea, Turkey, Japan, the Congo, and Cuba, left the world in a state of tension.

If nothing else, the developments abroad brought into sharp focus the problems of the hesitant leadership in our foreign policy program. They highlighted the lack of an aggressive leadership which, I maintain, is essential if we are to meet the challenges facing us in the world.

I expressed this view in Bridgeport on June 25 when I accepted nomination for re-election and I still maintain that ours is a world in revolution and in the last year we have suffered unexpected and incredible reverses. The situation in which we find ourselves is the result of a make-believe foreign policy—a policy which could cause countries in four continents to capitulate to communism.

In this world in ferment, our position has been weakened by lack of creative leadership and our only hope of survival is an aggressive foreign economic policy plus a strong military capability.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE

Congress, with world tension tightening, has been active. When the recess began, Congress had acted upon 10 regular appropriations bills and several supplementals for fiscal 1960 and 1961 and sent them to the President. Elsewhere in this newsletter, I have reproduced a breakdown for your information showing the status of appropriations in the second session of the 86th Congress. I would like to point out, however, that other statements to the contrary, the Democratic-controlled Congress kept a close eye on expenditures and you will note that the amounts appropriated are several millions less than President Eisenhower had requested. But note, too, the Defense budget—particularly for the Polaris missile program—is higher than requested. The Polaris program, of course, gives great promise for an effective mobile missile launching capability and Congress authorized $241 million more for this program than had been requested by President Eisenhower.

In the field of foreign aid, I want to emphasize that I supported every effort to appropriate the full amount requested. In this area, I feel very strongly that we should do much more than has been done. The mutual security bill passed the House before the recess, but is under consideration by the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is my sincere hope the Senate will restore the funds trimmed from the foreign aid bill by the House.

In connection with this subject, incidentally, I expect and hope that with Congress reconvening the President will present his program for aid to Latin America, where the crisis has been deepening and fostering new problems as the result of Castro's appeal to many Latin American countries. Not only is a strong program for our Latin American relations long overdue, but this Nation also should move forward in developing additional programs of this nature for all other critical areas of the world. It would not seem too early to prepare an economic program for the development of

Africa, where the emergence of any newly independent but ill-equipped nation presents fertile soil for Communist activity.

Other legislation completed by Congress prior to the recess included:

Civil rights: I had voted for the House-passed civil rights bill at the time of my last newsletter. Later, of course, after a record filibuster, the Senate also acted on civil rights legislation. For those who may not have read my last newsletter, let me emphasize I have long been a strong advocate of civil rights. I felt the House-passed bill could be improved upon but nevertheless certainly represented a step in the right direction.

Sugar Act extension: I supported this legislation, passed after an all-night session, which gave the President complete authority to determine the amount of sugar to be imported from Cuba. I did so in view of our deteriorating relations with the Castro government and because I felt the President should have the power to act in an emergency.

Farm legislation: The farm problem is still in a muddle and I voted against a wheat bill providing for the maintenance of supports at 75 percent of parity. I still feel the administration has shirked its responsibilities in failing to offer a comprehensive farm program this year. Just before the recess, incidentally, one bill was enacted which can absorb some of the mounting surpluses on farm commodities. This was a measure authorizing the United States to participate in the 68-nation International Development Association to help underdeveloped countries. The law permits the overseas sale of some farm surpluses, with payment to be made in foreign currencies. Farm spokesmen say the new law may have a dual advantage. Besides serving to relieve the surplus problem, returns from sales, when invested in the nations in which the sales are made, can help create or expand markets for other U.S. commodities.

Federal employees' pay raise: This measure, passed over a Presidential veto, was less than a perfect bill. I supported it, however, because of a very definite need for substantially increased Federal salaries. Experience has shown that the Government needs higher salaries at top levels of civil service and there is a study presently being made which I hope will result in legislation to correct this shortcoming.

Rivers and harbors bill: This was legislation of particular importance to Stamford and the Fourth Congressional District I represent. Included in this authorization bill was a vitally needed hurricane flood control project for Stamford. Many hours of combined effort and hard work went into this particular project before it was finally authorized. It took close coordination, cooperation, and teamwork on the part of Stamford city officials, and interested industrial and civilian parties, operating in conjunction with my office, to get the project approved. Congratulations are due Mayor Walter Kennedy, Flood and Erosion Control Board Chairman Al Kanzler, and others for sticking with this matter until it finally was included in the bill. Much credit must go, too, to people like Stamford Finance Commissioner Norm Gluss; Dean Brossman, executive vice president for the Stamford-Greenwich management council; Gil Brooks, Dom Del Guidice, and Ed Bankowski, among numerous others. The fight is not finished, though—it will resume in January when efforts must be made to get the necessary funds appropriated. Assuming I am reelected, I shall, of course, continue to do everything in my power to have the funds appropriated for the project.

Better labeling bill: Overlooked and often ignored in the heavy publicity and news coverage given controversial measures are many noncontroversial, so-called unimportant bills. Yet these little-known laws frequently do great public good. A case in point is the better labeling law requiring far more prominent warnings on hazardous and poisonous materials brought into the average home daily. Hereafter, labels on these items (including cleansers, dyes, disinfectants, and polishes) must clearly state: "Keep out of the reach of children." Also, every package must henceforth display prominently first-aid antidotes for the misuse of such products. Why is this such an important piece of legislation? Every year some 600,000 youngsters swallow dangerous preparations and, of these, more than 500 die.

STILL AWAITING ACTION

The Senate has already returned after the recess. The Senate, with more pending business on its calendar, resumed sessions in advance of the House which must wait for the Senate disposition of various bills before it can take action on them. I anticipate the House sessions will be fairly short, perhaps of but 2 or 3 weeks' duration. I do not think there will be any major squabbling because there is a definite job to do and we will want to get it done.

The mass transportation bill: Of major importance from my personal viewpoint is what I hope and expect will be final House action on the Senate-approved bill sponsored by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey to provide loans and grants to ease the mass transportation problem. This bill, a companion to one I introduced in the House, is vital to the ultimate solution of the commuter situation in Fairfield County. Incidentally, I have expressed strong dissatisfaction over the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting another 10 percent boost in New Haven railroad fares even before the ICC's investigation of the line was concluded. It appeared to me that the proper action would have been to refuse the fare increase until public hearings were completed.

Bridgeport Harbor appropriation: Another item I expect favorable action on in the remaining days of the session is an appropriation bill before the Senate containing $750,000 to inaugurate improvements of the Bridgeport Harbor during the coming fiscal year. The amount, contained in the President's budget, nearly got sidetracked by a House subcommittee recently but fortunately I was able to convince the subcommittee to retain the allocation because of the tremendous importance of the project to Fairfield County. Eventually the harbor improvements will cost more than $6 million. Had the subcommittee knocked out the allocation, work could not have been started this year. Thanks to the support of two of my New England colleagues I was able to convince the subcommittee the Bridgeport Harbor is a distribution point for southwestern Connecticut where commerce is increasing, and that deepening and widening of the channel would eliminate tidal delays to existing commercial traffic and permit the use of larger vessels with substantial transportation savings.

Also on the calendar for further action are the following:

Health insurance for the aged: High on the priority list for consideration when Congress reconvenes is the extremely controversial bill providing health insurance for the aged. The House has already passed legislation providing increased social security benefits and a moderate, State-option, health benefits program. The Senate Finance Committee held hearings on this legislation before the recess started, but took no further action. Incidentally, I did not consider the House-passed bill adequate in the area of health benefits for the aged.

Federal aid to education: This is a bill snarled in controversy and parliamentary wrangling and I hope that definite action can be taken before final adjournment, though I am far from hopeful on this possibility. The Senate, early in the session, passed a bill providing $1.8 billion over 2 years for school construction and teachers' salaries. Late in May, the House passed a bill authorizing $1.3 billion over 4 years for construction only.

Minimum wage bill: Another bill passed by the House just before the recess was a minimum wage bill raising the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour for workers previously covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act and extending a $1-an-hour minimum, without overtime protection, to an estimated 1.4 million workers in the interstate retail chains. The Senate is still to act on the legislation.

Omnibus housing: Also lodged in the House Rules Committee is an omnibus housing bill providing funds for Federal housing programs. This bill, reported favorably by the House Banking and Currency Committee, would, it is hoped, revitalize housing production which dropped sharply over the past year.

Foreign investments: I am hoping for Senate action on H.R. 5, a tax-incentive measure to spur U.S. private investment in underdeveloped countries. This is a bill I supported when it passed the House.

Self-employed retirement: This is H.R. 10, the Keogh-Simpson bill which would permit self-employed to defer taxes on portions of their income set aside for retirement purposes. I voted for it when it passed the House, and regard it as forward-looking legislation which I would like to see enacted into law. Indications are, however, that the bill may encounter opposition in Senate floor debate.

VIEWS ON THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

I attended the Democratic convention in Los Angeles as a delegate. I was satisfied both with the choice of the ticket and the platform adopted there. I also watched the Republican convention in Chicago and was encouraged by developments there, too. Of particular note, in my opinion, was the adaptation of Vice President NIXON to a new posture concerning the issues before the Nation in the light of developments of the last year. For an interesting view of the Republican platform, I suggest you read the editorial on page 120 of the July 30 issue of Business Week magazine.

MY BACKGROUND TO JUDGE CUBA

In my last newsletter, I commented about the Cuban crisis, United States-Cuban relations, the Castro government, etc. My comments were based partly on a personal trip I made to Cuba in March. Several letters I received questioned my authority to judge Cuba on the basis of such a brief visit. I would like to say this, in the event others also wondered about my remarks in which I said I was convinced a poor job of administering Cuba by the Castro government would in itself bring serious economic troubles to that country in the near future. True, my visit to Cuba was brief, but for the benefit of those unaware of it, my knowledge of Spanish-speaking nations is extensive. For one thing, I was born and raised in Argentina, where I attended public school. My father worked for Swift & Co. in Argentina and in fact is still employed by that company although now residing, with my two sisters and my brother, in Brazil. Besides this background, I also was an instructor in Spanish at Yale College and at Hotchkiss School in Lakeville, Conn. Developments since my comments appear to be bearing out the views I expressed regarding Cuba. Castro has grown weaker and seems to be losing his hold, particularly with important and influential groups. They're talking out

against him now, warning of economic collapse. There are some sources in our own Government who think Castro will fall by year's end. Incidentally, you might also be interested in knowing that for some months now I have been making weekly Voice of America broadcasts in Spanish which are aired into Latin American countries. Usually these broadcasts are made jointly with Representative JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico, and we feel they are playing an important role in improving and strengthening our Latin American relations. Similar programs are broadcast as panel discussions whenever visiting Latin American legislators are in Washington.

Public Laws 592 to and Including 620

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since the convening of the 2d session of the 86th Congress until the time of our adjourning for the recess, a total of 293 public laws were enacted. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress 383 public laws were enacted, hence the numbering for the 2d session starts with 384. In my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois I have given a digest of all the new legislation, both major and minor.

Thinking that this digest might be of interest to my colleagues, and of some use for easy reference, I extended my remarks on pages 15880–15882, 15884–15886, 15889–15894, 15900–15902, and 15906–15908 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 15, 1960, to include the digest of Public Laws 384 to and including 591. The large number of letters I have received from readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in all parts of the country has encouraged me further to extend my remarks to include Public Laws 592 to and including 620, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 592

H.R. 12311: Sugar quotas

Public Law 592 (1) extends the Sugar Act of 1948, which had been extended in 1952 and in 1956 for 4-year periods, for a period of only 3 months, and (2) empowers the President to determine Cuba's quota for the balance of the current year and until March 31, 1961, "as he shall find from time to time to be in the national interest."

On the role of national unity in matters of immediacy in international relationships, the House voted to the President the power he regarded as essential in the existing situation in Cuba. The vote was 395 to 0.

In my remarks I said: "I trust that the power the President has asked will be administered without punitive design and in sole consideration of what in his judgment is just, wise, and necessary for the nations of the American Hemisphere, including our own."

The squabble over where Cuba's quota, if terminated, would go almost tied up the adjournment for the recess. It will be renewed when the Congress reconvenes on August 15.

PUBLIC LAW 593

Air Force is building up its own traditions. Public Law 593 helps along by changing the designation of "Distinguished Service Cross" and "Soldier's Medal," which are Army terms, to "Air Force Cross" and "Airman's Medal."

PUBLIC LAW 594

Public Law 594 removes the 4-year limitation on the $400,000 total income tax deduction for expenditures on explorations for ore or minerals (not gas or oil). Purpose is to benefit small operators whose limited capital requires them to take more time.

PUBLIC LAW 595

Public Law 595 adds to the national parks of our Nation the Arkansas Post National Memorial at the site of a fur trading post set up in 1686 by Henry de Tonty, a lieutenant of La Salle's, that figured in the "Mississippi Bubble" scheme, was a military post from 1730 on and once was the capital of Arkansas Territory.

PUBLIC LAW 596

Public Law 596 is of interest to conservationists. It ends the scandals in California and the Southwest arising from raids by sharp operators on the lands of the national parks under a defect in the "lieu lands" provision in the act of 1897 as amended. It corrects the defect, disqualifies heirs and assigns and makes compensation to clear title.

PUBLIC LAW 597

In 1959 the Air Force gave flight instructions to 1,663 ROTC cadets at 159 schools, the Army to 643 cadets at 66 schools. This qualifies the cadets for FAA private pilot certificates. Public Law 597 extends the program for Army, Navy and Air Force another 4 years.

PUBLIC LAW 598

Public Law 598 provides the furnishing of needed services of optometrists to veterans having service-connected eye conditions. It adds "optometrists services" to VA's medical duties. This is in addition to the eyeglasses given to veterans, 30,774 pair in 1959. I am happy to report to many constituents who wrote me that I cast your vote for Public Law 598.

PUBLIC LAW 599

Coal industry, hard hit by oil and gas, is in a bad way. Public Law 599 authorizes a $2 million coal research program to open new ways.

PUBLIC LAW 600

Since 1820, when Yankee Captain Nathaniel Palmer landed on the shores of Antarctica, Americans have been exploring into the frozen realms. Public Law 600 creates a special commemorative medal to be presented persons (military and civilian) who have served on Antarctica expeditions.

PUBLIC LAW 601

H.R. 11998: Defense appropriations

Public Law 601 appropriates $39,996,608,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1961. That is slightly under $40 billion, and $661,608,000 above the budget, in part due to an increase in the number of Polaris nuclear submarines, in general to girding of defenses in a worsening world climate and to meet the challenge of Soviet missiles. The House passed the bill, 377 to 3. Your vote was aye.

PUBLIC LAW 602

This permits the Navy to swap some land in South Boston, no longer needed, for another piece of land owned by the Massachusetts Port Authority. It couldn't be done without the approval by Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 603

Public Law 603(1) eliminates requirement of physical examination every 4 years for members of the Standby Reserve, and (2) authorizes officers of the National Guard on inactive duty to issue orders to active duty for training and perform similar chores when designated by proper authority.

PUBLIC LAW 604

Former Members of Congress when they work for the Federal Government forfeit their civil service retirement annuities. Public Law 604 exempts them from such forfeiture when they work without compensation. This protects them from being penalized for rendering, gratuitously, a public service.

PUBLIC LAW 605

H.R. 12263: Dam on the Rio Grande

Public Law 605 authorizes agreements with Mexico for the joint construction and maintenance of a second major international storage dam, with water generating facilities (to be known as the Amistad Dam) on the Rio Grande River. The first major dam (the Falcon, 75 miles downstream from Laredo) under the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico was completed in 1953.

Your representative, as a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, attended many days of public hearings in the processing of this measure. It is refreshing and strengthening to have two neighboring nations working together in friendly cooperation in joint undertakings for a common benefit.

PUBLIC LAW 606

Public Law 606 extends until June 30, 1961, the present suspension of duty on metal scrap.

PUBLIC LAW 607

H.R. 10644: Merchant marine

Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is credited with building up a hard-core American-flag merchant fleet by construction and operating differential subsidies to bridge the gap between costs here and abroad. Nevertheless, rising costs here have caused the American ship building industry to drop from first to eighth place among the nations of the free world. Hence Public Law 607 raises the permissable construction differential subsidy from 50 to 55 percent.

PUBLIC LAW 608

In 1935 Congress cooperated with the cities in their street-widening programs by authorizing gift to municipalities of portions of Federal lands needed to widen streets. Public Law 608 extends this to States, counties, and other political subdivisions. It sometimes happens that a Federal Building is in a city but adjacent to a State or country highway.

PUBLIC LAW 609

Public Law 609 legalizes and admits to polite communications society the humble antenna booster stations that have been the sole means of extending TV entertainment to small, remote communities. Here is how the booster, now legalized, works: (1) an ordinary rooftop antenna strategically located to get a usable signal from a distant station, (2) a shielded cable connected to a small amplifier and running to a second rooftop antenna, and (3) everybody happy, the second rooftop antenna beams the signal to the whole community.

PUBLIC LAW 610

Public Law 610 I place high on the achievements of the 86th Congress. It authorizes the President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health research, training and planning. It envisions a scientist-to-scientist relationship on an international basis, the mobilization of the medical researchers of the world in an assault upon all the dread diseases that plague mankind. This, I would say, is along the road to peace, progress and universal goodwill. You may be sure your vote was aye.

PUBLIC LAW 611

S. 747: Des Plaines conservation

Public Law 611 gives to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation and recreation some 2,200 acres at Des Plaines, formerly part of the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, 946 acres at a consideration of $303 an acre (total, $286,638), 1,500 acres directly contiguous thereto as an outright gift, subject to use by the Government in event of emergency. I received many letters from conservationists and sportsmen, introduced in the House a companion bill to Senator DOUGLAS' and appeared at committee hearings. While we were unsuccessful in getting the exact land we wished, due to the adamant position of the Defense Department, the compromise at least served the general purpose of protecting much of the surplus area from private encroachment and turning it over to all the people as part of their outdoors domain.

PUBLIC LAW 612

At present there are 496 retired Foreign Service officers and 118 widows receiving annuities. Public Law 612 boosts the annuities 10 percent.

PUBLIC LAW 613

S. 1283: Protection of children from poisoning

In one year there are 200,000 poisonings in the United States, with 5,000 deaths, from common household products, such as polishers, bleaches and cleaners. An estimated 600,000 children under 15 annually swallow poisonous substances. Illinois is one of eight States that have enacted State legislation requiring warning labeling of all hazardous substances for household use. Public Law 613 requires and regulates the labeling of such products in interstate commerce. Of course, your vote was aye.

PUBLIC LAW 614

United States has participated in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property since 1887. Chief work of the bureau is in the field of patents and trademarks. Public Law 614 (introduced by Congressman LIBONATI of Chicago) authorizes a back payment of $10,514 and an annual payment of $7,500 as Uncle Sam's contribution to the bureau.

PUBLIC LAW 615

This grants "grandfather rights" to motor carriers, freight forwarders and water carriers in Alaska. That means they can continue operation of transportation services on the accustomed lines.

PUBLIC LAW 616

Public Law 616 (1) permits Army and Air Force involuntarily to retire permanent colonels and lieutenant colonels who have three or more times failed of promotion, and (2) provides boards to separate officers for moral, professional, or security dereliction. Armed Services Committee states purpose was to improve officer quality, not create vacancies.

PULIC LAW 617

Public Law 617 increases from $250,000 to $500,000 the authorization for the appropriation for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama to construct new facilities. This will make possible long-range studies of insects and the malaria, yellow fever and virus (among others) diseases they transmit. The laboratory is under American auspices, our chief such center in tropical America.

PUBLIC LAW 618

Protection of the health of the American people is the constant concern of the Congress. We like color in everything, including our foods, drugs, and cosmetics, where danger can lurk. Public Law 618 permits the use of suitable color additives but only after they have complied with rigid regulations (including maximum tolerances) and have been declared safe. Your vote always has supported health legislation.

PUBLIC LAW 619

This merely makes uniform the law fixing the terms of office of members of regulatory agencies of the Government.

PUBLIC LAW 620

Alaska University has 100,000 acres of land granted by the former territory. Public Law 620 permits its sale or lease by sealed competitive bids.

Address of Senator Keating to the National District Attorneys' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the National District Attorneys' Association held its annual conference in Boston, Mass., on August 11, 12, and 13 of this year. I had the honor to attend and to hear the remarks of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, as he by wire addressed the members of the association at their final banquet on August 13.

Edward S. Silver, district attorney of Kings County, Brooklyn, N.Y., and immediate past president of the National District Attorneys' Association, at the closing dinner of their conference, stated that Senator KEATING's talk ought to be read not only by every prosecutor in the United States, but by every legislator in our country.

I agree that the statement of Senator KEATING should be available to every prosecutor and every legislator and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ORGANIZED CRIME—WHAT CAN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DO ABOUT IT?

(Remarks of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING at the conference of the National District Attorneys Association in Boston, Mass., August 13, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, members of the National District Attorneys' Association, it is a distinct personal pleasure to be with you tonight. Both as legislator and as lawyer I feel preeminently at home in this good company. This conference, I might add, is proof of the twofold attribute of the law. It doesn't merely send people away. It brings them together, as well.

I must say, Ed, that my pleasure is the greater because you are in the chair.

Ed and I are on different sides of the political fence, but with a fellow like Ed you just cut a hole through the fence and maintain a continuous good neighbor policy. After all, friendship was "invented" long before politics.

At the outset, let me tell you how warmly, how wholeheartedly I commend this fine association for the public-spirited initiative you have displayed in accenting, in emphasizing the tremendous and fateful challenge that life—and death—on our highways represents for America.

It is, indeed, one of the grimmest ironies of this century that thousands of our fellow countrymen set out each year on pleasure trips—that end in the cemetery—or in the hospital.

I have often thought the concept of the motorcar in the public mind needs a new definition. The handling of firearms is surrounded by all manner of training and care and caution. It is not a mere matter of learning how to pull the trigger. But in the case of driving, all too often it is, so to speak, the ability to pull the trigger that qualifies a citizen to drive his car on the public highway.

For this reason, we have millions of people moving about our Nation with loaded guns—and many of them without any conception of the lethal quality of the weapons they grasp in their two hands. To me it is, therefore, immensely heartening that this association has thrown the floodlight of its interest and its dedication on a problem that cannot, that must not, be accepted as one of the scourges of civilization. It is the part of civilization to rid itself of scourges—and you gentlemen, by your forthright and dynamic acceptance of this grave challenge, are rendering a service of incalculable significance.

Tonight I should like to talk to you about a malignant cancer this Nation suffers from—the cancer of organized crime. I shall discuss it in terms of its national implications and in relation to the role of our Government in meeting its nefarious challenge.

Following the investigations and disclosures of the Senate Crime Committee in 1951—when a Nation learned to its shock and anger that vice and corruption had become major industries in the United States—there was the fervent hope that drastic action would be taken to break the back of organized nationwide crime.

As a matter of record, certain steps have been taken in this direction, notably the creation of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section in the Department of Justice. But today, 9 years after the Crime Committee's report, the proportions of the entire problem remain mountainous and frustrating.

We are still forced to prosecute alleged murderers and thieves for such comparatively innocuous offenses as tax evasion and contempt of court. There is evidence that organized crime syndicates continue to flourish in this country and, indeed that they are constantly spreading their influence into previously legitimate undertakings.

The hired killers, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the blackmailers, the illegal gamblers are still in business. They intimidate honest citizens, corrupt entire police forces, make the public streets unsafe at night, exploit many businessmen and workers. They are a blight upon the land, a running sore of evil, and it will take courage and determination to wipe out the conditions in which they thrive.

There have been enough studies and exposés. The time for counterattack is long overdue. Crime is at war with America. It is high time we declare war on crime.

Unless you are aware of the magnitude of the situation, you will be shocked by the statistics. Crime in the United States today is at the highest point in its history. Almost 3 million major crimes are now committed each year. What does that mean. It means that everyone in this land can expect to be the victim of a major crime at least once in his life if he lives to be 60 years of age. The crime rate has increased almost four times faster than the population of the country since 1950. There were more convictions for extortion, fraud, bank robbery, and gambling offenses last year

than ever before in the life of the Republic.

J. Edgar Hoover pointed out in a recent speech that the total cost of crime for the entire Nation "has reached the alarming figure of $22 billion a year—or nearly one-third of the cost of running the entire Federal Government for a year." This is not a very impressive image of the leader of the civilized world. This is America with a scar on its face—a scar of shame.

One of the major obstacles to effective law enforcement at present is the absence of any statutory authority (with few exceptions) for the Federal Government to deal directly with organized interstate criminal activities. The contention that crime is strictly a local problem has been used to defeat efforts to fill this gap in the Federal legal arsenal. Most crimes, of course, are strictly matters for local law enforcement.

But a local enforcement agency, no matter how effective, just cannot deal with crimes that spill over into other jurisdictions. Interstate criminal operations are purposely organized to escape the authority of any one local law-enforcement agency. Criminality doesn't end at State borders; why should law enforcement? We're not chasing speeders here. We're chasing the enemies of society.

The specter of a national police force has been one objection frequently raised to expanding the Federal Government's role in law enforcement. In my view, there is no danger of such a development. At the present time, there are some 347,000 citizens engaged in some kind of law-enforcement work.

This includes uniformed policemen, law-enforcement agents, and clerical, administrative, and custodial personnel concerned with police protection activities. Of these 347,000 law-enforcement employees, 326,000 are employed by State and local governments. On the other hand, only 21,000 are employed by all the Federal law-enforcement agencies combined, including the FBI, Immigration and Nationalization Service, Bureau of Narcotics, and Secret Service. To give one direct comparison, the FBI employs only 6,000 special agents compared to the 24,817 policemen employed by the city of New York alone.

An interstate crime bill certainly would require expansion of the FBI, but not in a manner which would give cause for reasonable concern to any person. The FBI still would be limited to investigative activities. Direction of its activities would remain under the Attorney General, and decisions as to whether to prosecute would remain with the local U.S. attorneys and other Department of Justice officials. The FBI, under the outstanding leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, has never sought expansion of its jurisdiction or an increase in its powers.

The tradition developed during Mr. Hoover's long and brilliant career has established guidelines for the functioning of the agency which would in no way be altered by increasing its personnel.

In its simplest terms, an interstate crime bill would make it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce to break certain specified State laws. The laws specified relate to the types of crimes to which these interstate syndicates are particularly prone, such as narcotics trafficking, fraud, murder, and gambling.

The bill is far reaching, but I do not believe it can be called drastic—although even some drastic measures to deal with the present menace would be justified. In many ways, my proposal is simply an extension of a trend started more than 60 years ago when Congress enacted the Lottery Act to cope with nationally organized lottery activities. Later, there were similar acts dealing with such previously local offenses as train robbery, cattle stealing, white slavery, and kidnappings. In every one of these fields the same thing happened: local criminals outgrew local law enforcement controls.

The intervention of the Federal Government in these cases has been very effective. The train robber, the white slaver and the kidnaper have now virtually vanished from the scene. It is time we moved with equal vigor against the new colossus of organized crime that confronts us today.

The practical operation of such a bill is easy to illustrate. Let us suppose, for example, that we wanted to move in on a big gambling syndicate operating out of New York with outposts in Chicago, Tampa and San Francisco. All you would have to prove is one overt act by a member of the conspiracy involving interstate commerce such as a telephone call or an interstate shipment, or the use of the mails. You could then close in. In one case, with a single conspiracy indictment, you could bag the rich overlords at the heart of the operation in New York and the lieutenants who were running things in Chicago, Tampa and San Francisco, and as many of the other small fry as you found wriggling in the bottom of the net. And that is not all. If the chiefs of police or sheriffs in certain towns and counties were mixed up in the mess, they would become defendants also.

This procedure in no way interferes with States rights, since under the terms of the law, State policies would control the definition of offenses. Nor would it throw an undue burden on our Federal law-enforcement officers.

A man can always do a better job with less trouble if he has the right tools. This is the right tool for breaking up these syndicates.

There is another aspect of crime control I have never been able to understand and that is the special protection we appear to be willing to give to crime plotted by telephone. This great scientific invention is fast becoming the privileged tool of the criminal. Recent court decisions have virtually succeeded in transferring the telephone into a private channel for organized crime.

I believe that we urgently need a Federal eavesdropping statute applicable to wiretapping and all other forms of electronic interception of conversations. Such a statute would permit Federal law-enforcement agents to utilize these devices for obtaining evidence of crime, but only under the safeguards of a court order. At the same time, as a protection against abuse, severe penalties should be provided for any electronic snooping not authorized by court order. And these penalties should be invoked against policemen, as well as ununiformed sleuths who ignore the limitations of the law. There is no criminal worse than a man who breaks the law he is sworn to uphold.

Congress should also make it clear that the States may adopt the same type of eavesdropping regulation.

In the recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York in the Pugach case, a majority of the court refused to enjoin the introduction of wiretap evidence in two State court prosecutions. At the same time, every judge on the court agreed that Federal law makes it a criminal offense to present such evidence in a State court. One judge went so far as to invite the U.S. attorney to institute criminal proceedings against the New York district attorneys if they attemped to introduce any wiretap evidence.

This decision emphasizes the incredible legal situation which now prevails.

New York has the most well-balanced, carefully safeguarded, up-to-date laws on the subject of wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping of any State in the Nation. Nevertheless, a New York district attorney, who acts in full compliance with the requirements of the New York law, now must face the risk of Federal prosecution. I cannot conceive of anything more illogical and indefensible.

If crime were not such a serious problem, the present situation would be ludicrous. I cannot believe that anyone in Congress intended, when the Federal Communications Act was passed, to make criminals out of district attorneys who obtain State court orders permitting wiretapping. We must act promptly to restore some sense and sanity in our handling of this subject.

The stark and ominous reality we must face is that crime is at war with America. It is about time America declared war against crime.

Congress must not delay any longer coming to grips with this challenge to our security. Immediate action is needed on the measures I have outlined. Comprehensive study is needed also to devise other solutions to this appalling nationwide scourge and shame. A national crime commission should be appointed to probe deeply into all the ramifications of this problem.

This should be a citizen's commission divorced from Congress, politics, or any existing law-enforcement agencies. Such a commission is imperative to adjust our operations against crime to the needs of today and the future. Many people shrink from such tasks—they display a certain disdain toward the whole subject of crime. But no one with the public welfare truly at heart can afford to shirk the duty to attack this evil.

In bringing these remarks to a close it is well to be reminded that even in our fight against crime no compromise can be condoned in according to every defendent his full constitutional rights. I would not stand for any departure from the requirements of due process no matter how heinous and outrageous the offense involved or how serious the problem to be dealt with.

At the same time, I do not equate a proper concern for the rights of an accused with a mawkish, sentimental dedication to safeguarding his every interest or convenience at the expense of the community. Law-abiding citizens have rights, too. I have tried to describe tonight some of the ways the Federal Government can protect those rights more effectively, but consistently with our traditions and principles.

Public Laws 621 to and Including 642

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include a digest of Public Laws 621 to and including 642 as reported by me to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 621

Bankruptcy lawyers, take note. False financial statement no longer is grounds for denial of discharge to a nonbusiness bankrupt. Public Law 621 provides, however, that obligations incurred by its use will not be discharged.

PUBLIC LAW 622

This exempts from future retirement contribution by civil service employees who remain with the Government after they have put in enough years to retire with an annuity of 80 percent of their salaries.

PUBLIC LAW 623

This is bigger news in Crawford in Nebraska than it is in Chicago. It permits sale of some land for $500 to the village of Crawford. It could not have been done without an act of Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 624

Public Law 624 is the Hawaii omnibus measure making complete and perfect the admission of Hawaii into the Union. It gathers up the loose ends of transition from territorial status to statehood, in many acts of Congress changes "Territory of Hawaii" to "State of Hawaii," in others includes the new state in grants-in-aid and other programs. Just a housekeeping job of rearranging the furniture.

PUBLIC LAW 625

In 1888 the Federal Government started contributing to the support of State homes for veterans. It gave $100 a year for each veteran. Now there are 33 State homes in 28 States and VA has been paying $700 annually for each veteran. Public Law 625 changes the rate from $700 a year to $2.50 a day, a 30 percent boost.

PUBLIC LAW 626

H.R. 11776: Independent offices appropriations

Public Law 626 is the annual appropriation act for the independent executive bureaus and agencies among which are the Veterans' Administration, National Science Foundation, Housing and Home Finance Agency and many others. It carries total appropriations for fiscal 1961 of $8,307,964,900, or about $109 million under the budget estimate.

PUBLIC LAW 627

Public Law 627 permits air carriers to give free or reduced rates transportation to (1) employees, present and retired, and their families, (2) widows and minor children of employees who died in air duty, (3) persons injured in air crashes, families, doctors and others in connection with the crashes, and (4) persons giving relief in times of pestilence or similar emergency.

PUBLIC LAW 628

H.R. 12232: 1961 legislative appropriations

Public Law 628 appropriates $129,470,410 for fiscal 1961 for the legislative department. This is $3,943,075 under the budget.

PUBLIC LAW 629

H.R. 1157: Ryukyu Islands

Our relationship with the Ryukyu Islands is unique in the history of the United States. I think you will share my interest in Public Law 629, which resulted from the studies of Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, and bears his name, the Price Act. MEL was a buck private when we were at war with Japan, now is a veteran member of the Armed Services Committee.

Okinawa is the largest of 63 islands in the Ryukyu group, about midway between Tokyo and Manila. It is the base of our Pacific defense. Under the peace treaty with Japan the United States exercises all powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction. Yet the islands are not American possessions, eligible to share in what we do for our own. Neither are they foreign territory, eligible under our foreign aid program.

Problem is to build up the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people with the objective of making them self-sustaining. Population density is among the world's highest, 1,000 persons per square mile.

Public Law 629 (1) authorizes an annual appropriation of $6 million (about equal to Japan's subsidy in pre-war years), and (2) turns over to the government of the Ryukyu Islands receipts from taxes and other sources much as is done with our own Guam and our own Virgin Islands.

PUBLIC LAW 630

H.R. 12231: Military construction appropriation

Public Law 630 carries fiscal 1961 appropriations for military construction, at home and overseas, housing, hospitals, missile, and other facilities of all military kinds. They total $994,855,000. This is $193,145,000 under the budget.

PUBLIC LAW 631

Chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act concerns only wage earners. Public Law 631 reduces the number of reports to the Treasury Department required of other bankrupts to a single notice to the regional internal revenue office of the first meeting of creditors.

PUBLIC LAW 632

Public Law 632 clarifies and strengths reemployment rights under the Reserve and Universal Military Training Acts. Among other things it specifies National Guardsmen are included. Employers, inductees, reservists, and others affected probably will wish to familiarize themselves with the provisions.

PUBLIC LAW 633

Court-Martial Manual automatically reduces to lowest pay grade an enlisted service person when convicted by court-martial. Court of Military Justice in the Sampson case said this held only when pay reduction was ordered by the court. Comptroller General, controlling the purse strings, sided with the manual. Congress quiets the confusion with Public Law 633. It (1) reduces pay to grade E–1 on conviction, and (2) restores former pay if court-martial sentence is set aside or pay reduction is not specifically included in the sentence.

PUBLIC LAW 634

Public Law 634 is another evidence of the amends the Congress is making for past trespasses upon the rights and dignity of the American Indian. It prohibits (1) the defacing or destruction of boundary markers on Indian reservations, and (2) the hunting, trapping, or fishing on Indian lands without permit. Penalties of both fine and imprisonment are provided.

PUBLIC LAW 635

Very important to our defense are the Polaris nuclear submarines. They are operated on a 2-crew plan, under which the crews rotate between sea duty and rehabilitation and training ashore. Public Law 635 extends extra incentive pay to the period both at sea and ashore.

PUBLIC LAW 636

Public Law 636 turns over to the Navajo Indian Tribe the irrigation project on its reservation in New Mexico. The Government will train tribal personnel and assist in operating project until trained tribesmen can take over.

PUBLIC LAW 637

In April of 1960 the Comptroller General reported a sampling of 13 oversea shipments by commercial air of household goods of officers of the armed services that cost the Federal Government $125,470 whereas the cost by water would have been $23,000. Two months later Public Law 637 had been drawn, passed by the Congress and signed by the President. It provides that hereafter no shipments, except in emergencies, shall be made by air if the cost is greater than by water or other means.

PUBLIC LAW 638

Public Law 638 puts reserve officers retiring after 8 years' service on the same basis as regular officers as regards travel pay to the places they have selected as their new homes.

PUBLIC LAW 639

Public Law 639 permits VA to furnish medical services for a non-service-connected disability, (1) in preparation for admission to hospital, and (2) in completion of treatment after leaving hospital. It is expected to accelerate patient turnover rate, partially check growing waiting lines as veteran population ages.

PUBLIC LAW 640

Grand Valley project in Colorado is one of the oldest and most successful of the Federal reclamation developments in the West. Public Law 640 permits the use (after operating expenses and payments to the Federal Government) of its revenues from power to meet its obligations for rehabilitation and improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 641

When a member of the armed services dies without a will (15 percent of the cases), settlement of his accrued pay cannot be made without approval of the General Accounting Office. That means a long delay, often pretty hard on a family with current bills to meet. Public Law 641 sensibly does away with reference to GA, except in unusual cases.

PUBLIC LAW 642

H.R. 11389: Executive Office appropriations

Public Law 642 appropriates $10,872,500 for fiscal 1961 for the Executive Office. The President is given $2,398,500 for personnel and expenses of the White House office, $1,500,000 for special staff assistants, $505,000 for upkeep of the White House itself, and $100,000 for White House repairs and furnishings.

Excerpts of Interview Between Senator Alexander Wiley and Dr. T. Keith Glennan, of NASA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the pace of our progress in space exploration has magnetically drawn the spotlight of respect and admiration by our own people, and the world. As a nation, our endeavors are: contributing, shot by shot, to our space knowledge; establishing a far faster rate of progress than had earlier been anticipated; and again reflecting favorably upon the ingenuity of a free people—putting their shoulders to a task.

With the rapid-fire space launchings and probes, it is difficult to keep abreast, not only of the specific shots, but of the significance of those ventures to the community of scientific knowledge, and to the ultimate conquest of the forces and elements of space.

Although there have been criticisms of our programs, it is not—realistically speaking—humanly possible to create beforehand a complete blueprint upon which to construct such a complex program—with so many yet unknown factors.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union started well ahead of the United States, today, we—in my humble judgment, based on expert opinion—are the leaders in space exploration, and the progress of our programs is moving ahead at a far faster rate than that of the Communist nation.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss the highlights of our space exploration with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, who is providing a splendid kind of leadership in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of our interview printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

TV INTERVIEW BETWEEN SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY AND DR. T. KEITH GLENNAN, OF NASA

Mr. WILEY. Friends, welcome to the program.

In the 1960's, the exploration of space will offer new challenges, adventures, problems, and promises for all of us—and for mankind. In these fast-advancing times, man's thinking, ingenuity, imagination—and, yes, his perspective—must extend to the new horizons. The home, fireside, community, and the national and international boundaries can no longer be the limits of our planning, dreaming, and vision.

To cope with the emerging challenges, man must attain a "satellite's eye" view, not only of his progress, but of the new interrelationships of men and nations on the globe—and of our planet, earth, to the universe.

Today, our exploration of space is only in its infancy. As a young child—beginning to walk, step by step—we, the people of earth, are moving forward gingerly—and yet, with confidence—into the unknowns of space.

As yet, there is no known yardstick by which to determine, evaluate, or predict the ultimate knowledge which the mysteries will unveil for mankind.

However, the tremendous progress already attained within a short time reveals—within our present limited vision—the prospects for dramatic, yet practical, benefits from further development of instruments and vehicles for exploring and utilizing space.

Briefly, now, let's review the accomplishments, projected plans for the future, and the practical benefits and rewards of space exploration.

To present the space picture to you, I have invited Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Welcome, Keith.

Mr. GLENNAN. I am happy to have the opportunity to discuss our program with you, Senator WILEY.

Mr. WILEY. As I recall, the United States has launched about 23 satellites, with 13 now in orbit?

Mr. GLENNAN. Yes; that's right. And I should point out that two of those are in orbit around the sun, of course.

Mr. WILEY. What, specifically, are these satellites doing up there?

Mr. GLENNAN. Senator, I would classify the accomplishments of our satellites into two broad categories. The first is the basic research category. This would include the Explorer and Vanguard series, which give us highly technical information about which we had earlier only been able to theorize. I refer to such matters as the Van Allen radiation belt; the concentration of low energy particles in space; radiation and magnetic storms and fields; and micrometeorites. All of these are tremendously important from the standpoint of basic research, and they help us in achieving our objectives of a more practical nature.

The second category of accomplishments goes toward the practical applications of our space program, and this would include the Pioneer, Transit, and Tiros series. From these we have the beginnings of reliable long-range communications, exact all-weather navigation, accurate earth and planetary mapping, and weather and climate prediction, and possibly control. These are scientific accomplishments to shatter the imagination, and they are at hand. Just as a case in point, we have here a half-scale model of Tiros I, which transmitted from orbit 23,000 excellent photographs of the earth's cloud cover, including the formation and movement of hurricanes and other violent weather phenomena all over the world.

Mr. WILEY. That's a splendid space-view of our accomplishments. Would it be your judgment, then, that—even though the Soviet Union launched the first sputnik, we are now ahead of the Communists in overall performance in space?

Mr. GLENNAN. It is impossible to gage Russia's overall performance in space, Senator, because space capability depends so heavily upon what is being done on the ground. Because of the policy of secrecy followed by Russia, it is difficult to compare their status with our own. I say unhesitatingly that from the standpoint of orbiting satellites—and not merely based upon numbers—that the genuine scientific accomplishments of our satellites surpass those of Russia.

Mr. WILEY. As I understand, you recently announced a new timetable of projects for the future, Keith. Would you give us a brief review of the program?

Mr. GLENNAN. Within the next 10 years, NASA plans about 260 major space shots, amounting to an average of more than 2 a month.

Before too many months have passed we hope to achieve a suborbital flight of an astronaut and, before the end of next year, a true manned orbital flight under Project Mercury. In, 1961, also we should see the first launching of an Atlas-Centaur vehicle employing for the first time liquid hydrogen as fuel.

In 1962 we hope to impact the Moon with a scientific payload and launch a spacecraft to the vicinity of Venus or Mars, or perhaps both.

In 1963–64 we should see the launching of the awesome Saturn vehicle, which we have here in model form. This 3-stage giant will be some 185 feet high and 21 feet in diameter at the base, will weigh about 1 million pounds as it stands on the launch pad, and will develop 1½ million pounds of thrust in the first stage alone. This scale model of a man standing at the base (pointing) gives you some conception of the size of the Saturn vehicle.

Also in the 1963–64 period we should see an unmanned soft lunar landing, as well as an Earth orbiting astronomical and radio astronomy laboratory. Unmanned vehicles are expected to circumnavigate the Moon and return to Earth, and reconnoiter Mars or Venus, or both.

In the 1965–67 period we will launch a program which we expect will lead to manned circumlunar flight, and an attempt to establish a permanent near-Earth space station. After 1970 we envision man on the Moon.

We recognize, of course, that unforeseen problems could slow down the achieving of these goals; or, conversely, breakthroughs could accelerate the program. At this time, however, we feel that this is a realistic plan for the 10 years ahead.

Mr. WILEY. The timetable of progress for the future is most impressive, inspiring, and challenging.

In looking ahead in space, it appears that the practical rewards may be just as dramatic and exciting as the idea of manned flights into space and to and from other planets. As a member of the Senate Space Committee—as a citizen and as a taxpayer—I am also interested in—as I know you are—these practical benefits. Would you review these for us?

Mr. GLENNAN. Although it's difficult to predict all the ultimate rewards of space, there are a number of foreseeable benefits, some of which I have already indicated:

(1) Improved radio, telephone, teletype, and television communications;

(2) more effective weather forecasting to minimize loss from tornadoes, hurricanes, and other storms and benefit agriculture and conservation programs for preservation of our natural resources;

(3) a stronger defense;

(4) further man's offorts to utilize heat and light from the sun and other natural forces of the universe; and

(5) generally gather other data and information about the elements and forces of space for harnessing them to serve mankind.

CONCLUSION

Mr. WILEY. I'm sure you'll agree that creating a greater public understanding of what we're "shooting for"—and what the benefits will be—is a most worthwhile objective.

Mr. GLENNAN. Very definitely. To secure the broad support of the people of the country—who must provide the resources and the personnel for manning the space program—this is absolutely essential.

Mr. WILEY. In conclusion, I want to congratulate you, Dr. Glennan, and your agency, for the splendid, outstanding accomplishments of the past, as well as the amazing plans you have for the future. Along with you, I sincerely believe that the forces and knowledge of space will play an increasingly significant role in the daily lives, security, welfare, and progress of our people in the years ahead.

Mr. GLENNAN. Thank you, Senator Wiley.

Mr. WILEY (to the audience). Now, friends, thank you for being with us.

Hemispheric Security: Congress Must Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, soon after the Congress recessed, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev on July 9, 1960, publicly declared that the Soviet, with its arsenal of rockets, is pledged to all-out support of Cuba in event that that country were attacked by the United States.

Does this provocative statement signify the existence of a mutual defense pact between captive Cuba and its Kremlin masters? I do not know, but believe it does. Nevertheless, this threat was and is a challenge of the most brazen audacity that could not be ignored and the President reacted promptly with a policy pronouncement on the next day, which I now quote:

The statement which has just been made by Mr. Khrushchev in which he promises full support to the Castro regime in Cuba is revealing in two respects.

It underscores the close ties that have developed between the Soviet and Cuban Governments. It also shows the Soviet purposes in this hemisphere.

The statement of the Soviet Premier reflects the efforts of an outside nation and of international communism to intervene in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere.

There is irony in Mr. Khrushchev's portrayal of the Soviet Union as the protector of independence of an American nation when viewed against the history of the enslavement of countless other peoples by Soviet imperialism.

The inter-American system has declared itself, on more than one occasion, beginning with the Rio Treaty, as opposed to any such interference. We are committed to uphold those agreements.

I affirm in the most emphatic terms that the United States will not be deterred from its responsibilities by the threats Mr. Khrushchev is making. Nor will the United States, in conformity with its treaty obligation, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

This was followed on July 12 with a statement by Premier Khrushchev to the effect that the Monroe Doctrine is dead, thus evoking a further statement on the matter by the Department of State on July 14 that I now quote:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1960]

TEXT OF MONROE DOCTRINE STATEMENT

In his remarks concerning the Monroe Doctrine at his press conference only July 12, Mr. Khrushchev again displayed his extraordinary ability to ignore facts.

In the first place, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed. Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine's purpose of preventing any extension to this hemisphere of a despotic political system contrary to the independent status of the American States is supported by the inter-American security system through the Organization of the American States.

Specifically the Organization of American States charter and the Rio Treaty provide the means for common action to protect the hemisphere against the interventionist and aggressive designs of international communism. Likewise, Mr. Khrushchev failed to mention that the Rio Treaty is the first of the regional treaties for which provision is made under article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

TREATY AIM CITED

Mr. Khrushchev might appropriately reflect on the fact that one of the considerations for establishing the Rio Treaty was that:

The American regional community affirms as a manifest truth that juridical organization is a necessary prerequisite of security and peace, is founded on justice and moral order and, consequently, on the international recognition and protection of human rights and freedoms, on the people and on the effectiveness of democracy for the international realization of justice and security.

One of the principal purposes of the Rio Treaty was to provide a method for dealing with threats of imperialistic powers seeking to establish their domination in the Western Hemisphere.

A further remarkable development was revealed in Mr. Khrushchev's meeting with the press. Speaking as the head of the Soviet Government, he arrogated to himself the power to determine what international agreements should or should not be binding—even though the Soviet Union is not a party thereto.

THREAT CALLED STRAW MAN

In this particular instance it was not only the Rio Treaty but also the treaty between the United States and Cuba covering Guantanamo, which he has sought to abrogate. While disregard for treaties to which it is a party may be viewed by the U.S.S.R. as a convenient approach to international relations, such an effort can only be regarded by law-abiding states as another example of Soviet intervention in the affairs of other countries.

Mr. Khrushchev's latest references to United States-Cuban relations are of a piece with his threat of July 9. As a pretext for his threat, he conjured up the strawman of a nonexistent menace of United States aggression against Cuba.

The threat of the use of force, made blatantly by the Soviet chairman in relation to the affairs of nations of the Western Hemisphere, is contrary to the basic principle of the United Nations Charter which rejects the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. This naked menace to world peace, brandished so callously by the Soviet leader, reveals the hypocrisy of his protestations in behalf of peace.

SEE BOLSHEVIK DOCTRINE

Moreover, these statements of Mr. Khrushchev appear to be designed to establish a Bolshevik doctrine providing for the use of Soviet military power in support of Communist movements anywhere in the world. Mr. Khrushchev speaks approvingly of the historically positive role of the Monroe Doctrine during the 19th century, when it was applied against the European imperialisms of that day, but declares that "everything has changed abruptly" now that it (the Monroe Doctrine) stands in the way of the new imperialism; international communism.

The principles which the U.S. Government enunciated in the face of the attempts of the old imperialism to intervene in the affairs of this hemisphere are as valid today for the attempts of the new imperialism. It consequently reaffirms with vigor the principles expressed by President Monroe: "We owe it * * * to candor * * * to declare that we should consider any attempt on their (European powers) part to extend this system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Today, nearly a century and a half later, the United States is gratified that these principles are not professed by itself alone, but represent through solemn agreements the views of the American community as a whole.

The agreements alluded to in the above statements are the 1947 pact of Rio, the 1948 Bogota Charter setting up the Organization of American States, and the 1954 Caracas Declaration.

With the sense of the statements above quoted, all thoughtful Americans of the Western Hemisphere, North, Central, and South, will heartily agree. But Executive pronouncements, merely reacting to crises created by our failure to lead boldly in making our position clear are not enough. They should be promptly followed up by adequate congressional actions on resolutions now pending in both Houses of the Congress to defend our policies from Bolshevist attacks.

In various previous addresses and unheeded warnings to this body, I have foreseen and predicted what is now happening, and outlined a definite program to remedy the situation in the Caribbean. So far, no conclusive measures have been taken and matters have been allowed to drift from bad to worse.

All the evidence increasingly emphasizes the necessity for immediate action and the gravest peril in further delay. We must make clear to all nations of the world exactly where we stand. Had the Congress and the Executive acted earlier, as they could and should have done, the present crucial situation might well have been avoided.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I ask again: Why wait for new blows to fall which may start another world war?

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years my research team at the University of Iowa, under the direction of Dr. Russell Ross, has conducted a study on the problems of small business. This study has been very interesting and worthwhile. This study has pointed up a need for certain legislation that will materially help resolve some of their problems about which I should like to comment briefly today.

Our study also reveals and it should be noted that American small business has grown, prospered, and gained more strength in 7 years of the Eisenhower administration than at any time during the previous 20 years. Today there are 4,666,000 businesses in the United States, an alltime high, and 95 percent of them are small enterprises.

This Republican administration recognizes that little businesses are the red corpuscles of the American free enterprise system. It has acted effectively to foster them. They must be kept healthy and vigorous and they must grow in numbers commensurate with the national growth.

To assist owners and managers of small firms improve their management techniques, the Small Business Administration cosponsors management extension courses with universities and colleges across the country. These courses are carried on at virtually no expense to the taxpayers, and to date about 700 courses have been conducted at 275 or more educational institutions. More than 22,000 students have attended.

Also as part of its management assistance activities, SBA publishes three series of leaflets for the benefit of small businessmen. These are titled "Management Aids for Small Manufacturers," "Technical Aids for Small Manufacturers" and "Small Marketers Aids." Distribution of SBA's aid leaflets has exceeded the 7-million mark.

Although much has been accomplished during the Eisenhower administration to foster and encourage small business enterprise and keep the doors of opportunity open to new businesses, there is urgent need for additional Government action directed at aiding small business firms to successfully solve their management problems in this age of rapid change and keen competition.

The need for such action is clearly demonstrated by the results of private surveys which time after time indicate that 9 out of 10 business failures in this country are attributable to incompetent or inexperienced management.

Let us examine for a moment the business failures record during 1959.

More than 95 percent of the 4.7 million businesses in operation in the United States are small. Yet it is among this group that most failures occur, and where the financial burden of loss is most severe. In 1959 the bulk of the failures was found in those business activities where small businesses are concentrated. For example, 39.6 percent of the failures occurred among the following industry groups:

Rank by number of failures:

Industry group:	*Number of failures*
1. Eating and drinking places	1,334
2. Retail food and liquor group	1,113
3. Retail automotive group	1,015
4. Retail apparel and accessories	1,011
5. Lumber and lumber products—manufacturing	503
6. Textile mill products and apparel—manufacturing	420
7. Food and kindred products—manufacturing	176

More than 28 percent of the total money loss was suffered by investors in these unsuccessful firms.

Recent Dun & Bradstreet reports with respect to the business failure experience of the American economy reveal that in 1959 approximately 14,053 businesses failed with a $692,808,000 loss to creditors. Thus, of every 10,000 businesses in operation in 1959, 52 failed, with a consequent average loss of $49,300 each. More than 60 percent of these failures had liabilities of less than $25,000, a relatively small amount in this land of multimillion-dollar corporations.

In the aggregate small business suffers by comparison with large and medium sized business when sales and profits are considered. Even at this time, when sales volumes generally are up, profits are down.

Since 1947 the annual rate of earnings on stockholders' equity has been consistently lower for manufacturing corporations with assets under $1 million than it has been for the larger ones. This may be attributed partly to the fact that industries in which small manufacturing corporations predominate, such as the textile, apparel, lumber and food groups, are characterized by relatively lower earnings. On the other hand, groups noted for large corporations, such as aircraft, electrical machinery, instruments, chemicals and drugs, and automobile manufacture, are characterized by relatively higher earnings. Nevertheless, when industry as a whole is considered, the earnings position of small manufacturing corporations has declined in the past decade. For these smaller corporations earnings before taxes in 1951 amounted to $2,027 million compared to $1,527 million last year—a drop of almost 25 percent. During the same period manufacturing corporations with over $1 million in assets increased their earnings from $25,592 million to $28,167 million, a 10-percent gain. Obviously, as the bigs get bigger, the smalls have to struggle harder and harder just to stay even.

Despite the danger of failure or the prospect of small profit, the desire of thousands of men and women to enter the competitive busines field is as strong as ever. This is reflected in the vigorous growth of our business population in recent months. During 1959 over 70,000 businesses were added to our growing business population. Virtually all of these were small with the greatest number of entries being made in the retail, service, and contract construction fields which are particularly characteristic of the small firm. Because Dun & Bradstreet tells us that over 57 percent of the firms which fail do so in the first 5 years, it is of paramount importance that these firms receive assistance.

The program that I have presented in H.R. 13039 is designed to provide such assistance.

Just what is the problem?

A simple answer to this question is difficult to state. But the general objective we are trying to achieve is to make it possible for a small enterpriser to establish a business and operate it profitably, without fear of being squeezed out of the market. We must provide the small businessman the help he wants and needs.

What does the small businessman need?

Management help, aid, and assistance is a primary need of our small businessman today. Dun & Bradstreet tells us that over 44 percent of the business failures in 1959 can be attributed directly to the incompetence of management. Lack of sufficient, balanced managerial experience accounts for an additional 35 percent of the failures, while unfamiliarity with the product line adds another 12 percent to the record. Thus, over 90 percent of the failures in 1959 can be attributed to one or more phases of management incompetency or inexperience.

Despite efforts on the part of Small Business Administration officials and employees, which have produced substantive results, much remains to be done. General Government experts can do only so much, and there are not enough of them to put more than a dent in a problem of such magnitude.

My bill will alleviate this problem. Small business advisers operating out of the business centers in the United States will be immediately available to the small businessman for on-the-spot consultation whenever problems arise. This adviser, using his skill, experience, and know-how, will provide sound management advice and technical assistance to any small businessman who seeks it. He will have at his beck-and-call—on a when-actually-employed basis—the literally hundreds of retired, successful businessmen who are concerned with the economic prosperity of their local communities, and who would be willing and anxious to assist the adviser when he is faced with problems beyond his comprehension or competence. These retired men have been owners, managers, production specialists and technicians who can give the technological aid so necessary for efficient operation of a plant or store; they have been financial specialists or operators who know how to raise and manage capital and operating funds; they have been marketing and distribution men who already have solved many of the mysteries of that important phase of business operation. Advisers, moreover, will have an intimate knowledge of Federal Government publications, technical bulletins and management aids, and sources of technical data. They will be able to help the small businessman exploit the almost limitless information resources already available, but of which he is presently unaware.

In our enterprising Nation where such rapid advances in science and technology are being made, new products and processes appear almost daily. Of course, this leads to increased obsolescence of plants, equipment, and products. Unfortunately, the small businessman is unable to enjoy the fruits of this research and development. He cannot afford to undertake a research and development program on his own account. He has neither the time nor the ability to evaluate the profit potential of a product or process discovered and developed by someone else. In this regard he cannot hope to compete with a large concern. Here the small business adviser will be most helpful. He will direct the attention of the small businessman to new developments affecting that businessman's field of operations. He will make available information with respect to new products and processes that can be manufactured or employed by the businessman.

These small business advisers will be performing an important and useful service and eventually, I know, will become dependable, invaluable cogs in the machine we call our economy. Small business will benefit, and the American people as a whole will profit.

Ukrainian American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my message on the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

THE UKRAINIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS

Twenty years ago the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America was founded by the First Congress of Ukrainian-Americans. Its objectives reflected the devotion of Ukrainian-Americans to their new country and their love for their motherland. In regard to the United States these objectives called for participation in the efforts of America to maintain peace and to strengthen the Amer-

ican way of life. In regard to the land of their origin, they called for making known the plight of the Ukrainian people and for helping the Ukrainians in their native land achieve their goal of freedom.

Today the Ukrainian Congress Committee is representative of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. It encompasses fraternal, civic, youth, religious, cultural, athletic, and other types of organizations from the many States in which Ukrainian-Americans have settled, providing a unity of action which is unique and valuable. For the past 20 years it has pursued its objectives with dedication and vigor, helping Ukrainian immigrants adapt to their new home, promoting the American way of life, and carrying on a campaign of education about the Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain in Europe.

Through the informational activities of the Congress Committee, the longings of the Ukrainian people for independence have been kept before the eyes of the world in spite of Soviet attempts to hide them. The history of the Ukrainian people has been brought to life and we have become more vividly aware of their 300 years of suffering under tsarist tyranny, the proclamation of independence on January 22, 1918, and the tragic takeover by a new tyranny in the form of Soviet communism.

On this 20th anniversary, all Americans join in wishing the Ukrainian Congress Committee continued success in its endeavors. We wish to express our gratitude for the service it has performed to the United States and its citizens of Ukrainian heritage. Finally, we express our hope that its ultimate goal of freedom and democracy everywhere will someday be achieved and the people of Ukraine will live in liberty once again.

Public Laws 643–676

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this completes my digest of all the public laws of the 2d session of the 86th Congress enacted up to this time as given in my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois:

BARRATT O'HARA'S REPORT FROM CONGRESS

PUBLIC LAW 643

Some 2,000 Americans owe Uncle Sam on notes for money for food and shelter when stranded in the Far East in the war years. Trouble is the notes are in foreign currencies. Example: One note for 16,800 Japanese central reserve bank dollars our GA says has a real American dollar value of $16.80. Public Law 643 enables Uncle Sam's debtors to settle on a realistic formula worked out by the General Accounting Office.

PUBLIC LAW 644

This clarifies special postal rates for educational, cultural and library books and materials. For instance, changes the term "phonograph records" to "sound recordings."

PUBLIC LAW 645

Public Law 645 authorizes $1.5 billion public works projects on rivers and harbors for flood control and improvement of navigation. CalSag, with $5,240,000, is among the approved projects.

Corps of Army Engineers at congressional direction has been a big factor in development and economic growth of the Nation. Our country now has 23,000 miles of navigable river, moving 115 billion ton-miles of traffic a year, 300 flood-protection projects, 32 multiple-purpose projects supplying 20 percent of all the hydroelectric power generated in the United States, 18 large reservoirs that supply 400 billion gallons of water annually for municipalities and industries, 6.1 million acre-feet of water for irrigation.

Congressman JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, of Chicago, with his seniority of five terms, is one of the high ranking and certainly one of the most popular and influential members of the important Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC LAW 646

Public Law 646 removes the escape clause in the conveyance some years ago of land, no longer needed, to the city of Little Rock in Arkansas. This will enable Little Rock to float bonds for the improvement of its municipal airfield.

PUBLIC LAW 647

Public Law 647 "authorizes" and "requests" the President to issue a proclamation inviting foreign nations to participate in the Pacific Festival at San Francisco September 9 to 18, 1960. Please note the quoted verbs. Congress cannot direct or order the President.

PUBLIC LAW 648

House Joint Resolution 397, refugee resettlement

Since the end of World War II over 2 million refugees have been resettled in the countries of the free world, 711,212 in the United States, which has only 6 percent of the world's land area.

Public Law 648 marks the participation of the United States in the drive of all free world countries to find new homes for the remaining unsettled refugees. It admits into the United States additional refugees under U.N. mandate in number predicated by the number admitted by cooperating nations. Hope is that refugee camps, after 15 years of existence, may be closed and brighter horizons of opportunity and contentment opened.

PUBLIC LAW 649

Management of the vast public domain is a big business. Public Law 649 gives to the Bureau of Land Management a greater flexibility of authority in fixing fees (now totaling $1 million annually) to meet inflated costs and use of revenues in expansion and maintenance of roads and forest trails. Logging operators, making heavy use of forest roads, are required to share in cost of preventing deterioration.

PUBLIC LAW 650

Public Law 650 creates a commission to prepare plans for a national celebration of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States. Surely an anniversary that all the world will note.

PUBLIC LAW 651

H.R. 12740, supplemental appropriations

Public Law 651 makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961 that total $138,293,740. Among items: (1) $1,500,000 for research to control insects, including the screw worm that causes annual damage to crops estimated between $25 and $125 million, (2) $73,666,700 subscription to International Development Association, (3) $5 million to purchase land near Capitol for new Library building, (4) $2,953,000 for Jefferson Memorial at St. Louis, and (5) $12 million additional for public housing.

PUBLIC LAW 652

St. Augustine in Florida is booming, needs more schools. Public Law 652 permits land conveyed to the city for a park to be used as site of a new schoolhouse.

PUBLIC LAW 653

Public Law 653 confers a Federal charter on the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc. Membership is limited to mothers, adopted mothers and stepmothers of sons and daughters who served in World War II or in the Korea hostilities or are presently serving with the Armed Forces.

PUBLIC LAW 654

Public Law 654 (1) denies to the District of Columbia the defense of governmental immunity in auto accident claims, and (2) relieves employees of the District from personal liability.

PUBLIC LAW 655

Harpers Ferry in West Virginia was the site of John Brown's famous raid in 1859, was captured by Stonewall Jackson in the Antietam campaign of 1862, and after the Civil War emerged a ghost town, its mills and armory all destroyed. Public Law 655 authorizes an expansion of the Harpers Ferry National Monument to take in John Brown's "Fort" and other lands.

PUBLIC LAW 656

Public Law 656 is another tribute to the immortal memory of the four chaplains who chose to die together on the troopship *Dorchester* that others to whom they gave their lifebelts could live. There is no greater epic of heroism and self-sacrifice in recorded history. Your vote, as I know you devotedly would have willed, was cast for an award posthumously of Congressional Medals to Chaplains George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington.

PUBLIC LAW 657

Public Law 657 authorizes $1 billion a year for fiscal 1962 and 1963 in Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions. At present A–B–C highways embrace 790,000 miles and carry 48 percent of the highway traffic of the Nation.

PUBLIC LAW 658

System of land-grant colleges and universities was established in 1862, since 1890 they have received direct Federal appropriations for teaching basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. These include chemistry, physics, botany, zoology, mathematics, basic English, veterinary medicine, and other subjects. Public Law 658 increases to $11,950,000 the Federal contribution to the land-grant colleges for teaching.

PUBLIC LAW 659

In 1959 Uncle Sam sold some land to the city of Keosauqua in Iowa for a sewage disposal plant and park. Keosauqua is shy of ready cash. So Public Law 659 helps out a good cause by providing 20-year installment payments, with interest.

PUBLIC LAW 660

Motorists, watch your step and test your breath. Public Law 660 establishes with the Secretary of Commerce a national register of names of all persons whose licenses have been revoked for drunken driving or who have been convicted of driving involving loss of life anywhere in the United States of America, including Puerto Rico, District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone.

George Stewart, of the National Safety Council of Chicago, and Bernard R. Caldwell, of Northwestern's Traffic Institute, were among advocates at House committee hearings. Motor deaths run about 40,000 annually, with 5 million persons injured and property loss of $7 billion.

PUBLIC LAW 661

Public Law 661 is stopgap legislation authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Board to permit 25 supplemental air carriers (nonscheduled airlines) to conduct limited operations for 12 months, pending further congressional study.

PUBLIC LAW 662

Public Law 662 makes the order of a referee in bankruptcy final unless a petition for review is filed within 10 days.

PUBLIC LAW 663

Public Law 663 increases from $225 to $265 monthly the rate of disability compensation to service-connected veterans who are totally disabled, or permanently housebound. It spells out that he does not necessarily have to require regular aid and attendance.

PUBLIC LAW 664

H.R. 10997, Guam

Pasco de Susana is the site of a public park in the city of Agana in Guam, the farmost territory of the American Union. Part of the area is land filled in by the dumping into Agana Bay of large quantities of debris resulting from the fighting in Agana in the liberation of the island from the Japanese. Public Law 664 turns title to this submerged or filled-in land over to the Government of Guam.

Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, who engineered the admission of Hawaii and Alaska to the Union and is confident that early in the 87th Congress Guam will be voted territorial representation in the House, was the author of Public Law 664. He tells me that favorable action on the measure was helped by Speaker Won Pat, Speaker of the Legislature of Guam, the most farflung legislative body under the Stars and Stripes. Speaker Won Pat is very popular on Capitol Hill. He has done an outstanding job in selling to the Congress that the United States will be judged in the far Pacific area by the warmth of the relationship between continental United States and Guam, its far away sister. With that I am in agreement.

PUBLIC LAW 665

This extends for 2 years the veterans guaranteed and direct loan program and requires that payments and deposits made by veterans shall be held in a trust fund to safeguard against claims of creditors of the seller.

PUBLIC LAW 666

Hydrofoil vessels, faster than vessels of conventional type, are not manufactured in the United States, therefore do not qualify under the law restricting commerce between American ports to American-built vessels. Public Law 666 makes an exception in the case of two hydrofoil vessels upon which the mainland of Puerto Rico depends for quick transportation with the off-lying island of Vieques.

PUBLIC LAW 667

Public Law 667 provides a new exempt category for income tax payments on trusts providing supplemental unemployment compensation benefits.

PUBLIC LAW 668

This relates only to the District of Columbia. It amends the District Narcotic Act to prevent too much dihydrocodeinone getting into a cough sirup to turn it from a medicine to a narcotic drug.

PUBLIC LAW 669

Public Law 669 establishes a National Capitol Transportation Agency for a coordinated system of rail transit, bus service and expanded highway and freeway networks, including portions of Maryland and Virginia, in the Washington Metropolitan area.

PUBLIC LAW 670

Public Law 670 affects only veterans of the Indian wars and the War with Spain. My advice to my Spanish War comrades is to look sharply before they leap. It permits them to get as much as $170 a month under Public Law 211 of the first session if helpless or blind to the extent of requiring the regular care and attendance of another person. Rub is that choice once made is irrevocable. If Spanish War vet remains permanently helpless he has made a good deal. But if his helplessness is temporary he cannot on recovery go back to his old Spanish War pension of $101.59 a month, paid regardless of his physical condition.

PUBLIC LAW 671

Public Law 671 is the first substantive change in assessments on banks under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act since 1950 when your representative was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and carried the brunt of the fight for an extension of the coverage to $10,000 for the protection of bank depositors. Not a cent has been lost by any depositor and the reserve fund is now over $2 billion, will reach an estimated $3 billion by 1968. Former Congressman Wolcott, in 1950, the ranking minority member and later the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, is now the head of FIDC.

Public Law 671 simplifies procedures in determining bank assessments and slightly increases FIDC's refund to the banks from net income. The House passed the measure by voice.

PUBLIC LAW 672

Most of the surviving persons who worked for the Government in the digging of the Panama Canal (now 55 to 80 years old) live in poverty on pensions ranging from $15 to $45 a month, graded by years of service, 10 to 30. Public Law 672 increases the pension $10 a month.

PUBLIC LAW 673

Public Law 673 is intended to strengthen the Government's hand in excluding obscene and fraudulent matter from the mails. It provides for a court order, on showing of reasonable cause by the Postmaster General. The order would tie up the defendant's mail until the investigation is completed.

PUBLIC LAW 674

This reduces from 1 year to 6 months time for filing caveat to a will in the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC LAW 675

Public Law 675 waives the zoning laws to permit the National Society, Daughters of American Colonists to establish its national headquarters at the desired site in Washington.

PUBLIC LAW 676

Another evidence of the intensifying fight against obscenity and pornography. Public Law 676 creates a judicial officer for the Post Office Department to act in all such cases. Congresswoman GRANAHAN whose fight against obscenity has made her name well-known in American homes, including many in our district, is the author.

Has Congress the Power To Investigate the Port of New York Authority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 14, 1960, I had the privilege of being a panelist on the program "Metropolitan Probe"—WNEW-TV, channel 5, 7:30 to 8 p.m.—with Gov. Robert B. Meyner; Councilman Stanley Isaacs, representative of New York; and the moderator, William Peer. We discussed the question of the authority of Congress to investigate the activities of the Port of New York Authority and the justification for its investigation.

This matter will be considered by the Congress, in view of the fact that the full House Committee on the Judiciary has voted to cite three members of the authority for contempt for refusing to produce the records of the Port of New York Authority.

The Port of New York Authority was created in 1921 with the consent of Congress. Without the consent of Congress, this bistate agency could not have come into being or into operation. This was the first bistate agency in the United States. Since then many other bistate agencies have come into being. These agencies operate in a manner which affects interstate commerce and, consequently, would be encroaching upon Federal authority if Congress had not approved the compact and the scope of its activities. The original compact of 1921, approved by the 67th Congress in chapter 77 of session 1, set forth the port authority's purposes, its scope, its powers. The resolution of Congress granted consent to the agreement for the creation of the port of New York district and for the establishment of the Port of New York Authority for the comprehensive development of the port of New York.

The Congress in its approving resolution declared as follows:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the said Government, and to each and every part and article thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of said agreement.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

Approved August 23, 1921.

Again in 1922 when the 67th Congress, 2d session, granted consent and authority to the Port of New York Authority to execute the comprehensive plan approved by the States of New York and New Jersey by chapter 43, Laws of New York, 1922, and chapter 9, Laws of New Jersey, 1922, it stated in section 2:

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

This matter shortly coming before Congress is a very important one. It is fundamental and far reaching. I am attaching a copy of the TV broadcast in which I was a panelist. This broadcast will provide certain information to my colleagues, and I trust it will to a certain extent be helpful to them in arriving at a correct decision on the question whether the port authority representatives are in contempt of Congress.

The broadcast follows:

PEER. Good evening. This is Bill Peer with another session of "Metropolitan Probe." Tonight another inquiry into the way our most powerful leaders fulfill the responsibilities that necessarily go with power. Our guest tonight is a distinguished visitor from across the Hudson River, Gov. Robert Meyner, of New Jersey. Governor Meyner is in the middle of a hot dispute over a current congressional investigation of the Port of New York Authority, the agency which handles the operation of port facilities on both sides of the river and the huge airfields that serve the metropolitan area. To-

night we probe into Governor Meyner's reasons for opposing this investigation, commuter problems of New York and New Jersey, and Governor Meyner's own political future. Our panelists for this evening, on my right, Councilman Stanley Isaacs, of Manhattan, the only Republican in the city council. And on my left, Congressman ALFRED SANTANGELO, Democrat, of Manhattan. Councilman Isaacs, I believe the first question this evening is yours.

ISAACS. Governor Meyner, I understand that in connection with this controversy that Mr. Peer has mentioned, you wrote a letter to the various Governors of the States and Members of Congress, asking their support in your dispute with Congressman CELLER. Can you tell me why so few have responded?

MEYNER. Well I might say, Councilman Isaacs, that practically every Governor feels favorable to the proposition. I was out at Glacier National Park at the national Governors conference, and it was there that a resolution was presented which in essence opposes the very thing Congress is trying to do. This resolution was passed unanimously. Now to date I have probably had about six Governors answer me personally and not one has taken the side of the congressional leaders. And quite a number of Congressmen have replied and many of those are favorable. Of course Congress hasn't gotten back to Washington and many of the replies are coming from secretaries, saying, "When the Congressman comes in I am sure he will give serious consideration to your letter." I think the response has been excellent. I know that practically all of the governors are opposed to the proposition of probing into the internal records. I want to make it clear that we are not trying to prevent Congress from looking into the areas Congress is expected to look into. What we are objecting to is that they look at the internal records. For instance, we might as a port authority look into the question of whether a contractor is fit to do business. Look into his financial responsibility. Get a lot of internal confidential information. I don't think that should be available. We might check the employment record of a person who is to be employed or promoted. We don't think that should be the subject of a record. As a matter of fact when the subpena was issued against the three people from the port authority they took seven packing cases of information down there. And apparently the subcommittee was more interested at the moment in establishing a record to hold these people in contempt. Even the Congressmen who might be favorable to a probe in the sense that they want some of these internal records, say that there ought to be some method by which we ought to determine this controversy without holding reputable citizens in criminal contempt.

ISAACS. You do feel that Congress of course has general power over interstate commerce and foreign commerce and is interested in the substance of what the port authority does. Is there anything in the original act which gave you and the Governor of the State of New York the power to organize this commission originally? And to continue to appoint its members? Is there anything in that act that gives Congress continued supervision over its details?

MEYNER. Congress takes the attitude that they do have this continuing supervision. We say it is not supervision. We say that they have the power to give consent. Now I think what happened was originally when the Constitution was formed, the Thirteen States didn't want two or three States developing a competing sort of government. To that extent this limitation was put in the Constitution that said, "No contract between the States can be entered into without the consent of Congress." I think what the framers were thinking "Well we don't want these two or three States developing a competing form of government." Now I say if they—if the Government gives us money for airways or for airport they can come in and check our records to see that we use the money properly. If we are engaged in some type of enterprise by which commerce is affected they can come in and look at that. But I don't think that they can come in and look into the internal administration of the port authority. The port authority is carrying on functions that a city or a State could be carrying on. For instance, New York City has a marine division where they build piers and rent them.

We don't think Congress will come in and say to them "Now let's look at all of your detailed records in this area." And by the same token when we are doing something that is properly a State function and which we think can be done better with the two States through the port authority that this power of infinitesimal investigation should go on.

ISAACS. I see.

PEER. Congressman SANTANGELO.

SANTANGELO. Governor, I am glad to see that you feel that Congress has the power to investigate the port authority if the conditions warrant. Your position apparently is diametrically opposite to that taken by the attorney general of the State of New York who has sent letters and briefs to the Congressmen to the position, to the effect, that Congress does not have the power to investigate the port authority, and that it is a bistate agency. And so I am very happy to see that you feel that we have the right if conditions warrant.

MEYNER. I don't think I am in disagreement with the attorney general of New York. I think that this particular investigation is a fishing expedition. After all I don't see any resolution of Congress on the record saying that we want to check this phase of interstate commerce, or we want to check customs, or we want to check the aviation problems. They want a staff study by which they are going into all ramifications. There is no pending resolution before Congress, as I see it, which says that there is some problem here we've got to look into. I think it is a fishing expedition that they are interested in right now.

SANTANGELO. Well of course we haven't heard from the Congress in the full House the reasons why the investigation is wanted. But it is a fact, is it not, that since 1921 when the compact between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey was entered into with the consent of the Congress of the United States that not one investigation, or one inquiry, into the inner workings of the port authority has taken place.

MEYNER. I can't say that that is a fact.

SANTANGELO. I know that in 1954 when I was in the State Senate I introduced a resolution to the effect that we should investigate the exploitation of the motorists who were compelled to pay 50 cents for crossing the bridges and the tunnels when the original bonds which had constructed these had been paid off. And it was at that time the port authority approached me and said that this was a bistate investigation, or a congressional investigation and therefore should not be done by one particular State, or one particular legislature. Now the question is whether or not this investigation should take place. Not whether or not Congress has the power because in the compact of 1921 Congress reserved unto itself the right to repeal, alter or modify the compact.

MEYNER. It reserved the right to withdraw its consent. I fully believe that consent is a lot different from having power. It is my feeling that most of the activity in the port authority is in the area that can be normally done by a State or a municipality or authorized by a State. These are functions that are ordinarily done by we'll say a port like Norfolk or Mobile or New Orleans. It happens that this port is in two States and because it is in two States we get together and do it by compact. And the Constitution only says "consent." It doesn't say a power. It doesn't say you run the thing. And I think it is very much like this. I don't think Congress can go into the President's office and get his records, or into a Cabinet member's office and get his records. If conservation and economic developments are engaged in some program that affects navigable streams they can come in and look at it and we'll give them all the information. But to look any time at general records it seems to me is going a bit too far.

PEER. Governor, the point that Congressman SANTANGELO made about the continuing tolls on the facilities operated by the authorities, tolls not being reduced despite the fact that the original bonds have been retired, do you feel that some of these tolls should be reduced?

MEYNER. I don't see how under existing conditions they can be reduced. For instance, Holland Tunnel has been paid off many years ago. But the revenues that they get from the Holland Tunnel will enable them to build piers.

PEER. The motorist is paying for the piers. That hardly seems fair. Don't you think the motorist is entitled to some relief? We have been told that the authorities have large surpluses for various purposes. Why should they continue to soak the motorist with a 50-cent toll because they want to build piers? That doesn't make a great deal of sense.

MEYNER. Well, I should like to point out to you for instance that if the third tube of the Lincoln Tunnel had to pay its way the charge would be a dollar—a dollar and 10 cents. Now they are building a second deck on the George Washington Bridge out of the 50 cents. Now it may take present day costs, they are going to spend for double decking for approaches on the New York and New Jersey side the cost wouldn't be 50 cents for going across but it would be $1 or $1.25. Now the fact that they have these facilities which were built at a lower cost enable them to pledge that revenue to raise more money to take care of additional facilities. And by the same token if they didn't build these modern piers we'd be losing our traffic, or very vital international traffic to some other ports along the eastern seaboard or maybe to the St. Lawrence Seaway. This is vital. Maybe we wouldn't have any jobs to drive to in an automobile. If we didn't develop the New York port—the New York and New Jersey port. I might say in this connection that when we build them we pledge this revenue. We build them and we get money back that pays for them, but this enables us to finance, the port authority through New Jersey and New York has no power, for instance, to levy a tax against the citizens of New York and New Jersey. All they have is this revenue. It is a billion-dollar corporation. But I don't know how the job would be done by the respective States if we didn't have this agency and I might say that it is a bipartisan agency. It was started out by Alfred E. Smith and Walter Edge, a Democratic and Republican Governor of the respective States. It subsisted even though we've had Republican Governors and Democratic Governors in New York and New Jersey, and Republican and Democratic legislators. And any time it is not being operated properly it is subject to investigation by the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey. I am sure, Congressman, that at times it resisted some investigation but the power is always there for the Governor to ask for any information and on the part of both branches of the State legislature to do it, and I don't see any overwhelming

sentiment of Congress to do it. Of course, you are a Congressman, you may encounter different sentiment.

PEER. Councilman Isaacs.

ISAACS. I'd like to bring up a different subject. You mentioned the George Washington Bridge and the new level being built. When that was originally designed as I understand it it was intended for rapid transit at least in part. But that has been abandoned. And of course you are interested in all your residents whether they work in New York or not. Here people arrive at the other side of the river by all of the railroads or they have no connection today in most cases with New York City where they want to work. So far too many people, from my point of view, come in by bus and by cars. That is encouraged and everything else seems to be excluded today by the port authority. That is true of the Narrows bid in their proposal. Isn't it time that someone persuaded the port authority—I'll put it that way—to build an underground railroad connecting all the railroads in New Jersey at their terminals and swinging in either through the Hudson tube or through the Narrows Bridge or the George Washington Bridge or what have you, carrying them by rail into our city. It is infinitely better for us to have people come in underground and connect with our local transit than it is to have our streets flooded with busses and automobiles.

MEYNER. I couldn't agree with you more, Councilman Isaacs, but I am afraid that you put the cart before the horse. Before we persuade the port authority I think we've got to persuade the traveling public. The traveling public somehow would much rather jump in a car parked outside of their respective apartment or home and travel into a crowded, congested city and pay the costs of parking. By the same token because a bus carries fewer passengers but gives more frequent service we want to use the busses. I think something must be done to counter this trend because I think if it continues we'll have nothing but chaos. And we try to counter it by setting up a division of transportation in our highway department so that we say to the highway builders "Well now look at Rapid Transit. The port authority whether you want to criticize them rightly or wrongly have merely followed this public trend of people getting into cars and busses and they furnishing the facilities for those people who want to go into cars and busses.

ISAACS. But they have encouraged the trend.

MEYNER. Well, on the other hand, on the other hand, any of these propositions that have been developed cost money—$400 million, $600 million, and there isn't in any of those studies any indication that you can make them pay for themselves. It may be that we can ask the port authority to be sensible about this thing and get the public to support them to subsidize this rail transportation which is much more efficient. You can travel and occupy much less space but how to sell the public on this? Places like Los Angeles where I think 60 percent of the downtown section is occupied by parking lots or streets are just clogged, all you have to do is get one or two cars stuck and everybody is jammed up for an hour or two especially at the rush hour. They are looking for something that we got and we should retain. I agree with you that there ought to be some method but first we've got to sell the public on using these facilities.

SANTANGELO. Governor, the purpose of the port authority was to enhance the transportation facilities of interstate commerce between States and between nations and also to aid in the general mass transportation. Since the last 10 years the port authority or the business in the port of New York which includes New Jersey and New York has been falling down and you may recall within the last 2 years in New York, the New Jersey Legislature the port authority opposed the bills that had been proposed in the New Jersey Legislature to have them take over transit facilities and cooperate in trying to streamline the transportation between the States. Now why is it that the port authority which has as its purpose improving the transportation facilities, encouraging transportation, comes into New Jersey and opposes aiding in the transit facilities of railroads and other transit facilities and at the same time their major objective, to increase the travel and cargo shipments out of the port of New York has been falling off? For example within the last several months we have heard through Governor Rockefeller that the wheat shipments through the port of New York have dropped to the lowest point since 1953. The port authority seems to be going into all other businesses. It has been labeled an octopus extending its tentacles throughout the State of New York. It has gone into Newburgh, 90 miles from the port of New York, and opened up a hotel. It is running a bowling alley. It is doing every other thing in real estate. Much of its business is going into areas unrelated to transportation, unrelated to the motorist, unrelated to the port. Do you think, Governor, that all this extension into areas which are not their primary concern and which prevent them from reducing the toll of the motorists who are financing and paying for the port authority revenue is fair? And should something be done about this? And don't you think an investigation by the Congress of the United States should inquire into this area to see whether they are applying their funds for the purposes of transportation into State commerce and don't you think that Congressman CELLER'S resolution to investigate along these lines is appropriate?

MEYNER. Does that question really call for an answer?

SANTANGELO. It certainly does.

MEYNER. It is the kind of question that starts off like "When did you last beat your wife." No I think you have got to differentiate here. I think obviously that originally it was thought that rail transportation would become important and that the port authority would move in this area. But I call your attention to the fact that in Boston, in Los Angeles, in San Francisco in Chicago, transportation by rail became a rather difficult kind of thing because people couldn't make money at it. People were leaving rail transportation and going to bus or to motor vehicle. Now the port authority representing the view of the public—the public wanted these facilities. I didn't hear any objection to building an extra tube on the Lincoln Tunnel or building a Lincoln Tunnel or any of the bridges that have been built. I haven't heard one. The public wanted them. They were responding to it. If any objection can be made of the port authority it is that it is conducted as a successful business. They always look for the successful projects rather than for those which would be subsidized. I think what they are worried about and remember you have got six reputable citizens in New Jersey, six from New York, and these people realize that they can only exist and build new projects which they feel will serve both States, if those projects will be paying propositions. Now if they have too many on the subsidy side they are going to be in difficulty. I think we found out long ago in transportation in New York City that it is a losing proposition. And they have been reluctant to take over. The Governor of New Jersey and the Governor of New York are interested in trying to get them to take some of these facilities over. I think we are making progress in that direction, but we can't saddle too much of a burden on them. Now with respect to these independent enterprises it has been—there are cases where they own airports and where they have to control the land which is the flight of the plane, the actual runway. Now they have leased some of that to private enterprise. They say they are leasing it at comparable rates charged other people. And the money they get from that enables them to maintain the services. Now this was written in their original constitution—their original laws. The Legislature of New Jersey and New York can withdraw this authority to build a hotel out at an airport or to maintain piers. They can withdraw that. As I say we might have to furnish them the money somewhere else to replace what revenue they get there.

SANTANGELO. That's $5 million for the hotel over in Idlewild and there is a bowling alley that they are operating and also a plan on the part of them to take over with $300 million all the East Side of New York. Don't forget this is a tax-exempt corporation. It pays no taxes. Interest on the bonds are tax exempt.

MEYNER. By the same token we don't take any of our revenues from the State of New Jersey or New York to appropriate them to the port authority to maintain bridges and piers.

PEER. Now, Governor Meyner, to get away from the——

MEYNER. I brought piers in here too often.

PEER. You know several of them. To get away from the port authority for a little while, let's get around to Gov. Robert Meyner. There was some criticism of you, you probably have suspected or heard, at the Los Angeles convention for keeping your delegates to what appeared to be a commitment to go along with you as a favorite son. What do you feel that has done to your political future?

MEYNER. I don't know what it has done to my political future.

PEER. What is your political future?

MEYNER. The political leaders in New Jersey decided early in January in 1960 that they wanted me to be a favorite son. The delegates were elected on that basis. We went to the convention on that basis. I assured all of the contenders that it looked to me as though I would be the favorite son on the first ballot. And KENNEDY would get most of the votes on the second ballot. We lived up to the assurances we gave to everybody. We gave any of those people who felt they had an opportunity after the first ballot to get their bandwagon rolling. We lived up to what we said to all of the delegates was going to happen. We didn't change at the last minute.

PEER. Now, Governor, under the New Jersey law you cannot succeed yourself as governor, can you?

MEYNER. I cannot.

PEER. What are your political plans from here on in?

MEYNER. I plan to be as strong a voice as I can present for the Democratic Party in New Jersey. I have given, or will have given 8 years of my life to State government. And we have tried to establish integrity in government. We have tried to establish a 21-county party. We have tried to make our politics synonymous with good government. I am going to try to exercise what influence I have—little or great—for the future to keep that kind of a party and that kind of government in New Jersey.

PEER. If the Democratic ticket is successful in November, do you feel that you may be a member of the Cabinet of the incoming President?

MEYNER. I won't be in a position to accept any job openings until January 1962.

PEER. Until 1962?

MEYNER. That's right. I go a year beyond——

PEER. I see. Well then is there any possibility that you may run for the Senate?

MEYNER. I have always found that jobs are available when you don't seek them too fervently.

PEER. And that is your position at this time? You are not seeking fervently but you sort of hope that it comes along?

MEYNER. Well I love public life. It gives more satisfaction, I think, than having a lot of money or being an outstanding person in your profession, or running a successful business.

PEER. Governor, I wish we had more time to go into a great many aspects of our discussion, but that is all the time we have on this session of "Metropolitan Probe." Thank you, Governor Meyner.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the past 20 years has witnessed the growth of an organization dedicated to keep alive the fires of Ukrainian independence and freedom. This organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, has persisted stubbornly despite obstacles, implementing American freedom and the power of the pen to spread truth and understanding about 114 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union, of which 42 million are Ukrainian. The many publications of the organization including the Ukrainian Quarterly and the Ukrainian Bulletin are acknowledged as authoritative literature, read by those who seek greater enlightenment in this area, maintaining the highest standards of integrity in their journalistic campaign of truth. The Ukrainian Congress Committee deserves the congratulations and gratitude of America for their endeavors, keeping our citizens aware of the Soviet rape of captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and the struggles of these nations for independence, exposing myths of Soviet unity, and proposing ways and means to defeat imperialist Moscow in the cold war. They have rallied some 2½ million Ukrainian-Americans to the cause of Ukrainian sovereignty. They have refurbished four centuries of hope by the Ukrainian people for the cherished gifts of independence and freedom which were realized in 1918 only to be heartlessly and brutally suppressed by the Soviet, Communist regime. The yoke of tyranny forced upon these people can never be forgotten. The accomplishments of the organization in these 20 years have given the Ukrainian people a new birth of hope that their sacrifices for liberty will not have been made in vain and that the rebirth of one independent Ukrainian state will soon be realized.

It is an honor and privilege for me to join with all Americans in conveying the appreciation of our country for their work. The Ukrainian Congress Committee has not shirked its duty to their brethren across the sea or to the free world. Let us pray for the maintenance of their strength to carry on future endeavors and let me hope for the fulfillment of their dreams for Ukrainian independence.

Only by Cutting Expenses Can We Hope To Cut Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, of all the problems which face the average American homeowner, worker or housewife, one of the most serious, most frustrating is the burden of taxation. This is a problem which affects every citizen of our land regardless of wealth or lack of riches. It is one from which none can escape.

Every citizen is aware, in a general way, of taxes. We become acutely aware of them when April 15 rolls around and the Federal and in some instances State and city income taxes fall due. But few are aware that almost every waking moment involves the payment of some form of tax. There are excise taxes piled upon transportation taxes piled upon real property taxes, all of which the consumer must eventually pay. The taxation of large corporations means an increase in the cost of their products. The tax paid by the small retailer, too, is passed on to the housewife and consumer.

For instance, there is much discussion about the telephone excise tax of 10 percent. The telephone companies wanted it removed. It must be remembered, though, that the companies do not pay these taxes—the people who use telephones do. And not only the 10 percent excise taxes, but also the real estate taxes the telephone companies pay are reflected in the monthly bill, and so is the tax on telephone cable and other equipment, and, of course, the transportation taxes to get this equipment from factory to the home. At every step, at every level, there is additional taxation, all paid by the use of telephones.

The growth of taxation has been the result of the growth of government, Federal, State, and local. Every new service actually costs the people who are supposed to be served.

There is talk of socialized medicine for the elderly. This new service cannot possibly be paid for entirely by social security taxes; other taxes will have to go up to help foot the bill. And the very people whom this new service is designed to help will be forced to pay for it from their meager receipts.

Once a new program gets launched, it is nearly impossible to curb it or to prevent it from growing. Therefore, the Congress should look with a careful eye at every new spending proposal, regardless of its purpose.

The other way to curb expenditures is to eliminate waste. Several important efforts have been made to curb this waste. At nearly every turn these efforts, to a great extent, have been blocked. There is fat and waste in the military. Our Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations has attempted to trim this fat, to curb unnecessary military travel, to prevent the overhiring of personnel and to control the use of high-salaried officers to do menial tasks. We are making some progress in this area.

It is my own recommendation that the Congress concentrate more on developing an efficient, streamlined government and less on finding new ways to spend the peoples' money. Only that way can we ever hope to reduce taxes in an orderly, economically sound manner.

Washington's Newspapers Deserve Praise in Handling Racial Listings in Real Estate Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that this month Washington's three daily newspapers—the Post and Times Herald, the Star, and the News—have abandoned the use of racial designations in real estate advertising.

Almost a year ago, on September 11, 1959, I introduced H.R. 9209, which would have prohibited newspapers in the District of Columbia from using racial designations in listing houses for sale or lease. In introducing the bill, I said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 15, page 19139.

> Some people may cry that this is an attempt to withhold information. It is nothing of the sort. It is an attempt to curb deceptive advertising. An examination of houses designated as "colored" in these ads will show that very often they are in neighborhoods still predominantly white. The ads falsely suggest to homeseekers who do not know the city that the houses are in a Negro neighborhood. Such designations act as a traffic signal, diverting white homebuyers to one section of the city and colored homebuyers to another. As a result, they are an obstacle to any attempt to stabilize these changing neighborhoods as integrated neighborhoods. Worse than that, the designations are used by some unscrupulous real estate dealers to "break" blocks, stir panic selling, and perpetuate and extend segregated neighborhoods. Deceptive advertising and racial zoning is not the proper business of newspapers.
>
> I regret to say that an example of a Federal area that continues this harmful practice is our Nation's Capital. The three major newspapers of the District of Columbia continue to list real estate by race, and show no disposition to examine the social and economic consequences of the practice. They have been listing houses by race for years and, though it is evident that the practice is a powerful force in creating racial ghettoes, the papers seem bent upon keeping things the way they are. This is the

result, I believe, of inertia, not of any careful consideration of what their advertising practices do. Because the welfare of this city and other Federal districts is entrusted to Congress, I believe we must take action in this matter.

The need for action to achieve the national goal of equal opportunity in housing was emphasized in the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which we received this week. My bill will materially aid this objective. I hope it will be promptly enacted."

A recent statement by the American Veterans Committee, through J. Arnold Feldman, its executive director, commended the three Washington papers for their forward-looking step. Mr. Feldman's statement reads in part as follows:

These racial designations in real estate ads have been an insidious influence in fostering racial segregation, racial ghettos, and racial tensions. Their elimination will greatly benefit the growth, welfare, and stability of Washington's neighborhoods. The Washington newspapers have, by this change in policy, come into step with the newspapers in many other cities which no longer use such racial labels. Among these cities are Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Sacramento, Indianapolis, San Francisco, and others. Two States (Oregon and Colorado) recently enacted statutes prohibiting racial designations in real estate ads.

It is our understanding that the newspapers will permit reference to race in ads for rental of apartments and furnished rooms; but we further understand that such references will not be placed at the top of the ad, that the ads will not be grouped by race, and that racial references will not be compulsory, but will be included only upon the specific request of the advertiser.

The new policy represents a great step forward in eliminating a substantial stimulus to racial discrimination.

The three Washington daily newspapers deserve praise for their forward-looking action.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Insurance Newsletter of August 8, editor, Mr. Al Goldsmith, are my remarks on the outlook for medical-care-for-the-aged legislation in the rump session of this Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this portion of Mr. Goldsmith's newsletter:

OUTLOOK FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED LEGISLATION OF THE RUMP SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri)

There is the usual flurry of predictions of what the Congress will do about health care for the aged when it reconvenes for its August rump session. They do not vary greatly from the predictions that were extant during the months of April, May, and June.

There is nothing fundamental about these predictions because they are all based upon a cynical approach to the subject. The presumption is that the entire matter will be decided upon the basis of what will get the most votes in the November election. The question of what might be best for the aged, their families, and our society as a whole does not enter into the discussions.

There is no question that some politicians in both political parties are treating the matter of health care for the aged in this fashion. Nonetheless, this is not the complete story.

There is a strong body of political opinion in both political parties that the question of health care for the aged should be decided upon what is best for the aged and our society as a whole, and not upon momentary political advantage.

Nor does this approach stem from a group of legislators who have taken a stand-pat position on the problems of the aged or, indeed, on the problems of our people in any area, in the past. It is headed by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Social Security Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. They believe that nothing should be done in this area in 1960.

Here are the background facts about the 1960 amendments to the Social Security Act which passed the House before the July recess and included a program of increased Federal participation in health care for the aged.

In the fall of 1959, the Social Security Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee held extensive public hearings on the subject of proposed amendments to the Social Security Act. This subcommittee went into the whole broad field of social security except for one specific area, health care for the aged.

The reason this area was set aside was because the Congress, in 1958, passed the Fogarty resolution requiring the executive branch of the Government to conduct extensive studies into the entire field of the problems of the aged. Under the resolution, the White House Conference for the Aging had been set up and its work scheduled, with a conference to consider these studies and make recommendations for courses of action to be held in January 1961.

The Social Security Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee made a unanimous report to the Ways and Means Committee, based upon its studies. In conjunction with the unanimous report, a bill was introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee which embodied the recommendations of the subcommittee for extensive and broad amendments to the Social Security Act. These amendments correct many inequities, liberalize and extend many of the programs, and improve their administration.

The full Ways and Means Committee held executive sessions on the subcommittee's report and bill and, within a week or 10 days, had agreed to almost every proposal. There were some additional proposals made for amending the act which met with the unanimous approval of the subcommittee and the full committee. The subcommittee's work and its additional proposals became the basis of H.R. 12580.

At this point, however, the highly controversial subject of health care for the aged was injected into the full committee's executive sessions. It was the view of the majority of the committee that the subject of health care for the aged should not be interjected into the comprehensive bill for social security amendments which had received unanimous approval.

However, due to pressures from outside the committee proceeded without the benefit of public hearings in executive session to consider various proposals for health care for the aged.

The Forand bill, as one proposal in this area, was early rejected by a vote of 17 to 8. It was rejected by the same vote several times later in the executive sessions. Other proposals, including the one finally recommended by the administration, were likewise voted down from time to time.

Throughout these executive sessions, which lasted almost 3 months, not one witness outside the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was called to give the committee information, on any phase of the subject. Time and again, the witnesses for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare admitted that they just did not have the data or information requested by members of the committee relating to the points under consideration. Time and again, requests were made by members of the committee to obtain additional information, much of which was available.

It was quite clear throughout these executive sessions that the real question was not what program might be good for the aged and our society, but rather, what the political heat would be if this or that bill on health care for the aged were passed out, or no bill at all.

In other words, this performance was not one of a legislative committee at work. It was an example of legislating under outside pressures based upon ignorance, not knowledge.

Who indeed can predict what a servile Congress will do? One which does not base its decisions upon committee studies, public hearings, honest executive sessions, honest committee reports and forthright debate on the floor of the House and Senate, but rather, upon outside pressures?

There is no point to go to the legislators and the legislative halls to make predictions of what such legislative bodies will or will not do. Go to the source, to those who are wielding the political pressures to find out what decisions they have made.

Will the Senate of the United States pass out without hearings or study or meaningful debate a health care for the aged bill tied to the social security "insurance" system?

Will the House conferees accept the Senate version?

Then the question becomes, Will the President veto the bill containing all the good and the unanimously approved amendments to the Social Security program, in order to block the ill-conceived health care for the aged features in the bill?

Will the decision be made upon the impact on the coming election or upon the balanced consideration of what is best for our people?

We reached a point of servility in the Congress of the United States on several issues in 1960, not just the issue of health care for the aged. Once it is established that votes can be bought for daily bread in a society, and the power of those legislators who wish to preserve an independent Congress is insufficient to stand against this protestation, the day of the Caesars cannot be far away.

Explanation of Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 120, Friday, June 3, 1960, a record vote on a motion to adjourn, I am recorded as not voting. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay."

Remove the Patent Monkey from NASA's Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the world was forcefully reminded of the crucial competition for national superiority in the field of space and astronautics—and I say "crucial" because it is now conceded that space exploration is becoming a prime influence in the ideological struggle between the free world and the Iron Curtain countries.

The reminder came in the form of Russia's Sputnik V, reportedly a 5-ton satellite containing almost a menagerie, which circled the earth for 24 hours and then was successfully brought back to land at a selected point in the Soviet Union. While the time involved was too short for Western scientists to check the truth of the Soviet claims, there appears to be no reason at present to doubt them.

Assuming they are correct, therefore, it is obvious that the Soviets are not far away from successfully placing man into space. Many experts, in fact, are predicting that this will take place within a month or two. If so, both the scientific and political ramifications of the feat will be very great indeed.

The reason for my brief review of the situation is to emphasize two things:

One is that, no matter how we rationalize it, we cannot get away from the fact that America's national space effort is vital to our security and our prestige and that we cannot afford to be second in this effort to the Soviets or anybody else.

The other point is that, in spite of the recognized importance of our space program, we are still indulging in an incredible sort of public myopia by forcing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to operate under provisions of patent law which hamper its efforts to improve space technology.

Mr. Speaker, I do not at this time care to get into the argument of how the United States stands vis-a-vis the Soviets in the so-called space race. As I have pointed out, the Soviets are very formidable. Nonetheless, in a relatively short time United States achievements have been remarkable and it would be idiotic to downgrade the worth of such recent ventures as Tiros, Transit, Pioneer V, Discoverer, and Echo. I note that Britain's eminent astronomer and space authority, Prof. A. C. B. Lovell, has said in just the past few days that the Russians "undoubtedly have a lead of several years over the Americans in their ability to put extremely heavy objects into orbit and also in the precision of their guidance. But, on the other hand, the Americans, from the extremely wide scope of their scientific experiments and their ability to extract fundamental results, have a considerable lead over the Russians."

This is not to suggest that our space program is all it should or could be. I have been critical of that program in some aspects in the past. I expect to be so again in the future. That is part of the function of the committee which I have to honor to chair. But I hope our criticisms will always be constructive ones leading to the fulfillment of our basic objective—which is to help make the American space effort as sound, effective, rapid, and economical as possible.

And it is in connection with this basic objective, Mr. Speaker, that I again emphasize the need to change NASA's organic act in order to free the Space Agency from its unduly burdensome patent provisions.

I am at a loss to understand the logic of continuing to require NASA to function in a condition of partial paralysis.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 forces NASA to take the entire right, title, and interest to patentable inventions made by contractors in the course of their work with the Space Agency. Worse, it does not allow anyone to receive a patent on any invention which may have significant utility for aeronautics or space unless the inventor can prove that his brainchild was developed without the aid of Government money.

Is it any wonder that NASA has difficulty in getting the best research available and getting it economically?

In most cases, all the Government really wants, needs or can use is a permanent royalty-free license to inventions made under space research contracts. And this right the Government always obtains under NASA contracts. So why do we demand that the space agency clutter and foul its vitally important contract processes with patent provisions which are anathema to private enterprise and generally useless to the Government and the public? Why NASA—when other Government agencies (with the exception of the Atomic Energy Commission) are free to contract for research and development as they please?

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, through its patents subcommittee headed by Representative ERWIN MITCHELL, of Georgia, and in full committee, investigated this complex patent problem for nearly a year. We found that the provisions tended to retard the conduct of the national space effort. And we agreed with the contention of NASA that the law could be amended in a manner to permit far greater contract flexibility and at the same time continue to safeguard the public interest from any flagrant misuse of government rights and funds.

We very carefully drafted a new provision which eventually drew the approval of Government experts, of industry, of the patent law profession and of small business.

That provision was contained in a bill—H.R. 12049—amending several parts of the Space Act. It was debated in the House for 2 days last June. At that time any arguments of potential dangers to the public interest, alleged by some to be inherent in the new provisions, were conclusively shown to be without foundation. The House passed the bill by the overwhelming vote of 235 to 31.

Now I freely acknowledge that Federal patent policy as a whole may need review and perhaps revision. But this will be a time-consuming matter for the proper authorities to investigate and weigh. Meanwhile, I cannot subscribe to the view that the U.S. space program should be made to suffer during this long interim, particularly when the recommended changes have the approval of our most knowledgeable Government patent officials and when authorities such as the Comptroller General of the United States express doubts that it will ever be possible for all Federal agencies to follow precisely the same contractual patent policies.

In my opinion it is folly to procrastinate where our space effort is concerned.

I do not know what plans the other body may have for considering the changes in the Space Act which the House has approved. But it is my earnest hope that those changes will become law in the near future.

Col. James Gaynor, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago a fellow Hoosier was assigned to the Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Army, as Chief of the Legislative Division. He has done a superior job in this assignment and has earned the respect of all who have had association with him in this job. No man could have served the Army better in this assignment which has been extremely difficult at times; and his fair, kind, and efficient handling of those problems with which he was confronted has added to the prestige of the Army.

It is no accident that Col. James K. "Jim" Gaynor has done an outstanding job, for he has always performed in that manner. During two of the years that he attended Indiana University he was managing editor of the Star-Courier, where he was highly regarded by all who had contact with him. He holds B.S. and J.D. degrees from Indiana University and LL.M. and S.J.D. from George Washington University. He is accomplished in the world of sports and was an accredited umpire in following leagues: Arkansas State League, Nebraska State League, Western Association, North Carolina State League, Northern New York-Vermont League, Pennsylvania-Ontario-New York League, Three-I League, American Legion Junior National Finals at Omaha, Detroit, Denver, and Miami.

Colonel Gaynor has had a distinguished military career which included a tour as judge advocate of the Ryukyus Command in Okinawa.

Colonel Gaynor has written many outstanding legal articles, the latest of

which is his book "The Army and the Congress," soon to be published, which is very informative and challenging.

We are happy that, although Colonel Gaynor is leaving his present assignment, he will still remain in Washington as a member of the board of review of the Office of the Judge Advocate General. Capitol Hill, especially those of us from Indiana, wish Colonel Gaynor the best.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the Establishment of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, personnel of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Altoona, Pa., under the leadership of Mr. Bernard E. Leighton, manager of the hospital, celebrated the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the Veterans' Administration at an enjoyable outing held at Lakemont Park, July 21, 1960, at 6:30 p.m.

During the fine program, it was my privilege to deliver the following address in keeping with the anniversary celebration:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, JULY 21, 1960, 6:30 P.M., LAKEMONT PARK, ALTOONA, PA.

Thirty years have passed since the founding of the Veterans' Administration, and these three decades provide a record rich in human service.

For this reason, it gives me the greatest pleasure to appear before you today and to add my praise to those of many others throughout the country for the splendid accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration.

Before the Executive order was issued July 21, 1930, establishing the Veterans' Administration—many of us will recall the cumbersome manner in which veterans' laws were administered because of the lack of one central agency.

It was apparent after the armistice in 1918 that some means should be found to meet the growing needs of American veterans whose ranks were increased by the 4,744,000 veterans who—according to records of the Veterans' Administration—served in World War I.

From the close of World War I until 1930 there were numerous bureaus and agencies concerned in the administration of laws providing benefits for veterans.

The Executive order of July 21, 1930, was the result of the act of July 3, 1930, which authorized the President to consolidate and coordinate the Federal agencies especially created for or concerned with the administration of veterans' laws.

As a result, the Veterans' Administration was born for the purpose of placing the administration of veterans affairs "under one roof."

To those of us who recall the operation of the old agencies such as the Pension Bureau, the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers, and the Veterans Bureau, the creation of the Veterans' Administration was a master stroke for efficiency and service.

It would be difficult indeed to pick one program of the many sponsored by the Veterans' Administration as the most valuable or most successful.

If, for the sake of discussion, I were to single out one activity, however, I think few would quarrel with my choosing the hospital and medical care program of the Veterans' Administration, as one of the most essential.

We in Altoona have had good occasion to experience first hand the importance of the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

We are fortunate to have an excellent Veterans' Administration hospital in our community under the management of Mr. Bernard E. Leighton, who is recognized as one of the finest hospital managers among Veterans' Administration personnel.

The excellent medical care obtained at the Altoona Veterans' Administration hospital is due to the personal interest taken by Manager Leighton and the highly trained and efficient medical and nursing staffs and hospital personnel.

We are also deeply aware of the vital role a Veterans' Administration hospital can play in raising the health standards of the entire community.

This it does in two ways:

First of all, the Veterans' Administration hospitals and the medical care program take care of those service-connected disabilities incurred by former members of the Armed Forces.

It would be difficult—if not impossible in many cases—for veterans to obtain and finance care for these ailments in any other way.

The number of veterans in this country now stands at more than 22 million.

As the percentage of this group aged 65 and over has continued to grow—their health problems have become increasingly severe.

It is clearly to the advantage of the entire community that certain of the medical problems of this group be treated in special facilities at Government expense.

A second major advantage to the community of the Veterans' Administration hospital program lies in the inevitable interdependence of all the facets of a community's health services.

The excellence of each component contributes to the excellence of the whole.

Thus—many communities now boast improved hospital facilities as a partial result of the high level of care in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Since the veteran is eligible for medical and dental care for service-connected disabilities from private physicians and dentists on a fee-for-service basis—the medical program of the Veterans' Administration is further integrated into that of the rest of the community through private practitioners.

The Veterans' Administration also authorizes care in other public and private hospitals and homes when this is necessary.

We can view the improvement in medical care for veterans as part of a larger picture—the tremendous advance in hospital care for the entire population.

We know that some provision has been made for the medical care of former members of the Armed Forces as far back as—and before—Civil War days.

We read of the founding of sanitary commission homes for sick and disabled soldiers and sailors in 1861.

But when we investigate the hospital conditions of that time, we can be more grateful than ever for Veterans' Administration and other hospitals of today.

Apparently a popular saying a century ago was—"Be born at home and die at home."

Hospitals of that era were a combination of pest houses and almshouses with a tremendously high death rate.

The mortality from amputations in the hospital hovered between the figure of 40 and 60 percent—a much higher number than those performed in private homes.

In addition—the lack of paying patients meant that hospitals faced a constant struggle to keep their doors open.

I understand that during the Civil War the Government stepped in to pay 94 cents a day per soldier patient.

A mere rundown of advances since that time makes my head swim.

There have been major revolutions in every conceivable facet of hospital operation from personnel to equipment—to methods of treatment.

Veterans' Administration hospitals account for about eight percent of the Nation's average daily patient load and hospital beds.

This significant segment of the Nation's hospital plant has become the center for the world's most remarkable and advanced medical care—along with the rest of the hospitals of this country.

The evolution of the modern hospital is vividly described in a report presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means in April 1959—by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the subject of hospitalization insurance for social security beneficiaries.

The report states in part:

"The hospital of today is as unlike the hospital of 20 or 30 years ago as the 1958 automobile is unlike the model T.

"You pay more but also get more.

"The hospital of today stands for the oxygen tent—the blood bank—the operating room—and the other instruments through which modern medicine demonstrates its ability to save life.

"It is also where the laboratory and radiographic procedures and radioactive elements are available for diagnostic procedures.

"It is a complicated organization of services most of which must be available for use on a moment's notice."

When we focus our attention specifically on the medical program of the Veterans' Administration—we note an amazing capacity for growth in excellence even in its development shortly after World War II when the Department of Medicine and Surgery was first organized.

An aspect of the changed procedures which interests me particularly is the organization at that time of a system of cooperation between Veterans' Administration hospitals and the rest of the medical community.

Based on the assumption that the finest of medical practice can be found in an atmosphere of teaching and research—committees composed of deans and the heads of major departments in participating medical schools give advice in staffing—education and research to the managers and staffs of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

There have been two vitally important by-products of this system.

One is the high level of care in Veterans' Administration hospitals made possible by access to the most enlightened and advanced medical opinion.

The other is the atmosphere of acceptance and understanding between practicing and teaching physicians and Veterans' Administration personnel.

Both groups are aware that they are working toward the same goal of better medical care for all the people of this great Nation.

In the field of medical research, too—collaboration with other Government agencies and private groups has resulted in a vital, successful Veterans' Administration program.

Many medical specialists have been attracted to the staffs of Veterans' Administration hospitals by the opportunity for research—and this has worked to the benefit of patients in these hospitals.

In addition—the program has yielded many worthwhile results—such as the development of a successful plan for the treatment of tuberculosis by chemotherapy.

This revolutionary development has shortened the period of hospitalization for tubercular patients and has substantially reduced the morbidity and mortality from this disease.

There is yet another aspect of the development of the Veterans' Administration hospital program which I find particularly encouraging.

This is the solution recently settled upon by the President—on request from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—to the problem of regulating the overall total of Veterans' Administration hospital beds.

The President set the total for Veterans' Administration beds at 125,000 and—at the same time—provided that—within the limit—beds could be shifted from one use to another or from one geographical area to another depending on medical needs.

This decision resolved two difficult questions in the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

First it removed the possibility that the total number of beds would continue to expand responding to pressures of all kinds—regardless of the number of unused or little used beds in certain areas.

The fixed total requires the most responsible kind of constant and continued evaluation to determine where and how Veterans' Administration beds may be most profitably used.

The resulting administrative stability will lead to better medical care.

Secondly, this policy decision clarified the issue of how much care would be available for veterans with non-service-connected illnesses.

It had previously been understood that such veterans could receive care if they were unable to pay for it otherwise—and if a bed were available.

But the possibility of demands for this type of care constantly expanding the total number of Veterans' Administration beds was not a pleasant one.

It is now clear that there will be an upper limit to the number of non-service-connected cases which can be cared for at Government expense after that.

In addition to constant improvement of its hospital care program—the Veterans' Administration has continued to meet the changing demands in medical problems of the veteran population.

Significant changes in medical practice have made it possible to increase the use of outpatient services and thereby to reduce hospitalization.

As the number of veterans suffering from permanent or chronic disabilities continues to grow—the domiciliary program becomes increasingly important.

Great advances in rehabilitation have opened up new possibilities for extending the productive life of disabled veterans.

We see in the medical program of the Veterans' Administration a living example of the gratitude of an enlightened society to those men who gave up valuable years of their lives and often their health to the service of their country.

We see not a grudging dole or a fixed pension—as if this debt could be repaid in any set dollar amount—but a changing, flexible program suited to meet the most urgent needs of the veteran.

We can also see a healthy attitude of self-evaluation on the part of the Veterans' Administration—A recognition that the problems of the veteran must be matched against the problems of other members of our society—that the requirements of the veteran are subject to continual change—and that this change must be reflected in the Veterans' Administration program.

In 1929 President Hoover commented in his state of the Union message on the advantages of a strong—unified agency to administer veterans' benefits.

He stated: "I am convinced that we will gain in efficiency—economy—and more uniform administration and better definition of national policies—if the Pension Bureau—The National Home for Volunteer Soldiers—and the Veterans Bureau are brought together in a single agency."

Thirty years have—I believe—confirmed his predictions.

Whether it is the veterans' hospital in our own community of Altoona—or the assistance to a disabled veteran or the home loan program of the Veterans' Administration—we are struck by the vigor and responsible attitude of a program designed to serve the veteran and the Nation.

Therefore, in concluding my remarks on this happy occasion, I wish to commend again Manager Bernard E. Leighton and the doctors, nurses, and professional employees—as well as all other hospital personnel—for the part they have played in maintaining the high standards of the Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital.

In this connection, let it be remembered that all employees of the Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital, regardless of the type of their employment, share in the credit being given for a well-staffed and efficiently operated hospital.

For that reason, all of you can "take a bow" because your contribution added to those of your fellow-employees, making it possible for the Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital to maintain such a fine rating for efficient service, and excellent medical and hospital care.

It is my sincere hope that continued success will be the result of such highly dedicated service in the constant effort to alleviate human suffering and to restore peace and contentment to troubled minds.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this fall the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of its founding. This committee is a uniquely united national organization reflecting the thoughts and sentiments of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

It is dedicated to the task of serving the national security interests of this country by first, advancing the strategic value of all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself; second, informing the people of this country about the independence struggles of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; third, exposing the many current myths about Soviet unity in all its alleged ramifications; and, fourth, proposing concrete ways and means to defeat imperialist Moscow in the cold war, the chief mode of which is psychopolitical and propagandistic.

I pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian people in this country and throughout the world who are dedicated to the belief that freedom is the right of all nations. It remains for us of the free world to help them sustain their faith in God and humanity, in their own survival and in their inevitable freedom. Words of encouragement and sympathetic expressions of understanding of their plight will mean a great deal to these people in their dark hours of desperation.

We must work diligently in support of freedom everywhere so all freedom-loving people of the captive nations may continue to hope fervently that they may soon enjoy the God-given right of independence with justice which should be the national heritage of all mankind everywhere.

Proposed Citation for Contempt of Congress by House of Representatives of Officials of the Port of New York Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, late today a telegram came to one of my colleagues from New York in the House of Representatives. Apparently it was sent to all Members of the House by the incumbent Governor of New York, Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, and the three preceding Governors of New York, Hon. W. Averell Harriman, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, and Hon. Herbert H. Lehman. The telegram is with relation to a matter which will be before the House of Representatives tomorrow concerning certain citations for contempt involving three officials of the Port of New York Authority. This agency is a bistate agency.

The telegram makes an urgent plea which otherwise might not be available to all Members of the House tomorrow, because of their not having received a telegram or through other failures of delivery. Therefore, in fairness to my colleague, Representative LINDSAY, who has asked that this matter be placed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, that the text of the telegram be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it will be readily available to all Members of the House of Representatives.

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

AUGUST 22, 1960.

Telegram to all Congressmen:

We join together in our respective capacities as Governor of the State of New York and as his immediate predecessors in that great State office to express our concern over the recommendation to be made to the House of Representatives tomorrow that the House cite three respected officers of this State and the State of New Jersey for contempt of Congress. One of these officers is serving our

State, on successive appointments by Governor Dewey and Governor Harriman, as the nonsalaried chairman of the Port of New York Authority.

To the best of our information and belief such precipitate and unhappy action would mark the first time in the history of the United States that the Congress ever voted to instigate criminal prosecution for contempt against State officers serving a State agency in a matter that concerns the proper exercise of their official State duties. What is more they will have been cited for carrying out the express and written instructions of the Governors of New York and New Jersey, based on the conclusion of the two Governors that "the furnishing of the internal records now requested, in the opinion of (the Governors') legal advisers, would represent a serious infringement of the rights of the States under the Constitution and could constitute a dangerous precedent as recognition of Federal authority in an area of State responsibility."

Prior to the issuance of these instructions the three officers had made available to the Congress great volumes of materials amply sufficient to supply all the information with which the Congress could have any proper concern in the pursuance of its legislative functions.

Since last April the Governors of New York and New Jersey, as well as many former Governors, had asked to be heard in opposition to the bill introduced by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER (H.J. Res. 615) which would require that all future projects of our port agency here in New York be conditioned upon the approval of the Congress and the President of the United States, and which would provide also for a continuous right of inspection, review and approval by the Congress of all books, records, and papers of the port authority. The hearings on this bill have been repeatedly and now indefinitely adjourned by Congressman CELLER with the result that both the two Governors and former Governors of New York and New Jersey have been denied any opportunity to be heard in opposition to this destructive legislation.

Furthermore, the appeal of Governor Rockefeller and Governor Meyner to be heard by Mr. CELLER's committee before any action was taken by his committee on the contempt citations was also rejected by Congressman CELLER.

We are therefore faced with an assertion of Federal power to control State and municipal agencies which would wrench our system of government from its established foundations. As Governor Rockefeller and Governor Meyner put it in their joint directives of June 25, 1960, to the port authority the subpena at issue appeared to us and our legal advisers to constitute a novel intrusion by the Federal Government into areas reserved by the Constitution to our respective States and to constitute a precedent which could subject various agencies of State government throughout the Nation to be similarly answerable to Federal authority.

There has thus been precipitated a clash between the Congress on the one hand and the constitutional rights of the people of the States to administer their own governments on the other which can and should be avoided. We respectfully request you support our position.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
W. AVERELL HARRIMAN.
THOMAS DEWEY.
HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was my hope that this matter could be discussed at some length in the Senate today. There is great concern throughout the country over the proposed action in the House of Representatives. Not only are the Governors of New York and New Jersey concerned about the development; but we have had some expressions of concern from many Governors. Furthermore, there are 36 bistate agencies which are looking with interest, some with alarm, but all with concern, at this development.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I thought might be timely for the discussion in the Senate today. However, the hour is late, so I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

I have refrained from public comment on the dispute between the Port of New York Authority and Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee because I do not wish to interfere in a matter now directly under House consideration. Since, however, the subject has been raised here today, I would like to give a brief statement on my reasons for hoping that the subcommittee will not press for a contempt citation.

Thirty-six interstate agencies throughout the Nation now await the outcome of this dispute. Grave concern has been expressed by the directors of those agencies, by several Governors, by legislators, and by newspaper editors and others who have studied the relationship of State and Federal Government.

Already, several of the New Jersey Representatives who asked for the original House subcommittee inquiry into port authority operations have said that the demands made by the subcommittee go further than anything they asked for. Gov. Robert Meyner has found considerable agreement from other Governors on his stand against the investigation of records describing internal operations.

Undoubtedly, there are many general questions about the Port of New York Authority that warrant the attention of legislators here and all those concerned about the powers of such agencies elsewhere throughout the Nation. How, for instance, are metropolitan regions of the future to work cooperatively with such agencies to settle mutual problems? But I personally doubt that the issuance of subpenas will lead to little more than protracted court test and general confusion about the purposes of the original House subcommittee inquiry.

I think that Governor Meyner, in a letter to New Jersey representatives on August 19, suggested a wise and workable alternative. First he wrote that he objected only to the subcommittee request for material relating to internal management of the agency, not to requests for any documents necessary to help the Congress in its study of whether the agency is operating within the scope of its authority. Then he wrote:

"There is a simple, quick, and efficient means by which the issue could be resolved in court if the committee were willing to permit it. The Attorney General of the United States is fully empowered to bring an action against the port authority for a declaratory judgment as to the respective rights of the Federal and State Governments. *United States* v. *California* (332 U.S. 19 (1947)).

"I would be pleased to have a court test if Congress wishes to question the sanctity of confidential internal memoranda of an executive arm of State government. Indeed, I have requested such a court test. But I believe it would ill befit the importance of this principle of Federal-State relations to try the issue in a criminal proceeding against three eminent, reputable State officials who acted in conscientious obedience to the instructions of the elected chief executives of their States."

It may well be that, after nearly 40 years of operation under a novel method of authorization, the Port of New York Authority will require a legislative reassessment of some of its policies. Any such reassessment can be done most thoroughly, I believe, at a State level, while Congress lives up to its more general responsibilities.

I hope, therefore, that a more satisfactory way will be found for the subcommittee to continue its inquiry, if it is decided that the inquiry must be continued. Unless we do find a more satisfactory way, we shall find ourselves increasingly involved in side issues rather than in obtaining a more thorough understanding of the questions raised by the overall impact of interstate agencies on the Nation today.

Communist Propaganda in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, recently while waiting in a barbershop in New Delhi, India, I looked around as one does in our country for something to read.

I picked up a magazine with a beautiful colored front. It was printed in English.

It was called Soviet Land. It was published in Moscow.

I glanced through it quickly. I immediately recognized a superb job of Communist propaganda.

It was not all. There were others in the pile. One was entitled "China Reconstructs." It told of the Red Chinese Communist experiment in vivid and dramatic language. It was published in Peiping. There were still others, all gorgeously prepared periodicals, from Communist satellite countries.

My curiosity was aroused. I was there as a U.S. Congressman, chairman of a committee which seeks to promote American private investment in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and the Middle East, hoping to improve the climate for such investment.

But the literature in the barbershop was a real barrier to my mission. I asked the barber where he got it. He said it came in free every week. I looked around for something to counteract this massive display of Communist propaganda.

There was nothing. Not a single publication from the United States or any other free world nation.

The next morning, I was back at our embassy in New Delhi, asking questions. Our officials there told me I had not seen anything yet. I had not. I was shown

a file packed with propaganda—Communist propaganda. It literally amazed me. It was also depressing. I knew that my mission was being hamstrung by such material. I felt that the first thing we must do is to portray our country as it is and not as this propaganda claims us to be.

The Communist propaganda portrays America as a land where a few millionaires exploit the masses by getting rich on the production of armaments, and that the rest of the world is threatened by our warmongering. The Communist countries are, of course, shown as dedicated to peace and progress and capable of producing all the good things of life in a new world Communist society.

The distorted propaganda has a tremendous effect. Such material is a vital weapon, and a firstline enemy, in the underdeveloped lands in the crescent from Turkey to Japan.

The reasons for this are easily seen when one visits these countries, as I did on this tour to encourage investment.

In these countries, the people depend on the media of propaganda for much of their information, and education. The village center with its few periodicals, the community radio, and the small library are the intellectual focus for millions of these impressionable people. Whoever provides the periodicals, the radio broadcasts, the books, has the best chance of winning the minds of these people who do not have the means to pick and choose among a great range of such material.

The Communist propaganda effort can subvert millions of minds. It is a deliberate, conscious, well-conceived, and well-financed campaign to do just that, and in doing so to destroy the correct image of America as a land of political freedom and economic opportunity.

What are some of the methods used by the Communists in this propaganda battle?

Everything.

Periodicals? One hundred and eighteen Communist publications are available in India, and most of them circulate throughout Asia and the Middle East. Soviet Land, my barbershop reading fare, has a circulation of over 1 million copies.

Books? Thirty-seven Communist publishing houses operate in India alone. A quarter of the space in the university library in Thailand is taken up with Communist books. Iran bookstores bulge with Communist titles.

The sum total: Communist publishing aimed at the underdeveloped nations in Asia and the Middle East increased 150 percent from 1957 to 1959.

The free world effort? Only a tenth of this.

An especially dangerous part of this publishing propaganda is a series of books for children which have come from Communist presses and are now flooding bookstores. One hundred titles are available in India alone. The Communists are putting major emphasis on this for obvious reasons.

Motion pictures? Communist films are increasingly competing with American commercial productions in Asian theaters. Communist bloc countries are producing films in Pakistan. Red China has turned out pictures in eight Asian languages.

Radio broadcasting? This country is far outstripped. Communist broadcasting overseas is three times that of our Voice of America. Red China alone beams nearly half as much time overseas as the Voice, all of it to the countries of Asia and the Middle East.

What does it add up to?

Dr. Robert Johnson, president of Temple University, recently estimated the total Communist propaganda effort amounts to $5 billion a year. I can readily believe this. The night skies in Indian cities are lit with great red signs urging people to "Read Soviet Books and Periodicals." Theater marquees invite people to see Communist movies.

The effects of this massive campaign are seen in every strata of Asian life. Attending a reception at an Asian university, I had a conversation with a student.

He told me: "We're going all the way down the path of socialism. Our country will be one of equals, not of very rich and very poor, as in your country."

I asked him how this would be achieved?

"We will break the back of the reactionaries in government, and pass laws. These laws will provide for the needs of the people, but nobody will be allowed to have more than he really needs," he replied.

I recognized the Communist line that is the theme of all the periodicals, the broadcasts, the books and the movies.

What is our response to this? What are we doing to present America as it really is, a nation of peace and democratic processes and of a free enterprise economic system?

Not much, not as much as we must do. In comparison to the Communist propaganda campaign, ours is feeble.

We have two periodicals which circulate in Asia and the Middle East. They are American Reporter—250,000 in India—and the New World—less than a million in 15 countries. We have participated in big international fairs and exhibitions. We have helped provide some textbooks for universities. We have a modest program of book translation.

The total budget of our U.S. Information Agency, our major information and education tool, is about $100 million a year. We support 60 cultural centers in the Middle East and Asia. Many of these are one-room affairs. They are spread thin. There is 1 for every 35 million people in India.

The effects of the big Communist effort shows. The Communist voting strength in India has tripled in the last 5 years. In other nations, the Communists are continually making new gains.

We must join in this battle for men's minds with a positive and sustained campaign.

What are some of the things we must do? I do not pretend to have all the answers. But in talking with knowledgeable people in Washington, including many of my colleagues in Congress, I find some things on which there is general agreement.

A basic need is more financial support.

The answer does not lie in money alone. But more money can be used and used intelligently.

Millions are available, in a form that would not cost the American taxpayer another dollar. These are counterpart funds, money which this country has earned through the operation of several aid programs, notably the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

These currencies can only be spent in the oversea nations. There are more than $100 million in such currencies lying idle in oversea banks. Millions more are becoming available every year.

Why haven't they been put to work? Congress has restricted their use. Ridiculous legal restrictions do not allow us to use small amounts for publishing, student exchange, or broadcasting and film production. Only $3.5 million of these funds are budgeted to be spent in 1960.

I have introduced legislation to remove these restrictions. They are vital to our information and education effort. They are needed tools in the battle for men's minds.

The unleashing of these currencies is the first step in our battle. American taxpayers should demand that these funds be put to work.

With this money there are several programs which could be started, others greatly expanded.

For instance:

Publishing: Expansion of our periodical coverage is vital. Further, expansion of the textbook translation program is a key effort to export democracy. I especially favor a program of publishing children's books. All kinds of books, the tools of education and truth, should certainly be a major American weapon in the propaganda battle.

Higher education: We should establish chairs of American studies in Asian universities. We could provide scholarships for students to attend these universities, to take courses designed to show America as it is. We should help in the construction and stocking of college libraries and student centers.

Motion pictures: Educational films, and films showing how America has contributed to the overseas countries, could be produced in the countries themselves, paid for with counterpart currencies.

Science education: New methods of teaching the basic sciences, developed in this country, should be exported to help the growing public school systems of Asian countries. The simple materials used in these teaching methods, and the training of teachers to use them, could be supported by local currencies.

Committee centers: We should support the construction of thousands of community centers in the villages of the Asian-Middle Eastern area. They are the focus of community life and we should have a part in their success.

Educational television: This modern method is being used slightly in colleges and universities in India. It could be expanded to include the public school systems and become a quick means of overcoming the problem of mass illiteracy.

Exhibits: We have made a big hit with big exhibitions. We should develop a program of small, village-size exhibits for constant use. One such exhibit, on small industry possibilities, is now showing throughout India. It has been praised by Prime Minister Nehru on the floor of the Indian Parliament. Counterpart funds should develop and support other small exhibits.

Exchange: We have developed a great number of exchange programs. But these could be expanded fourfold and still not meet all the needs. We could support thousands of American students, teachers, and technicians with counterpart currencies.

All these programs could be carried on with idle money which this country desperately needs to put to work. This could be done without additional cost to American taxpayers.

To me, this makes sense.

Jane Addams and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Nation and the world are yearning for peace and many of us are fervently dedicated to that cherished end, it is appropriate to dwell thoughtfully on the great contributions of the famous humanitarian, Jane Addams.

I will not here detail the brilliant career of this great woman, but would like to bring to the attention of the House by way of a reminder her heroic efforts for world peace.

As long ago as 1904 at the convention of the National Peace Societies held at Boston in my home State, Jane Addams spoke and worked for universal peace between nations.

In her "Newer Ideals of Peace" published in 1907 she sought and urged moral substitutes for war.

During World War I she worked to try to prevent the spread of that great conflict and the provoking of the most primitive antagonisms associated with it.

Her efforts to secure a conference of neutrals many leaders had urged were sustained with the same vigor and ability that typified her activities in conserving the food supply, in distributing food to allay hunger, suffering, and privation.

Jane Addams was a nonconformist in the sense that she possessed the courage to differ with the main stream of public opinion whenever she thought it wise or in the interests of the Nation to do so.

She was a controversial figure to be sure, because she spoke her own mind—and it was a great mind—and because she set her judgment against that of statesmen and other leaders who were more concerned about waging war than in trying to prevent it before it started, or end it when it had commenced.

One of her last comments on war ranks with her best:

> The worst thing about war is not the poison gas which wipes out lives and destroys cities, but the poison it spreads in the minds of men. * * * We must be ready not only with political institutions but with an educated public opinion which shall fight this poison's spread. Only thus—

She wrote—

> will people be able to come into friendly relationships with ever larger and larger groups, and to live constantly a more extended life.

It was inevitable that catch phrases, labels, and even epithets should be applied to those who were seeking peace while the Nation was at war. An incited and patriotic public was inclined to sweep away as unworthy and base every utterance or gesture for peace. It cannot be denied, of course, that when the Nation was fighting for its survival against cruel and ruthless aggressors that it could ill afford time to debate the merits of peace, let alone permit spies and traitors to weaken the national purpose by conspiring against the preparedness and readiness of our fighting forces to defend our liberties and win the war.

Notwithstanding that fact, it is clear that peace is not only a sacred goal, but it is a dire necessity, if freedom and civilization are to be sustained.

No campaign of terrorism appealing to fainthearted people and urging national helplessness and fostering doctrines of appeasement can successfully becloud the fact that while the American people mean to preserve their free heritage and will never surrender it, they are nevertheless willing to stand courageously for every practicable measure to lessen international tensions and promote international control of nuclear substances and weapons, effective disarmament and enduring peace.

While the goal has not changed since Jane Addams' day, it has become infinitely more desirable and critical. To reach it, wholehearted international efforts are imperative. Every nation must join earnestly and wholeheartedly in the quest for the sacred grail of peace.

To the extent that some nations are refusing to abandon their oft-expressed ambition to suppress freedom and dominate the world this problem becomes more difficult, if not impossible of accomplishment, until those nations have a change of heart. But that fact must never deter us from fighting as fiercely in the moral sense as we would fight a war to protect our shores and our homes and our liberties, for a just consideration and a just resolution of the problems that must be solved before peace can become a reality in this cruelly divided world.

Let not despair possess us, nor courage forsake us, in this fight. If the price of peace is loss of our freedom and a form of serfdom more abominable than death itself then by all means let us die in a fiery holocaust of destruction before we forfeit or surrender our God-given rights to be free men and women. But let us strive prayerfully and courageously for universal peace.

Among rational people, if there be such in the Communist world, there is no necessity for such a choice. The people of the world can and should make the choice now before they are engulfed by nuclear conflict, and they should never tolerate the machinations of communism, or any other ideology or bloc, to thwart the progress, freedom and security of man.

Jane Addams accomplished many things in her long, useful, life, and her work for peace was not the least of these. We can well recall today her thesis that consent should be substituted for coercion and a will to peace for a belief in war—that justice and love of humanity, brotherhood and devotion to the living God should prevail in the world.

William Parker Kennedy, President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Honored on His 50th Anniversary as a Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in making a part of this RECORD a most outstanding event concerning a most outstanding American.

On September 3, 1960, at the Leamington Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., William Parker Kennedy, one of America's foremost citizens and great labor leaders, who is president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, will be honored on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his membership in that organization.

Among the many distinguished persons who will be present at that time to pay their respects to Mr. Kennedy will be the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey and the Honorable Eugene J. McCarthy, Senators from the State of Minnesota; the Honorable Roy W. Wier, the Honorable Joseph E. Karth, the Honorable Fred Marshall, and the Honorable John A. Blatnik, Representatives from the State of Minnesota, and the following State officials from the State of Minnesota: the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Governor; the Honorable Karl Rolvaag, Lieutenant Governor; the Honorable Walter F. Mondale, attorney general; the Honorable Joseph Donovan, secretary of state; the Honorable Roger L. Dell, Thomas Gallagher, Frank T. Gallagher, W. P. Murphy, and Lee Loevinger, justices of the

supreme court. Also present will be: Robert A. Olson, president, Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor; Walter Cramond, president, Minneapolis CLU; and R. D. Cramer, editor, Labor Review.

Mr. Kennedy's achievements in his many years of dedicated effort on behalf of his fellow man in all elements of our society have long been recognized. His preeminent standing in American life has been accomplished in the classic American tradition, having risen from the most humble beginnings.

William Parker Kennedy has been president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen since July 19, 1949, when he was appointed by the board of directors. He was elected by the brotherhood's 29th convention in 1950 and reelected at the 1954 and 1960 conventions. The brotherhood, with headquarters at 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio, has a membership of 218,000 throughout the United States and Canada. It represents railway employees in train and yard service and intercity bus operators. Besides representing the members in labor-management matters it furnishes sound life, health, and accident insurance to its members and it is one of the largest fraternal insurance societies in America.

Mr. Kennedy was born in Huttonville, Ontario, Canada, April 3, 1892, and came to Chicago, Ill., at the age of 10. He attended Ogden School, Chicago.

At the age of 17, he worked as a news butcher on the Rock Island Railroad, between Chicago and Des Moines, on the Rocky Mountain Limited.

He first saw train service as a freight brakeman, on the Dakota division of the Great Northern Railway, working out of Grand Forks, N. Dak., beginning such employment October 1, 1909.

On July 24, 1910, he joined Wheat Sheaf Lodge No. 463, of the brotherhood, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and has held continuous membership since that time. He resigned from the Great Northern Railway in 1911 and entered the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a switchman, at Calgary, Alberta, Canada, May 7, 1911. He continued in this employment until October 22, 1911.

He was employed as a switchman on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, at Minneapolis, Minn., February 1, 1912, and still retains seniority rights in this terminal.

In 1913, he transferred his brotherhood membership to Minnehaha Lodge No. 625, Minneapolis, Minn., and retains his membership in that lodge.

He served as president and local chairman of that lodge and January 2, 1920, was elected secretary of the general grievance committee on the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad. In April 1921, he was elected general chairman of the grievance committee. He served in such capacity until June 1935.

He attended the 1917, 1919, 1922, 1925, and 1928 conventions of the Brotherhood, as a delegate, representing his lodge. At the latter convention, he was elected to the board of trustees and served as secretary of such board until June 1935, when the board of directors appointed him to the position of vice president in charge of the northwest territory of the United States and all of Canada, west of Fort William and Port Arthur.

While serving as vice president, he participated in numerous wage and rule movements and headed the committee which negotiated the electric lantern agreements. He was in charge of the committtee, at Washington, D.C., in the 1928 wage reduction fight, when the widely quoted Brotherhood defense book "Main Street Not Wall Street" was prepared and published.

From January 1, 1944, to August 30, 1946, Mr. Kennedy was in charge of the super-promotion department of the Brotherhood, with headquarters at the Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

While in this work, Mr. Kennedy handled 146 representation disputes in the United States and Canada, involving railroads in every section of both countries. He was successful in achieving 109 Brotherhood representation victories.

At the 1946 convention, held in Miami Beach, Fla., he was elected general secretary and treasurer and assumed that office January 1, 1947, and was serving in that capacity at the time he was appointed president.

While general secretary and treasurer, he also served as national reporting officer for the Railroad Retirement Board.

From July to September 1934, Mr. Kennedy made an extensive trip through Europe studying labor conditions in England, Ireland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Italy.

In May 1955, as a guest of the Israeli Government, he visited that country, addressing large groups of railroad and government workers in Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Beersheba, Tiberias, Haifa, and Jaffa. In July 1956, he was a delegate to the 24th Congress of the International Transport Workers Federation held at Vienna, Austria, at which time he also attended meetings at London, Paris, Rome, and Barcelona. In July 1958, he was a delegate to the 25th labor congress at Amsterdam, Netherlands; also attended meetings in Norway, Sweden, and Belgium.

While serving the brotherhood as secretary of the board of trustees, he traveled extensively through Canada and the United States, studying financial and banking conditions and wrote a series of articles for the official publication of the brotherhood, entitled "History of Banking in Canada." Such articles have been extensively quoted in many leading financial and trade publications.

He was instrumental in bringing the use of "piggybacking" to the railroad industry several years ago, a development that has since proven of great financial advantage to the railroads, and promises to bring even greater business to the railroads in the future.

At present, he is engaged on another campaign—one to bring order to the present chaos of transportation in major cities of the land, particularly in such metropolitan complexes as are growing in the New York, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, Cleveland, and Chicago areas.

Mr. Kennedy was married January 21, 1913, to Amy Hannah Berglund at Minneapolis, Minn. Their daughter and three sons are: Miss Phyllis Kennedy, assistant to the librarian, at Minneapolis; R. P. Kennedy, attorney, Minneapolis, Minn.; W. H. Kennedy, traffic representative, Soo Line, Minneapolis, Minn.; and D. C. Kennedy, department manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Minneapolis. Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy have four grandchildren.

Mr. Kennedy is a member of Minnehaha Lodge 165, A. F. & A. M.; Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, and Zurah Temple A. A. O. N. M. S., in Minneapolis.

It is most appropriate and timely that the ceremony honoring the 50 years of devoted service of Mr. Kennedy to the preservation and enrichment of our democratic way of life be held on the eve of Labor Day.

Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association Annual Convention Banquet Held at Altoona, Pa., July 21, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Altoona, Pa., was the scene of the 1960 convention of the Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association which was highlighted by the annual banquet held on Thursday, July 21 at 6:30 p.m., at the Penn-Alto Hotel. It was my pleasure to deliver the principal address of the evening at which time I spoke on "The Nature of the Communist Threat to America."

Blair County Sheriff V. Paul Reed proved to be a fine host to his fellow sheriffs of the Keystone State who in turn expressed their regard and esteem by electing him second vice president of the Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association. Sheriff Reed was the only newly elected officer and in line with the traditional policy, he is slated to become president of the association in 1962.

The 1960 convention was voted as one of the finest in the history of the Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association with the convention banquet providing a fitting climax to the annual convention proceedings.

My address on the occasion follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION, HOTEL PENN-ALTO, ALTOONA, PA., JULY 21, 1960

It is a real pleasure to address this sheriffs' convention.

As we all know enormous problems beset our country and the world. One of these problems is communism, and I want to talk to you about it.

Certainly, you law enforcement officers, of all people, need not be reminded of the great dangers to our Nation and the free world that are inherent in the Communist threat.

The first page of every daily newspaper throughout the Nation carries a headline or byline—

(a) reporting a Soviet thrust in this quarter or that quarter of the globe.

(b) repeating another boast by Khrushchev about surpassing the United States militarily and economically.

(c) or disclosing the details of another Communist Chinese attack on Tibet, the Indian border, or Formosa.

Most of us are consciously aware of this ominous threat.

What we are not fully aware of, however, is the overall Soviet outlook on the world as it relates to us and the problems it presents to us.

We are not all fully conscious of the political problem and the moral problem that exists in the Soviet concept of a divided world.

There can be no mistake about the fact that theoretically the Soviets view the world as a divided world. In the Soviet mind, ours is the capitalist world; and theirs is the Communist world. Both are "camps," to use the Soviet terminology. Indeed it would be more accurate to say that both are "military camps" in the sense that the Soviets view this historic build-up of power in the same light as a military campaign.

Both "camps" or worlds are to the Soviets distinctly opposite in philosophic orientation, political behavior, and ultimate goals.

The Soviets claim further that as a matter of doctrinal truth both worlds are engaged in disputes at every level of human existence and as a result they are unavoidably engaged in a gigantic struggle for survival.

The Soviets claim that the struggle is a continuing one which will go on until either capitalism or communism triumphs.

Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state and world communism, put it in these terms, "who whom," or in other words, "who will conquer whom."

On another occasion Lenin described the contest for survival in this highly dramatic and imaginative way: "As long as capitalism and socialism (that is, communism) remained, we cannot live in peace.

"In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

However, neither Lenin, Stalin, nor their successor, Khrushchev, doubted that communism would emerge triumphant and in Khrushchev's words, would "bury" us.

Thus, the Soviets are committed to a line of action that seeks not only to destroy the American way of life.

But it goes further because the Soviets are determined to transform the entire world in the Soviet image.

Regarding force and power as political weapons to be used ruthlessly in achieving this end, the Soviets press ever forward.

They seek advantages here and there, probing for soft spots in the defenses of the free world.

Furthermore, they aggressively assert their power through outright territorial conquests or through their fifth column operations within the world Communist movement.

So much for the Soviet world outlook.

On the other hand, what about the United States and the outlook of its people and leaders? We, Americans, have a completely different outlook on the world.

First of all, we, along with our allies, are trying to preserve the prevailing world political structure which we regard generally as the most acceptable structure for insuring freedom and democracy. For us, it is a simple fact of survival.

This does not mean that we are blindly attached to a type of status quo that preaches the ill-fated doctrine of keeping things as they are. We are, and always should be, sensitive to the winds of political change throughout the world.

We admit the necessity of political change not only in our own domestic politics but in world politics in general.

What we seek to preserve is the procedure of free government through which orderly transfer of political power can take place in a genuine spirit of liberty and justice.

Unlike the Soviets, we are not committed to the planned destruction of world societies. In a spirit of tolerance, we seek rather to assist the peoples of the world, wherever possible, to achieve a higher state of human liberty through the institution which is most likely to succeed in accomplishing this goal, a government of free people.

In addition, we are committed by heritage and national tradition to the belief that differences among nations—as those among individuals—can be resolved through the exercise of reason and good will.

Differences between us and the Soviets, as with any other nation, we would say, are not beyond solution, but rather are adjustable. So it is then that we Americans and the Soviets do have radically different conceptions of the world around us.

We have different national purposes and different national goals. We are both guided by wholly different philosophies of life. But the political problems inherent in this divided and contrasting view of the world has still another particular manifestation.

We could call it the problem of a divided morality. The Soviets operate within a very restricted framework of morality which is radically at variance with our own conceptions. The Soviet moral conscience is colored totally by the dogmatic belief that whatever is good for the advancement of communism is morally right. In addition the Soviets believe whatever deters or opposes communism is morally evil.

Lenin spelled out this belief in answer to the question, "Is there such a thing as Communist morality?" He said: "Of course there is."

He continued by saying: "It is frequently asserted that we have no ethics, and that * * * Communists deny all morality. * * * We say that our morality is wholly subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class struggle. * * * At the basis of Communist morality lies the struggle for strengthening and completing communism."

Finally Lenin said: "For us morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle."

Ladies and gentlemen, these standards of morality and ethics conceived in these narrowly restricted terms permit the Soviets and their Communist allies great versatility in political action. Communists can and do operate completely unimpeded by codes of ethical conduct that are normally accepted in world society as morally correct. They can disregard morality, as we conceive it, and assert that to act otherwise would be to them "immoral."

This is a peculiar type of logic I know; but nonetheless this is the foundation of Communist morality. This is the way they, Soviets, think of good and evil.

What this means in concrete terms is that the Soviets are able to profess the principles of peaceful coexistence which explicitly stipulates noninterference in the internal affairs of other states.

Yet, at the same time they carry on subversive activities—on a mass scale—to destroy those states and expand Soviet power.

By the same perverted moral justification, a treaty is to be complied with only so long as it serves Soviet purposes. When its usefulness has been served, then it can be broken.

To you law-enforcement officers this problem of a divided morality has a special meaning.

For the Soviets, law that is formulated by a free capitalistic republic such as ours is not necessarily morally binding on Communists.

Only Communist law, as such, has the real force of moral compulsion in Soviet terms and thus must be obeyed. Non-Communist laws, as all other institutions, are looked upon by the Communists as instruments of what they call capitalist exploitation. As such, they are to be tolerated where no other course is possible until they can be destroyed.

At this point let me quote again Lenin's words on how the Communists are to use legislatures and parliaments, the very heart of free government, as devices to further Communist ends.

Lenin said: "No parliament can in any circumstances be for Communists an arena of struggle for reforms for betterment of the situation of the working class. The only question can be that of utilizing state institutions for their destruction."

Ladies and gentlemen, we don't have to look back very far in recent history to find excellent examples that illustrate the moral level upon which Communists function to accomplish their goals.

You may be interested to know that one of the first areas for penetration and seizure prior to a takeover in Communist tactical procedure is the organization for maintaining law and order.

Throughout Eastern Europe at the end of the war the Communists uniformly took over the functions of the interior ministry which in those countries controlled the national police.

In Czechoslovakia, the democratic opposition was paralyzed when the Communists asserted their power in February 1948 mainly because the police power had been successfully communized.

In Hungary, the Communist police were able to reduce the democratic opposition through terror, intrigue, and torture and thus establish uncontestable Communist control over every facet of national life.

It is significant that the notorious Hungarian secret police who were communized were the first victims of the Freedom Fighters in the revolution of 1956.

Similar patterns of communist control are seen in other countries that were conquered by Soviet Russia. And, there can be little doubt that the Communist supporters of Fidel Castro, following the Communist example elsewhere, have already conspired to assume total control over Cuba's police authority. With this weapon of manipulation and control in the hands of a dictator, the Cuban people will be hard pressed to stage a resistance movement against Castro's excesses.

The Communist aim in a period of takeover, as the East European experience indicates, is to win control over police authority within the nation and thereafter to impose their own system of law and order. But it is significant that one of the primary tactics of the Communists in doing this is to encourage and create civil disobedience. With the ultimate objective of destroying all civil law and order, the Communists seize upon any occasion that can be used to undermine the authority of established police power and destroy the laws it seeks to uphold and enforce.

Only very recently we had a dramatic, and I might add, lamentable, experience of seeing this tactic in operation. I am speaking, of course, of Japan and the recent riots there against the Japanese-American Security Treaty. We know now that a widespread feeling of neutralism existed in many quarters of Japanese political life which are not Communist. But, the Japanese Communists, aided financially by the Soviet Union, were able to exploit these deep-seated emotions of the Japanese populace and direct the vast energies generated as a consequence into a massive and prolonged demonstration of civil disobedience.

Surely, therefore, if there ever was a first line of defense in any nation against Communist internal subversion it is the law enforcement officers. They are in a sense the weapon and the shield of the law. They supply the inner structural discipline within the state that permits law and order to prevail.

The last 15 years' experience of Soviet Communist activity throughout the world bears out the truth of this generalization.

Ladies and gentlemen, great problems face us today and in the future that arise from the threat of world communism.

In many respects the 1960's are the beginning of a new era in American history. It is the beginning of a new revolutionary era in which we must face up to enormous problems. These problems have in part domestic and international implications.

The domestic implications are the following:

(a) The need to speed up our economic growth.

(b) Expansion of American educational facilities.

(c) Fulfilling the social needs of the Nation.

(d) And particularly the urgency of harnessing the enormous material resources of our Nation in the continuing struggle for survival against world communism.

The problems facing us have also international implications which are focused entirely on our conquest with Soviet powers.

Briefly, they are:

First the necessity of reformulating a policy for Western Europe that recognizes the emergence of our allies to a new status of economic and political independence.

Secondly there is the urgency in adjusting our policy requirements to meet the demands of the emerging new states of Asia and Africa.

And finally the need to recast our strategic thinking, taking into account the rising tide of neutralism in Asia and Africa and the development of intercontinental mass destruction weapons.

Ladies and gentlemen as I conclude my remarks let none of us underrate the great dimensions of the challenge of the 1960's.

As our forebears before us, let us extend ourselves and meet this challenge. Frankly our survival depends on it.

Consumer Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1960, I addressed the 46th Annual International Consumer Credit Conference at Chicago, Ill. My remarks were printed in the Credit World of August 1960 and I have requested permission to have them included in the RECORD:

CONSUMER CREDIT

(By THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri)

Consumer credit has been a subject in which I have been very much interested for many years.

Soviet Russia is now following Western Europe in developing consumer credit. Western Europe has been slow in developing consumer credit; indeed it has been only since the Korean war that consumer credit has assumed any importance there, and yet today there are indications that its growth rate is matching that which has occurred in the United States.

Consumer credit in the United States has been growing at a very rapid rate. At the end of 1950 total consumer credit outstanding was $21,741 million. At the end of 1959 the total was $52,046. The figure by the end of 1960 will be close to $60 billion.

Even in the United States consumer credit may be regarded as a recent and modern phenomena. In 1929 the total consumer credit outstanding was $6.4 billion and in 1945 it was $5.7 billion. It is apparent, however, that World War II stunted the growth of this economic phenomena, because in the 1941 the figure was $9.2 and this should be related to the nadir of 1933 of $3.5 billion.

The most rapid growth has been in personal loans: $2.8 billion in 1950 to $9.97 in 1959, although automobile paper is a close second, $6.07 billion in 1950 to $16.59 in 1959. Repair and modernization loans jumped from $1.016 in 1950 to $2.704 in 1959. Other consumer goods paper rose from $4.799 in 1950 to $10.234 in 1959. Noninstallment credit, though showing continuing growth, is less spectacular. The 1950 figure was $6.768 billion in comparison to $12.564 billion in 1959.

Underlying this growth is its strange imperviousness to the postwar recessions. Also notable is the commendable increase in the installment credit repaid figures which rise from $18.445 in 1950 to $43.239 in 1959. Of course, without this factor, installment credit would not be in a business.

I believe it is about time that consumer credit receive the social and economic analysis that its importance deserves. Much damage can result, indeed has resulted, from a misinterpretation of what consumer credit is in essence.

For example, I believe that consumer credit is really not a proper tool for monetary control except in very short periods of time, and even then only in very specific ways. And yet it is one of the first items listed by economists and monetary authorities when they speak of monetary restraint. When standby controls are mentioned reference is immediately made to consumer credit as one of the major controls to be implemented.

I believe, aside from the evidence before our own eyes in the United States and Western Europe, if a Communist State like Russia is beginning to use consumer credit it must have some real basis in modern economics.

The inherent power behind this economic phenomena has to be very great to break through the Communist ideology which it basically contradicts.

Indeed, this economic force is great. It stems from the fact that an individual's needs and wants do not conform to the years in his life during which he is gainfully employed. Consumer credit is the counterpart of pensions and annuities and insurance. Both seek to spread the earnings of the individual more equally over his entire life, and not bunch it in the years when he is actually productive.

Much has been done in our society by way of spreading income over from the working period of a man's life to the years of his retirement and many devices have been developed to assist him in performing this desirable economic and human function.

Little, however, has been said of anticipating the income of an individual so that the earlier years before the earnings are sufficient may be adequately and economically financed. Yet if spreading income over a person's entire life more equally is important, and I believe it is, attention should be paid to both periods when the income is not being earned the period before it is earned as well as the period after it has been earned.

The income of a man should be permitted, if at all economically possible, to be related to his expenditures. We have learned that business cycles no longer, if they ever did, relate to the number of days it takes the earth to go around the sun. Similarly, we should realize that the individual man has only 40 working years out of a lifetime of three score and ten. The expenditures required of a man when he starts married life, for example, are on the average greater than his expenses after his family has been raised, particularly after he has acquired equity interests in his home, consumer durables, savings, etc.

The income of a man should be spread, if it can be done economically, to cover the period when he is still learning his profession, or trade. I might interpolate that either it is his anticipated income that is used or it is bound to come somewhere from within the society, be it the family, privately endowed institutions or the Government, if we are to have education. Indeed, the correlation between amount of education and amount of income has now been clearly established and money invested in education can be paid off as a relatively small percentage of the increased earnings resulting from the education. Society as well as the individual benefits from this process.

I do not believe our society, based as it is upon the theory that men should be permitted to rise to the limits of their abilities, is well served by an economic system where only those who have assisting parents or inheritance can gain the capital necessary to get the education they can absorb to establish for themselves and their families the standard of living which their abilities would permit. Nor do I believe our society is well served by the alternative system of having a political bureaucracy set up a system of endowments and scholarships and select through whatever procedures they might develop who shall be more fully trained and educated and who shall not. Consumer credit is the way to get off this dilemma.

There is no question of the added value to society from spreading income from the earning years to cover the later years of retirement from earning. This process requires savings. Capital accumulation which is required to finance economic growth is dependent upon savings.

SPREADING INCOME

However, there is this added value to society from spreading income from the future back to the present in order to train and educate the future entrant into the labor market, which I suggest. Furthermore, there is, I have suggested, the value to society from spreading income anticipated in the future back to the present in order to permit young families to have and rear children in an atmosphere and home life of reasonable high standards. To be specific, if a young mother can have a dishwasher and a clothes drier during the period she is try-

ing to raise young children, she can do a much better job of rearing the children, and society definitely benefits from this process.

I believe the economists who look at the increasing amount of consumer credit in the United States with alarm should relax. The rapid growth should be related to the fact that consumer credit in the United States, if it is the economic and social phenomena I believe it is, has not yet matured, indeed it is in its infancy, and it will not mature until three full generations pass. Furthermore, as inherited wealth continues to decline in importance in our society, as I anticipate it will, I expect consumer credit to take up the gap. Consumer credit will reach maturity when the personal income of our society is fully spread both backward and forward relating the earning years to the full years of the individual's life.

There are many faults in our political economic structure which still operate at cross-purposes to the idea of spreading a person's income throughout their entire life as opposed to spreading it unevenly as we do over the working years of a person's life. Our tax laws still do not recognize this desirable feature, although in respect to savings and spreading income into the later years of life through annuities and other devices some recognition has been given to it. However, under our system of graduated income taxes we have no device which permits a person to spread his personal income for tax purposes over a period of years. The result is that those with fluctuating incomes like our farmers or those who amass most of their income for their life in a few short years like athletes and entertainers are taxed at higher rates in the years of great earnings and in the years of little or no earnings they frequently lose even the value of their personal exemptions. Accordingly, a great premium and one without any social values that I can see, is placed under our graduated income-tax laws upon a person with a more even flow of income.

We have seen the great efforts being made by our people to spread their income into their years of retirement through stock purchase plans, pension plans, insurance of all sorts, etc., which seek to avoid the impact of the high tax rate in their years of earning. This era has been one of insurance, one of prepayment, which is good. Now we are seeing an overlapping of a new era, that of postpayment, and it is important to examine it to see if it, too, is good.

I again point out that prepaying—saving—for retirement has received the social and monetary economists' sanction because it carries with it the desirable economic feature of generating savings. It also carries with it the sanctions of mankind's traditions developed over the centuries he has had to cope with economic laws based as they were upon scarcities. Therefore, the progress we are making in encouraging retirement programs has been widely acclaimed.

Unfortunately, postpaying * * * consumer credit * * * has not received this social sanction and indeed it is viewed as being something almost socially undesirable. One reason, of course, has been the thought that this is the reverse of saving. Another explanation is that we have not yet fully realized that base of all economic law of the centuries preceding us has been altered. Through the availability of electric power and technological advancements on a broad front, our society in America today is based upon plenty, not scarcity. But I can even speak to the subject in a traditional fashion and point up arguments which I think make credit respectable.

Some consumer credit may be the reverse of saving, but a great deal of consumer credit is in itself saving. Buying a consumer durable on time certainly is a device for gaining an equity investment in the consumer durable, and to this extent it is savings. Buying a home on time certainly has a large element of saving connected with it. I have suggested that buying an education on time is in essence a capital investment that produces an ample return on the investment. Therefore, even that has a large aspect of saving about it. Postpaying a trip to Florida or Europe seems to have little element of saving about it, and I can imagine other areas of use of consumer credit which on their face also seem to have little savings in them. Yet, I would not presume to judge hastily what is in reality a capital investment and what not. A trip to Europe to a budding young architect or a linguistic student might indeed be a very sensible capital investment and, therefore, have a real element of personal as well as social saving about it.

The most that can be said against consumer credit saving is that it does not provide accumulated capital for investing in economic growth. But even here we must pause to take stock. We are well aware of the fact that economic growth is dependent on something more than capital accumulation; it is likewise based upon human skills and capital must be used to train the skills if they do not already exist. It is not easy to separate capital from that which capital must be spent for. When we speak of capital being necessary to finance growth we certainly imply that the capital will be spent. Investing money in a company means that the company will use the capital for either building buildings, purchasing machines, or in training human skills or at least in gathering together human skills that already exist.

Am I coming through on this subject of consumer credit? If I am, then it should now be apparent why I view with great alarm the idea that consumer credit controls is a desirable social tool for controlling consumer spending. If what we are seeking in utilizing credit controls is to curb inflation then I would urge that we deal directly with what we are talking about * * * prices of goods and services. Much as I dislike the idea of price controls because of the administrative difficulties connected with them and the interference that it imposes in the free marketplace, I would much prefer this type of control to an attempt to interfere with the economic function being performed in our society by consumer credit * * * as I have been outlining it. Nor is it sufficient to state that consumer credit control would be selective. Who indeed is capable of selecting what our individual citizens should have and not have?

However, I would like to go one step further in discussing inflation itself because inflation has been as much misunderstood, in my judgment, as has consumer credit. Real inflation is what I call a blood disease. It exists when we have tampered with the value of money as a measure of goods, services, labor, and savings. I have said "tampered." Perhaps a better statement would be this: when through our ignorance we have failed to preserve the dollar as an accurate measuring device of goods, services, labor, and savings.

ECONOMIC COSTS

Part of our tampering or failure to act wisely in our treatment of the dollar as a "weight and measure" has been our failure to understand economic costs. Our method of measuring inflation has been primarily through the consumer price index, the wholesale price index and other selective series. All of these statistical series though very valuable have obvious defects about them.

None of them measure increase in quality or the cost resulting from increased variety or choice. Furthermore, none of these indexes measures other increased real costs; for example, the economic cost resulting from the depletion of the Mesabi iron ore in Minnesota was bound to increase the cost of steel and this increase unless compensated for by increased productivity was bound to show up in the consumer price index. Yet, it would be economically unsound to refer to this increased rise as an element of "inflation."

The cost of rapid technological advancement is another real economic cost which is not measured in our economic indices set up to measure inflation. We talk about the increased cost of drugs and seek to relate that to inflation or to some group of individuals trying to gouge the public. Both references are equally unsound. Rapid technological advancement springs from increased capital spent in research and development. This cost must be recouped in the price charged for the product. Rapid technological advancement brings in its wake obsolete equipment and obsolete skills. The cost of this, too, must be borne somewhere, usually in the price of the product or service to be sold. Rapid technological advancement requires training of new skills and the purchase of new equipment. These costs too must be borne. The only recoupment of these costs other than in sales price of the articles or services is through increased quality, which is very inadequately measured in our indices and increased productivity which might be reflected in a lowering of the cost.

Consumer controls or indeed price controls will not help to hold in line this economic process, except to damage it. If a wrong diagnosis has been made the only effect of treating this as the disease of inflation would be to curb future economic growth as well as undermine the present standards of living.

MONETARY DISEASE

There is such a thing as inflation—a monetary disease. It occurs when more money is printed than the economic growth up to that point justifies. Credit control is not money control. It can be affected by the amount of money available and it can be controlled by those who have the power to control the amount of money in ways short of credit controls. Unfortunately, in the past those who have the power to control money have confused credit with money and with the economic process which I have attempted to describe. In so doing they have damaged economic growth as well as price stability.

Credit is controlled, in essence, by the judgment of those in the business of extending it. If they—and that means essentially this audience—relate it to the ability of the individual to earn and they look upon this as a method of income spreading then we will keep the process from being abused.

Furthermore, I believe the success or failure of the creditman's business is so wrapped up in making an accurate appraisal of potential earnings of their customers that there really is little danger of their overextending credit. However, as in any business there can be those who enter it to abuse it—to make the fast buck and then to flee. But I regard policing against this kind of operation to be the same as policing against any kind of piracy. We must maintain constant vigilance, but as long as the pirates don't control the police force we are on safe grounds.

CREDIT CONTROL

In this respect I want to discuss briefly a subject where I believe those in the credit control field need to tighten up. A congressional committee has already started looking into this matter. I do not believe I am telling any of you anything. All I am really doing is emphasizing it. There must be an end to this business of using a consumer

durable business or any other business seeking to sell goods or services to the public as a front for what really is a business of extending consumer credit. However, these are rackets and like all rackets they cannot stand up against good competition. Indeed, the only way they can survive economically is gouging the public at high prices. I saw a great deal of this operation back in the thirties when I was chairman of the St. Louis Bar Small Loans Committee. And I am happy to state it was the good small loan companies who provided the force needed to curb the abuses and keep the matter in hand.

It is my opinion that you are in a new, growing, exciting and socially valuable economic operation. If you handle it well, as I believe you essentially have been handling it, you will be making a great contribution to the well-being of our society and to each individual who goes to make it up today and those who will be its composition three generations from now.

Vice President Nixon's Acceptance Speech in Chicago on July 28, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks I include the outstanding acceptance speech of Vice President NIXON at the Republican Convention in Chicago:

Mr. Chairman, delegates to this convention, my fellow Americans, I have made many speeches in my life, and never have I found it more difficult to find the words adequate to express what I feel, as I find them tonight.

To stand here before this great convention, to hear your expression of affection for me, for Pat, for our daughters, for my mother, for all of us who are representing our party, is, of course, the greatest moment of my life.

And I just want you to know that my only prayer as I stand here is that in the months ahead I may be in some way worthy of the affection and the trust which you have presented to me on this occasion, in everything that I say, in everything that I do, in everything that I think in this campaign and afterwards.

PROUD OF PARTY

May I also say that I have been wanting to come to this convention, but because of the protocol that makes it necessary for a candidate not to attend the convention until the nominations are over, I have had to watch it on television. And I want all of you to know that I have never been so proud of my party as I have been in these last 3 days as I compared this convention, the conduct of our delegates and our speakers, with what went on in my native State of California, just 2 weeks ago. I congratulate Chairman HALLECK and Chairman MORTON and all of those who have helped to make this convention one that will stand in the annals of our party forever as one of the finest we have ever held.

Have you ever stopped to think of the memories you will take away from this convention? The things that run through my mind are these: That first day, with the magnificent speeches—Mr. Hoover with his great lessons for the American people; WALTER JUDD, with one of the most outstanding keynote addresses in either party in history and last night our beloved, fighting President, making the greatest speech I ever heard him make, before this convention.

Your platform and its magnificent presentation by Chuck Percy, the chairman. For these and for so many other things I want to congratulate you tonight and to thank you from the bottom of my heart and on behalf of Americans—not just Republicans, but Americans—everywhere for making us proud of our country and of our two-party system for what you have done.

WORLD STATESMAN

Tonight, too, I particularly want to thank this convention for nominating as my running mate a world statesman of the first rank, my friend and colleague, Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts. In refreshing contrast to what happened in Los Angeles you nominated a man who shares my views on the great issues and who will work with me and not against me in carrying out our magnificent platform.

And, may I say that during this week we Republicans with strong convictions about our party and about our country had our differences—but as the speech by Senator GOLDWATER indicated yesterday, and the elegant and gracious remarks of my friend, Nelson Rockefeller, indicated tonight, we know that the differences that divided us were infinitesimal compared to the gulf between us and what the Democrats would put upon us as a result of what they did at Los Angeles during their convention 2 weeks ago.

It was only 8 years ago that I stood in this very place after you had nominated as our candidate for the President one of the great men of our century; and I say to you tonight that for generations to come Americans, regardless of party, will gratefully remember Dwight Eisenhower as the man who brought peace to America, as the man under whose leadership Americans enjoyed the greatest progress and prosperity in history. Above all, they will remember him as the man who restored honesty, integrity and dignity to the conduct of Government in the highest office of this land.

NEW PROBLEMS

And, my fellow Americans, I know now that you will understand what I am about to say, because the next President of the United States will have Dwight Eisenhower's great example to follow in confronting new and challenging world problems of utmost gravity. This truly is the time for greatness in America's leadership.

I am sure you will understand why I do not say tonight that I alone am the man who can furnish that leadership. That question is not for me to decide, but for you—and I only ask that the thousands in this hall and the millions listening to me on television make that decision in the most thoughtful way you possibly can, because what you decide this November will not only affect your lives and your future, it will affect the future of millions throughout the world. I urge you to study the records of the candidates, to listen to my speeches and my opponent's and Mr. Lodge's and his opponent's, and then, after you have studied our records and listened to our speeches, decide. Decide on the basis of what we say and what we believe who is best qualified to lead America and the free world in this critical period.

To help you make this decision I would like to discuss tonight some of the great problems which will confront the next President of the United States and the policies that I believe should be adopted to meet them.

QUESTION OF SURVIVAL

One hundred years ago, in this very city, Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President of the United States. The problems which will confront our next President will be even greater than those that confronted Lincoln. The question then was freedom for the slaves and survival of the Nation. The question now is freedom for all mankind and the survival of civilizations, and the choice that each of you listening to me makes this November can affect the answer to that question.

What should your choice be? Well, let us first examine what our opponents offered in Los Angeles 2 weeks ago. They claimed theirs was a new program, but you know what it was. It was simply the same old proposition that a political party should be all things to all men, and nothing more than that, and they promised everything to everybody with one exception: they didn't promise to pay the bill.

And I say tonight that with their convention, their platform, and their ticket, they composed a symphony of political cynicism which is out of harmony with our times today.

DISASTROUS PROGRAM

Now, we come to the key question, What should our answer be? And some might say to do as they do—out-promise them because that is the only way to win. And I want to tell you my answer. I happen to believe that their program would be disastrous for America, that it would wreck our economy, and that it would dash our people's high hopes for a better life. And I serve notice here and now that whatever the political consequences, we are not going to try to out-promise our opponents in this campaign.

We are not going to make promises we cannot and should not keep, and we are not going to try to buy the people's votes with their own money. And to those who say that this position will mean political defeat, my answer is this: We have more faith than that in the good sense of the American people, provided the people know the facts, and here is where we come in.

I pledge to you tonight that we will bring the facts home to the American people, and we will do it with a campaign such as this country has never seen before.

I have been asked all week long by the newsmen sitting on my right and left, "When is this campaign going to begin, Mr. Vice President? On Labor Day or one of the other traditional starting dates?" And this is my answer: This campaign begins tonight, here and now, and this campaign will continue from now until November 8 without any letup.

CAMPAIGN EVERYWHERE

I have also been asked by my friends in the press, "Mr. Vice President, where are you going to concentrate? What States are you going to visit?" And this is my answer: In this campaign we are going to take no States for granted, and we are not going to concede any States to the opposition.

I announce to you tonight, and I pledge to you, that I personally will carry this campaign into every one of the 50 States of this Nation between now and November 8. And in this campaign I make a prediction—I say that just as in 1952 and 1956 millions of Democrats will join us, not because they are deserting their party, but because their party deserted them at Los Angeles 2 weeks ago.

Now, I have suggested to you what our friends of the opposition offered to the American people. What do we offer? First, we are proud to offer the best 8-year record of any administration in the history of this country. But, my fellow Americans, that isn't all and that isn't enough, because we

happen to believe that a record is not something to stand on, but something to build on; and in building on the record of this administration we shall build a better America, we shall build an America in which we shall see the realization of the dreams of millions of people not only in America but throughout the world for a fuller, freer, richer life than men have ever known in the history of mankind.

Let me tell you something of the goals of this better America toward which we will strive. In this America, our older citizens shall not only have adequate protection against the hazards of ill health, but a greater opportunity to lead a useful and productive life by participating to the extent they are able in the Nation's exciting work rather than sitting on the sidelines. And in the better America, young Americans shall not only have the best basic education in America, but every boy and girl of ability, regardless of his financial circumstances, shall have the opportunity to develop his intellectual capabilities to the full. Our wage earners shall enjoy increasingly higher wages in honest dollars, with better protection against the hazards of unemployment and old age. And, for those millions of Americans who are still denied equality of rights and opportunity, I say there shall be the greatest progress in human rights since the days of Lincoln 100 years ago.

WILL HELP FARMERS

And America's farmers, to whose hard work and almost incredible efficiency we owe the fact that we are the best fed, best clothed people in the world, I say America's farmers must and will receive what they do not have today, and what they deserve—a fair share of America's ever-increasing prosperity. To accomplish these things we will develop to the full the untapped natural resources, our water, our minerals, our power with which we are so fortunate to be blessed in this rich land of ours. And we shall provide for our scientists the support they need for the research that will open exciting new highways into a future in which we shall have progress which we cannot even dream of today. Above all, in this decade of decision and progress we will witness the continued revitalization of America's moral and spiritual strength, with a renewed faith in the eternal ideals of freedom and justice under God which are our priceless heritage as a people.

Now, I am sure that many of you in this hall, and many of you watching on television, might well ask, "But Mr. NIXON, don't our opponents favor just such goals as this?" And my answer is, Yes, of course. All Americans regardless of party want a better life for our people. What is the difference then? I will tell you what it is. The difference is in the way we propose to reach these goals, and the record shows that our way works and theirs doesn't and we are going to prove it in this campaign.

We produce on the promises that they make. We succeed where they fail.

Do you know why? Because, as Governor Rockefeller said in his remarks, we put our primary reliance not upon government but upon people for progress in America. That is why we will succeed.

We must never forget that the strength of America is not in its Government, but in its people. And we say tonight there is no limit to the goals America can reach, provided we stay true to the great American traditions.

GOVERNMENT HAS ROLE

A government has a role, and a very important one, but the role of government is not to take responsibility from people, but to put responsibility on them. It is not to dictate to people, but to encourage and stimulate the creative productivity of 180 million free Americans. That is the way to progress in America.

In other words, we have faith in the people, and because our programs for progress are based on that faith, we shall succeed where our opponents will fail, in building the better America that I have described.

But if these goals are to be reached, the next President of the United States must have the wisdom to choose between the things government should and should not do. He must have the courage to stand against the pressures of the few for the good of the many. And he must have the vision to press forward on all fronts for the better life our people want.

Now, I have spoken to you of the responsibilities of our next President at home. Those which he will face abroad will be infinitely greater. But before I look to the future, let me say a word about the past.

At Los Angeles 2 weeks ago, we heard the United States, our Government, blamed for Mr. Khrushchev's sabotage of the Paris Conference. We heard the United States blamed for the actions of Communist-led mobs in Caracas and Tokyo. We heard that American education and American scientists are inferior. We heard that America militarily and economically is a second-rate country We heard that American prestige is at an alltime low.

This is my answer: I say that at a time the Communists are running us down abroad, it is time to speak up for America at home.

CRITICISM ESSENTIAL

And my friends, let us recognize that America has its weaknesses, and constructive criticism of those weaknesses is essential—essential so that we can correct our weaknesses in the best traditions of our democratic process.

But let us also recognize this: While it is dangerous to see nothing wrong in America, it is just as wrong to refuse to recognize what is right about America.

And tonight I say to you no criticism should be allowed to obscure the truth either at home or abroad that today America is the strongest nation militarily, economically, ideologically in the world; and we have the will and the stamina and the resources to maintain that strength in the years ahead.

Now, turning to the future. We must recognize that the foreign policy problems of the 1960's will be different and they will be vastly more difficult than those of the 1950's through which we have just passed.

We are in a race tonight, my fellow Americans, a race for survival in which our lives, our fortunes, our liberties are at stake. We are ahead now, but the only way to stay ahead in a race is to move ahead; and the next President will make decisions which will determine whether we win or whether we lose this race.

What must he do? These things I believe: he must resolve first and above all that the United States must never settle for second best in anything.

Let us look at the specifics. Militarily, the security of the United States must be put before all other considerations. Why? Not only because this is necessary to deter aggression, but because we must make sure that we are never in a position at the conference table where Mr. Khrushchev or his successor is able to coerce an American President because of his strength and our weakness.

MUST BE FIRM

Diplomatically, let us look at what the problem is. Diplomatically, our next President must be firm—firm on principles; but he must never be belligerent, he must never engage in a war of words which might heat up the international climate to the igniting point of nuclear catastrophe.

But while he must never answer insults in kind, he must leave no doubt at any time that in Berlin or in Cuba or anywhere else in the world, America will not tolerate being pushed around by anybody, because we have already paid a terrible price in lives and resources to learn that appeasement leads not to peace but to war. It will indeed take great leadership to steer us through these years, avoiding the extremes of belligerency on the one hand, and appeasement on the other.

Now, Mr. KENNEDY has suggested that what the world needs is young leadership; and, understandably this has great appeal, because it is true that youth does bring boldness and imagination and drive to leadership, and we need all those things. But I think most people will agree with me tonight when I say that President De Gaulle, Prime Minister Macmillan, and Chancellor Adenauer may not be young men—but we are indeed fortunate in that we have their wisdom and their experience and their courage on our side in the struggle for freedom today in the world.

And I might suggest that as we consider the relative merits of youth and age it is only fair to point out that it was not Mr. De Gaulle or Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Adenauer, but Mr. KENNEDY who made the rash and impulsive suggestion that President Eisenhower could have apologized or sent regrets to Mr. Khrushchev for the U–2 flights which the President had ordered to save our country from surprise attack.

But formidable as will be the diplomatic and military problems confronting the next President, far more difficult and critical will be the decisions he must make to meet and defeat the enemies of freedom in an entirely different kind of struggle. And here I want to speak to you of another kind of aggression, aggression without war, where the aggressor comes not as a conqueror, but as a champion of peace, of freedom, offering progress and plenty and hope to the unfortunates of the earth.

A DIFFICULT ASSIGNMENT

I say tonight that the major problem confronting the next President of the United States will be to inform the people of the character of this kind of aggression, to arouse the people to the mortal danger it presents, and to inspire the people to meet that danger. And he must develop a brand-new strategy which will win the battle for freedom for all men and win it without a war. That is the great task of the next President of the United States. And this will be a difficult task, difficult because at times our next President must tell the people, not what they want to hear, but what they need to hear. Why, for example, it may be just as essential to the national interest to build a dam in India as in California.

It will be difficult, too, because, you know, we Americans have always been able to see and understand the danger presented by missiles and airplanes and bombs; but we have found it hard to recognize the even more deadly danger of the propaganda that warps the mind, the economic offensive that softens a nation, the subversion that destroys the will of a people to resist tyranny.

And yet, I say tonight that while this threat is, as I believe it to be, the greatest danger we have ever confronted, this is no reason for lack of confidence in the outcome.

Do you know why? Because there is one great theme that runs through our history as a Nation: "Americans are always at their best when the challenge is greatest."

And I say tonight that we Americans shall rise to our greatest heights in this decade of the sixties as we mount the offensive to meet those forces which threaten the peace and the rights of free men everywhere.

But there are some things we can do and some things we must do, and I would like to list them for you tonight:

First, we must take the necessary steps which will assure that the American economy grows at a maximum rate so that we can maintain our present massive lead over the Communist bloc. How do we do this? There isn't any magic formula by which government in a free nation can bring this about. The way to assure maximum growth in America is not by expanding the functions of government, but by increasing the opportunities for investment and creative enterprise for millions of individual Americans.

WON'T TURN TOWARD REDS

And at a time when the Communists have found it necessary to turn to decentralization of their economy and to turn to the use of individual incentives to increase productivity—at a time, in other words, when they are turning our way—I say we must and we will not make the mistake of turning their way.

There is another step that we must take: our Government activities must be reorganized, reorganized to take the initiative from the Communists and to develop and carry out a worldwide strategy and offensive for peace and freedom.

The complex of agencies which have grown up through the years for exchange of persons, for technical assistance, for information, for loans and grants—all these must be welded together into one powerful economic and ideological striking force under the direct supervision and leadership of the United States.

Because what we must do, you see, is to wage the battles for peace and freedom with the same unified direction and dedication with which we wage battles in war. And if these activities are to succeed, we must develop a better training program for the men and women who will represent our country at home and abroad. What we need are men with a broad knowledge of the intricacies and techniques of the strategies of the Communists, with the keen knowledge of the great principles for which free people stand, and, above all, men who with a zeal and dedication which the Communists cannot match will outthink, outwork and outlast the enemies of freedom wherever they meet them anywhere in the world. This is the kind of men we must train.

NEED ALL FREE PEOPLE

And we must recognize that government cannot do this job alone. The most effective proponents of freedom are not governments, but free people; and this means that every American—every one of you listening tonight—who works or travels abroad, must represent his country at its best in everything that he does.

The United States, big as it is, strong as it is, cannot do this job alone. The best brains, the fullest resources of free nations, which have as great a stake in freedom as we have, must be mobilized to participate with us in this task to the extent they are able.

But do you know what is most important of all? Above all, we must recognize that the greatest economic strength that we can imagine, and the finest government organization—all this will fail if we are not united and inspired by a great idea, an idea which will be a battle cry for a grand offensive to win the minds and the hearts and the souls of men. Do we have such an idea?

The Communists proclaim over and over again that their aim is the victory of communism throughout the world. It is not enough for us to reply that our aim is to contain communism, to defend the free world against communism, to hold the line against communism; the only answer to a strategy of victory for the Communist world is a strategy of victory for the free world.

But let the victory we seek be not victory over any other nation or any other people. Let it be the victory of freedom over tyranny, of plenty over hunger, of health over disease, in every country of the world.

When Mr. Khrushchev says our grandchildren will live under communism, let us say his grandchildren will live in freedom. When Mr. Khrushchev says the Monroe Doctrine is dead in the Americas, we say the doctrine of freedom applies everywhere in the world.

WELCOME CHALLENGE

And I say tonight let us welcome Mr. Khrushchev's challenge to peaceful competition of our systems; but let us reply, "Let us compete in the Communist world as well as in the free world," because Communist dictators must not be allowed the privileged sanctuary from which to launch their guerrilla attacks on the citadels of freedom.

And, we say further, extend this competition, extend it to include not only food and factories as he has suggested but extend it to include the great spiritual and moral values which characterize our civilization.

Also, my friends, let us welcome the challenge, not be disconcerted by it nor fail to meet it, but welcome the challenge presented by the revolution of peaceful peoples' aspirations in South America, in Africa.

We cannot fail in this mission. We cannot fail to assist them in finding a way to progress with freedom so that they will be faced with the terrible alternative of turning to communism with its promise of progress at the cost of freedom.

Let us make it clear to them that our aim in helping them is not merely to stop communism, but that in the great American tradition of concern for those less fortunate than we are that we welcome the opportunity to work with people everywhere in helping them to achieve their aspirations for a life of human dignity. And this means that our primary aim must be not to help governments but to help people, to help people attain the life they deserve.

In essence, what I am saying tonight is that our answer to the threat of the Communist revolution is renewed devotion to the great ideals of the American Revolution, ideals that caught the imagination of the world 180 years ago and that still live in the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

I could tell you tonight that all you need to do to bring about these things that I have just described is to elect the right man as President of this country and leave these tasks to him. But, my fellow Americans, America demands more than that of me and of you.

ALL MUST WORK

When I visited the Soviet Union, in every factory there was a huge sign which read, "Work for the victory of communism," and what America needs today is not just a President, not just a few leaders, but millions of Americans working for the victory of freedom. Each American must make a personal and total commitment to the cause of freedom and all it stands for. It means wage earners and employers making an extra effort to increase the productivity of our factories. It means our students in schools striving for increasing excellence rather than adjusting to mediocrity.

It means supporting and encouraging our scientists to explore the unknown, not just for what we can get but for what we can learn, and it means each American assuming a personal responsibility to make this country which we love a proud example of freedom for all the world; each of us for example, doing our part in ending the prejudice which 100 years after Lincoln, to our shame, still embarrasses us abroad and saps our strength at home; each of us participating in this and other political campaigns not just by going to the polls and voting but working for the candidate of your choice. And, my fellow Americans, it means sacrifice—not the grim sacrifice of desperation but the rewarding sacrifice of choice which lifts us out of the humdrum life in which we live and gives us the supreme satisfaction which comes from working together in a cause greater than ourselves, greater than our Nation, as great as the whole world itself.

What I propose tonight is not new, it is as old as America, and as young as America, because America will never grow old. You will remember that Thomas Jefferson said, "We act not for ourselves alone, but for the whole human race." Lincoln said, "In giving freedom to these slaves we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last hope of the earth." And Teddy Roosevelt said, "Our first duty as citizens of the Nation is owed to the United States, but if we are true to our principles we must also think of serving the interests of mankind at large." And Woodrow Wilson said, "A patriotic American is never so proud of the flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to others, as well as himself, a symbol of hope and liberty."

We say today that a young America shall fulfill her destiny by helping to build a new world in which men can live together in peace and justice and freedom with each other. But there is a difference today, an exciting difference, and the difference is because of the dramatic breakthrough in science for the first time in human history. We have the resources, the resources to wage a winning war against poverty, misery and disease wherever it exists in the world.

BELIEVES IN AMERICA

And upon the next President of the United States will rest the responsibility to inspire and to lead the forces of freedom toward this goal.

I am sure now that you understand why I said at the beginning that it would be difficult for any man to say that he was qualified to provide this kind of leadership. I can only say to you tonight that I believe in the American dream because I have seen it come true in my own life. I know something of the threat which confronts us and I know something of the effort which will be needed to meet it. I have seen hate for America, not only in the Kremlin, but in the eyes of Communists in our own country, and on the ugly face of a mob in Caracas.

I have heard doubts about America expressed, not just by Communists, but by sincere students and labor leaders in other countries searching for the way to a better life and wondering if we had lost the way. And I have also seen love for America in countries throughout the world, in a crowd in Chicago, in Bogota, in the heart of Siberia, and in Warsaw—250,000 people on the streets on a Sunday afternoon singing, crying with tears running down their cheeks and shouting "Niech Zyje America"—Long live the United States.

And my fellow Americans, I know that we must resist the hate, we must remove the doubts, but above all we must be worthy of the love and the trust of millions on this earth for whom America is the hope of the world.

A hundred years ago, Abraham Lincoln was asked during the dark days of the tragic War Between the States whether he thought God was on his side. His answer was, "My concern is not whether God is on our side, but whether we are on God's side." My fellow Americans, may that ever be our prayer for our country. And in that spirit, with faith in America, with faith in her ideals and in her people, I accept your nomination for President of the United States.