in the world. He is also, I believe, brother-in-law of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Harold Macmillan.

I wish to welcome this distinguished citizen of Great Britain, and to let one and all know that the Cavendish family is well recognized for its dedication to public service and for its great, liberal traditions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. On behalf of the minority, I wish to join in this tribute to our distinguished visitor. He knows more about being in the majority than does the present speaker, who has had very little experience in that happy state during his 14 years in the Congress. [Laughter.]

We welcome our visitor to our shores. We know of his distinguished career. He knows, as well as we do, of the great ties which bind his country and ours. I know that I can express, in this Chamber, the affectionate greetings of all Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there is other business to be transacted at this time—and I gather there is none—I now move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, to Monday, January 23, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State.

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Robert V. Roosa, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, of California, to be Treasurer of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

James K. Carr, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Frank Barry, of Arizona, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Edward Gudeman, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William Willard Wirtz, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

Jerry R. Holleman, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Walter W. Heller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Kermit Gordon, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

James Tobin, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

George Docking, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

John S. Gleason, Jr., of Illinois, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1963.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 21, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert S. McNamara, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be Attorney General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

J. Edward Day, of California, to be Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Stewart Lee Udall, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Luther H. Hodges, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

UNITED NATIONS

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1961

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

Msgr. Nicholas Babak, rector, St. Basil's College and Preparatory School, Stamford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O almighty and everlasting God, Creator of the world and its people, we, Thy servants, thank Thee for the many blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us. Especially do we thank Thee for the blessings Thou hast showered upon these United States of America and its citizens. We are thankful to Thee that we live in a land of plenty, where we enjoy the priceless gift of liberty.

O merciful Father, endow our new President and the Members of the Senate with vigorous health and the strength to fulfill the exhausting demands of their office. Give them the wisdom always to perceive what is right, and the courage to be leaders in the fight against injustice. May they ever be mindful of the common good, and avoid selfish gain. Grant that they continue to be the hope of freedom for the oppressed according to the spirit expressed in the Captive Nations Week resolution of the Congress.

We humbly pray for the liberation of all enslaved people. Especially on this celebration of the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, we pray that the Ukrainian people will be given the strength to bear the sufferings of ruthless persecution inflicted upon them by the forces of godless and imperialistic communism. Bless them with ultimate victory in their struggle for freedom, so

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

that they may worship as freemen in a world at peace.

Inspire the members of our Government with the indomitable spirit and love of liberty as expressed in the moving words of Taras Shevchenko, the great poet and champion of freedom of the Ukraine.

Keep our Nation ever vigilant, and grant even greater strength to better preserve the peace throughout the world, by protecting the helpless whom the forces of tyranny seek to enslave.

Deliver us from the fear of our enemies so that we may pass our time in peace under Thy protection, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Saturday, January 21, 1961, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that on last Saturday, January 21, President Kennedy sent to the Senate 12 nominations within the Department of Defense, which must be confirmed by the Senate. The Senate Armed Services Committee has conducted hearings on each of the nominations, and the hearings were available for all Senators on last Saturday. Unfortunately, the Armed Services Committee did not receive official word about the nominations last Saturday; and, as a consequence, the names of the nominees do not appear on the Executive Calendar today. Because of the error of transmission, and inasmuch as all these nominations have been reported favorably by the Armed Services Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the following nominations, reported today by the Armed Services Committee, be acted on today by the Senate, notwithstanding the fact that they have not officially gone over 1 calendar day:

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, a holdover, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, a holdover, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, also a holdover, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State; Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States; Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General; and H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General, be considered on the same basis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ROLE OF SENATOR METCALF ON INAUGURAL DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the last day of the Eisenhower administration and the first day of the Kennedy administration, the State of Montana was the recipient of an exceptional distinction. The new Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] was selected as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate for the day. In that capacity, Senator METCALF, in effect, presided over the withdrawal of the old administration and ushered in the new administration. He received on behalf of the Senate, the nominations for the Cabinet of the new administration. He led the Senate in a body to the east front of the Capitol, there to witness the inaugural ceremony, the great symbol of American democracy in action, whereby one administration recedes into the glow of our history after it passes on to the new administration the torch of temporary authority, and all Americans reaffirm their subordination to the Constitution and the laws of the United States. It was a great day for the Nation, Mr. President. And it was a great day for the State of Montana that an outstanding Montanan, the able new Senator, LEE METCALF, should have played such an auspicious role in it.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

USER CHARGES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PERFORMED BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize user charges for certain services performed by the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6(d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(d)) to authorize certain persons who complete a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPUTATION OF PAY FOR CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASE OF PAY OF CERTAIN PROFESSORS AT THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY AND U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEDENDENTS AND BAGGAGE AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions, for the quarter ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NICKEL AND COBALT

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 96 short tons of 91 percent nickel in ingot form, approximately 4 short tons of sintered nickel powder, and approximately 9 short tons of cobalt, now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NICKEL-COBALT-COPPER

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 3,431 short tons of nickel-cobalt-copper calcines and approximately 87 tons of nickel-cobalt-copper matte, now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of that Administration, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN CHILDREN'S INSTITUTE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON SALES AND TRANSFERS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on sales and transfers of foreign excess property by that Administration, for the period January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO PAINTING AND ILLUMINATION OF RADIO TOWERS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO OATHS ON CERTAIN DOCUMENTS FILED WITH FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GERARDO P. MAGCANAM AND PEDRO F. BANTILLO

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Gerardo P. Magcanam and Pedro F. Bantillo (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSAULTS UPON CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration within the provisions of the United States Code relating to assaults upon, and homicides of, certain officers and employees of the United States as constituting a crime (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.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–17 AND GS–18, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during calendar year 1960 no changes occurred in the following four positions in that Department, three in grade GS–18, and one in grade GS–17; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ANNUAL AUDIT OF BRIDGE COMMISSIONS AND AUTHORITIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas a great number of gangsters, outlaws, mobsters, racketeers, and other violators of laws and society in the United States are immigrants from other countries; and

"Whereas no definite steps have been taken to reduce the percentage of immigrants from the countries which furnish the greater number of such immigrants; and

"Whereas a reduction of immigrants in the same ratio as to the crimes the immigrants from such countries commit would help reduce such crimes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 63d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to make rules and regulations to require that the percentage of immigrants to the United States from any country will be reduced in the same ratio that the immigrants from that country participate in crimes in this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall furnish a copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

"MELVIN T. CHAMBERS.
"ROY MILIUM.
"JOE LEE ANDERSON.
"DOUG BRADLEY.
"JIMMY SLACK.

"Attest:

"LEE REAVES,
"Secretary of the Senate."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND SAM RAYBURN — RESOLUTIONS OF TEXAS SENATE

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate of the State of Texas, certified by its president, the Honorable Ben Ramsey, Lieutenant Governor of Texas, did on January 11, 1961, by unanimous action pass Senate Resolution 7, expressing admiration and esteem for Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and extending best wishes to President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON for a constructive and stable administration.

Moreover, the Senate of Texas, did on January 10, 1961, by unanimous action, pass Senate Resolution 3 marking the 40th anniversary of the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, and expressing appreciation for his leadership and achievements for and on behalf of his State and country.

Mr. President, I, concurring in the expressed sentiments of the resolutions, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these resolutions passed by the Senate of the State of Texas.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 7

Whereas in the course of events the American people authorized a change in the administration of their Government with the election of Hon. John F. Kennedy, as President, and Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as Vice President; and

Whereas, with the eyes of the world focused on the National Capital, the new President and Vice President will be inaugurated on January 20, 1961, and thus launch the country on a program of constructive achievements and stability in these precarious and troublous times; and

Whereas the transition in administrations is of tremendous importance to the free world and to our country, and of particular interest to Texas and to Texans; and

Whereas in the person of Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON to become the Vice President of the United States and as such, President of the Senate of the United States, the State of Texas has given to the country a talented and able leader; and

Whereas this distinguished native Texan served his district in the U.S. House of Representatives, followed by representation of his State in the U.S. Senate, to which he was elected three times, and by reason of his ability, energy, integrity, and devotion to duty, was chosen as majority leader of the U.S. Senate in which capacity he exercised those qualities of leadership which gained the respect of all his colleagues and reflected credit upon himself, his State, and the Nation; and

Whereas during his long and successful tenure as Senate majority leader his cooperation with the administration, of a different political faith, demonstrated his patriotism, his capacity, and his desire to serve the best interests of his country; and

Whereas the Senate of Texas is grateful for the service rendered to the State and the Nation by its former U.S. Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and desires to extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, all good wishes in their new official roles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That we do hereby express our appreciation for the services so ably rendered the State and the Nation by Vice President-elect JOHNSON, and extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, our best wishes for a constructive and stable administration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, under the seal of the senate, be forwarded by the secretary of the senate, to Hon. John F. Kennedy; and to Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON; and to the members of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3

Whereas 50 years ago on this date, a young man from north Texas, serving in the Texas House of Representatives was elevated to the position of speaker of the house; and

Whereas following his service in such capacity, he was chosen by the people of his district to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives where he has served continuously, with distinction, since 1913; and

Whereas by hard work, integrity, devotion to duty, and dedication to the best interests of his adopted State, he grew in stature and in the respect of his colleagues in the House of Representatives in which he served as its majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses, followed by his selection as Speaker on September 16, 1940, which position he has held continuoulsy since such time with the exception of the 80th Congress, during which he was the distinguished minority leader; and

Whereas by reason of his outstanding ability and fine character he has served his State and Nation in the Congress and as Speaker of the House longer than any other person in American history; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to mark this anniversary and congratulate this outstanding Texan upon his constructive contributions to our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That it does hereby extend its congratulations and best wishes to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for his great and outstanding leadership and achievements for and on behalf of his State and country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded under the seal of the Senate of Texas, to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN and to members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has for many years planned and developed a program for irrigation, flood control, and recreation facilities in Kansas.

Some of these projects are completed and are rendering outstanding service to our citizens.

Programs on the planning boards and other projects not completed need additional funds and Congress was urged to appropriate them in this session.

The projects already completed have demonstrated the value of water for beneficial uses in every section of the State.

At the 21st annual meeting of the Kansas Reclamation Association held at Osborne, Kans., on October 27, 1960, definite resolutions were adopted, urging funds for Big Creek near Ellis and Hays, the Glen Elder flood control and irrigation project near Beloit, and the Cheney Reservoir project on the Ninnescah River west of Wichita.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 21ST ANNUAL MEETING AT OSBORNE, KANS., OCTOBER 27, 1960

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Corps of Engineers have, under the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, investigated and recommended several projects in the State of Kansas for the purpose of flood control, stabilization of agriculture through irrigation, and to provide needed water for domestic, municipal, and industrial use; and

Whereas these projects have been authorized by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend that the investigation, planning, and construction be accelerated to the end that the completion of these plans be accomplished at the earliest possible date.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the economy of the Western States depends on the control and use of the water for irrigation; and

Whereas since the beginning of the development of the West it has been generally recognized by administrative officials and courts of law that the water rights belong to the several States: Be it

Resolved, That this association concur with and affirm action by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the senate concurring therein, that the Congress and the President of the United States and the Representatives of Kansas in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, respectfully urged and requested to take all necessary action to: (1) Preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States, the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas a disastrous flood occurred on Big Creek on June 16, 1957, which resulted in the loss of several lives and direct damage to property of more than $3 million to the cities of Ellis and Hays and surrounding rural areas; and

Whereas a similar flood occurred in 1951, which likewise resulted in the loss of several lives and great destruction of property: Now, be it

Resolved, That this association urges the investigation by the appropriate Federal and State agencies to determine feasible plans to prevent future flood disaster and that Federal funds for such investigation be included in the 1962 budget.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is investigating Glen Elder Reservoir flood control and irrigation project;

Whereas this reservoir is urgently needed to control floods not only on the Solomon but the Kaw River as well and to stabilize the economy of the Solomon River Valley by irrigation of agricultural products and to provide urgently needed municipal water to the city of Beloit; and

Whereas these investigations will be completed in 1961: Be it

Resolved, That this project be allocated sufficient funds to start construction in 1962.

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has completed a feasibility report regarding the Cheney Division, Wichita project (Kansas), commonly called the Cheney Reservoir located on the north fork of the Ninnescah River; and

Whereas this project has been approved overwhelmingly at the polls in the city of Wichita and has met with the favorable comments of the Federal and State agencies concerned; and

Whereas this project envisions flood control, irrigation, fish and wildlife, municipal supply, and recreational benefits; and

Whereas a proposed contract has been negotiated between the city of Wichita and the United States providing for the repayment to the Federal Government of that portion of the project cost allocated to municipal water supply; and

Whereas has authorized this project: Now, therefore, this association urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to initiate construction of this worthwhile project.

RESOLUTION 6

The Kansas Reclamation Association reaffirms its opposition to a Missouri Valley Authority.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is authorized to plan for and cooperate in construction of recreational areas at its reservoir sites, but is not permitted under Federal reclamation laws to operate recreational facilities: Now, therefore, this association commends the Kansas Park and Resources Authority and the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission for the cooperation with various Federal agencies in the development of such areas for recreational use by the general public and urges continuation of this development.

RESOLUTION 8

Resolution urging legislation to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to allocate joint reservoir costs to recreation and to construct basic recreational facilities on a nonreimbursable basis

Whereas one of the products of the technological advances of modern society is the gradual extension of leisure time; and

Whereas it is a matter of national concern that such leisure time be provided healthful outlets; and

Whereas multiple-purpose reservoirs constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation create centers for a wide range of recreational activities including fishing, hunting, boating, swimming, water skiing, and picnicking; and

Whereas although recreation is served by creation of these manmade lakes, there is no provision for allocating any part of the joint costs to recreation; and

Whereas present scale construction of minimum basic facilities at the Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs is purely a defensive program of protecting the reservoir from the people and the people from the reservoir and falls woefully short of being a positive program for enhancing recreation potentials of the reservoirs; and

Whereas this defensive and wholly inadequate policy of construction of recreational facilities is reimbursable and therefore repayable only by water and power users: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allocate joint reservoir costs to recreation to a degree commensurate with recreation benefits created by the reservoir and that such allocation be nonreimbursable; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior to construct such basic recreational facilities as required to permit and facilitate eventual maximum recreational use of the reservoirs and that funds so expended be nonreimbursable; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Reclamation Association for referral to its resolution committee with the recommendation that a similar expression be registered by the national body, and that copies be sent to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress to make the provisions stated herein.

RESOLUTION 9

Recognition of future needs in construction of projects: By general survey the Kansas State Board of Water Resources has definitely shown that the growth of agriculture, industry, and commerce in Kansas depend on available future water supply. In order to store and use for beneficial purposes all surface water available, and as the location sites for large storage reservoirs are limited, we believe that anticipated future needs for water, as well as present needs, should be recognized by the people of the State of Kansas. We recommend that the State legislature develop and adopt a basic State water development policy establishing the principle of State participation in water projects, in cooperation with local and Federal agencies, for the purpose of assuring full development of the surface water resources of the State.

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas history has proved that the well-being of any people is related directly to the productivity of the land on which they live and the protection they have from the ravages of uncontrolled waters; and

Whereas we believe the welfare of future generations of Americans will be directly affected by these conditions;

Whereas we now have knowledge and technical skill, if used with vigor and foresight, to preserve our heritage of natural resources: Now, therefore, we recommend that the State board of education adopt the teaching of conservation as a required subject in our public schools.

RESOLUTION 11

Whereas an irrigation district has been organized below the Kanopolis Dam consisting of some 17,000 acres; Be it

Resolved, That this association request the Congress of the United States for sufficient funds to begin construction of this worthwhile project.

RESOLUTION 12

Be it resolved, That this association recommends that in all future contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and any irrigation district that there be included therein a 10-year development period and further that all existing contracts upon request by any irrigation district be amended by the Secretary of Interior granting a 10-year development period rather than the present 5-year period.

RESOLUTION 13

This association heartily endorses the fine work which has been done in Kansas by the following agencies in the fields of flood control and conservation of water and soil: U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Soil Conservation Service, Water Resources Council of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, Kansas Water Resources Board, Kansas Water Resources Division of Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Kansas Industrial Development Commission, The Missouri-Arkansas Flood Control Association, the Republican Valley Conservation Association, U.S. Geological Survey, the State Geological Survey of the University of Kansas.

RESOLUTION 14

This association extends its thanks to the city of Osborne, the chamber of commerce, Ralph Wyckoff, and all others who have extended such fine hospitality to the delegates to this 21st meeting of the Kansas Reclamation Association.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HENNINGS, OF MISSOURI—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably the resolution (S. Res. 19) to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Hennings, of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 19), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Thomas C. Hennings, Junior, late a Senator from the State of Missouri, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the adoption of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution providing for the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the 87th Congress. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-seventh Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the adoption of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 519. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 520. A bill to authorize certain modification of the existing project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, for navigation purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Utterback; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 522. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 524. A bill to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 525. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act;

S. 526. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith;

S. 527. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia; and

S. 528. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr.

McGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 529. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 530. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 532. A bill for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 533. A bill for the relief of Irena Maria KOLLER; *and*

S. 534. A bill for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 535. A bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 536. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 537. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes;

S. 538. A bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses;

S. 539. A bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

S. 540. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes;

S. 541. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint non-uniformed special policemen; and

S. 542. A bill to amend section 203(j), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HART):

S. 543. A bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 544. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 546. A bill for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung; and

S. 547. A bill for the relief of Young Jei Oh and Soon Nee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 548. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; and

S. 549. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. HART:

S. 550. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Chirco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 551. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 552. A bill to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 553. A bill for the relief of George John Coutsoubinas, Olga G. Coutsoubinas, Spyridon G. Coutsoubinas, and Agatha G. Coutsoubinas;

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Suzuki Davis; and

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 556. A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 557. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended;

S. 558. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1901 and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia;

S. 559. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

S. 560. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 561. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 562. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; and

S. 563. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. BEALL) (by request):

S. 564. A bill to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; and

S. 565. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 566. A bill for the relief of Renata Najman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 567. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place in grade 18 of the general schedule the positions of hearing examiners of the Social Security Administration in the Department of Heatlh, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 568. A bill providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety and guaranty bonds and for all forms of fire, marine and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and of rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 569. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 571. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines so as to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 572. A bill to extend the Farmers' Home Administration operating loan program to bona fide fur farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 573. A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proffered discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court-martial, or if not court-martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for expenses paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a higher education or in providing a higher education for his spouse or children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 575. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; and

S. 576. A bill 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; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 577. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62; and

S. 578. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 579. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 581. A bill to amend the Act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 582. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to create a joint committee for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KERR, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of such plants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS ON "PROJECT HOPE"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) expressing the sense of Congress on "Project Hope," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

RESOLUTIONS

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 64) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 87th Congress, which was considered and agreed to.

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

STUDY OF UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST SUCCESSORS TO THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year I introduced, at the suggestion of the Treasury Department, a bill to close the gaps that exist in present law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line to the Presidency. This proposal was favorably approved by the Judiciary Committee, and passed the Senate on May 26, 1960; but final action was not consummated by the Congress before adjournment.

Existing law provides penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States and authorizes their protection by the U.S. Secret Service. The objective of these provisions would appear to be to take care of any contingency that may arise as to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who may become President. However, existing law does not take care of the situation that would occur in the event of the death or disability of either the President or the Vice President, or both. Furthermore, existing law does not provide protection for the Vice President-elect while he is waiting to assume office after his election. This proposed legislation would remedy this lack of coverage, by making the threat and protection provisions coextensive with the possibilities of succession to the Presidency.

With regard to the protection of the Vice President, existing law authorizes the full-time protection of the President, but provides protection of the Vice President only upon his request; that is, the protection of the Vice President is at the present time at the discretion of the Vice President. In its letter of transmittal, under date of January 27, 1960, the Department of the Treasury expressed the opinion "that this presents an untenable situation."

Part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded. Therefore, this proposal would remove the discretion of the Vice President as to his protection. It would, therefore, provide mandatory protection by the Secret Service for the Vice President, the Vice President-elect, or other officers next in order of succession to the Presidency.

I, therefore, introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "To amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury addressed to the President of the Senate, under date of January 27, 1960, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 27, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to close gaps that exist in present law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line to the Presidency.

Existing law provides penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States and authorizes their protection by the U.S. Secret Service. The objective of these provisions would appear to be to take care of any contingency that may arise as to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who may become the President. However, existing law does not take care of the situation that would occur in the event of the death or disability of either the President or Vice President, or both. Also, existing law does not provide protection for the Vice-President-elect while he is waiting to assume office after his election. The draft bill would remedy this lack of coverage by making the threat and protection provisions coextensive with the possibilities of succession to the Presidency.

With respect to the protection of the Vice President, existing law authorizes the full-time protection of the President, but provides protection of the Vice President only upon his request. In other words, the protection of the Vice President is at the present time at the discretion of the Vice President. The Department considers this an untenable situation. Part-time protection is ineffectual since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded. Consequently, the draft bill would remove the discretion the Vice President presently

has as to his protection, effective upon the expiration of the term of the present incumbent. It would also provide similar protection for the Vice-President-elect or other officer next in order of succession to the Presidency.

A comparative type showing changes which the proposed legislation would make in existing law is enclosed for convenient reference.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

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

The bill (S. 519) to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT ON THE KASKASKIA RIVER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last month the Army Engineers made a favorable report on the Kaskaskia River, with respect to navigation improvement from its mouth to Fayetteville, in St. Clair County, Ill. The Engineers submitted a finding that the proposed project is sound and feasible at an estimated cost of $58,200,000. Therefore, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize this navigation proposal.

The report contains, among other things, a recommendation for dredging and widening the Kaskaskia River, to provide a 9-foot channel along the 45-mile stretch from the Mississippi River.

This would open up the rich Illinois coalfields, through which the Kaskaskia runs, to economical commercial exploitation. Coal reserves in this vicinity are estimated to be in the neighborhood of 2 billion tons. With the river open for commercial navigation, the Illinois coal industry would be revived. Current shipping costs now price Illinois coal out of the market. What is more important, in the long run, is the possibility that the coal would naturally attract industry to the lower reaches of the Kaskaskia. Electric power can be generated at a reasonably low cost in coal-fired steamplants.

In fact, there is every reason to believe that the proposed improvement of the river will induce industry to come into that area; and the project certainly is in conformity with all the emphasis that has been placed upon the development of distressed areas. The project will result in the improvement of a river which now is not navigable, and which traverses the southwest section of Illinois; and the project will open a great area that is abundant in natural resources and includes some of the finest coal fields in the country.

Industrial concerns have already indicated an interest in locating in this area. In fact, one large aluminum company has already acquired a site of approximately 2,200 acres near the mouth of the Kaskaskia, for an aluminum reduction plant. This process requires vast amounts of electricity. Illinois coal, plus the newly discovered iron ore deposits in Missouri, could also mean the location of a steel mill in the Kaskaskia River Valley. Furthermore, prime industrial producers always attract satellites who want to be close to their source of supply.

A proposal of this nature is a long way from the time of its authorization to the time when the dredges go into action. This project is worth dreaming about and working for, inasmuch as this area could very well some day become a "Ruhr Valley of America." At the same time, it fits into the programs to asist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies and to create new employment opportunities, as already set forth in various area assistance measures—including one I introduced early in the session—which have been introduced in the Senate, and now are under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Everett T. Winter, executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association, endorsing this proposed Kaskaskia River navigation project.

In conclusion, I may add that this measure also has the strong endorsement of the Missouri-Illinois Bi-State Development Agency, of St. Louis, as well as the endorsement of other industrial enterprises in both States.

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

The bill (S. 520) to authorize certain modification of the existing project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., for navigation purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: We are very pleased to learn of your interest in seeking quick authorization of the navigation part of the overall development of the Kaskaskia River Basin.

Our organization has enthusiastically endorsed this project and a year ago in our official platform, we stated, "We urge the expeditious processing of the Kaskaskia River navigation report and prompt action in accordance with the findings and recommendations therein."

As you know this area has been the victim of some serious chronic unemployment, and we believe the completion of the Kaskaskia River project will do much to alleviate this condition.

The metroplex of St. Louis which includes both sides of the Mississippi River is dependent upon the coal deposits in Illinois for the millions of tons of coal needed to generate electricity for domestic and industrial uses. The completion of this canal will make possible the movement of this coal to the generating plants at a much reduced cost for transportation, and this reduction of cost will be reflected in the power and light bills of every consumer in a very wide area.

A nationwide grain company has informed us that as soon as the canal is assured they will build a grain elevator which will give the farmers of the area an improved market for soy beans, corn, and wheat.

One of the large aluminum companies contemplates the building of a plant on the canal that will mean a great many new jobs.

On the Missouri side of the Mississippi River, a very high grade iron ore deposit estimated to be some 30 billion tons has been discovered, and is being developed. With the opening of the Kaskaskia navigation project we will be able to bring together the almost unlimited deposits of coal from Illinois and this iron ore from Missouri to the benefit of both States, and of the entire Nation. The canalization of this river will change the Kaskaskia Valley from its present state to a midcontinent "Ruhr Valley."

We certainly wish you success in getting this very meritorious project authorized, and under construction.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT T. WINTER,
Executive Vice President.

STRENGTHENING OF LAWS AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, just before completing his distinguished tenure in office, William P. Rogers, the past Attorney General, proposed, on behalf of the Department of Justice, that in the criminal law there be made certain changes which would aid in the Nation's struggle against organized crime. In proposing these changes in the criminal law, the Department of Justice stated that it has long been concerned with the existence in the United States of nationwide crime syndicates which plunder the country of many billions of dollars each year.

It was the feeling of the Department of Justice that although combating crime is fundamentally the responsibility of local law-enforcement agencies, syndicated crime does not respect State boundaries, but operates on a national basis, and even in foreign countries.

It was, therefore, the position of the Department of Justice that Federal law enforcement should in every way possible aid the States to cope with the increasing interstate character of organized crime. It is the conviction of the Department of Justice that only through the use of such additional legal tools can this Federal assistance be adequately given to the States.

On behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I now introduce six different bills which would aid in the fight against organized crime.

I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD, preceding each bill, an explanation of its purpose.

I further request unanimous consent that the bills lie on the table for a week, to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to join in sponsoring them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and explanations will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILEY, were received, read twice by their titles, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance.

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 274. CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES.

"No deduction otherwise allowable under this subtitle shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for rent, wages or salaries if under any statutes of the United States, or of the State, Territory or Possession of the United States in which such amount is paid or incurred, the payment of such amount constitutes a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment or both."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 274. CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES.

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act but only with respect to amounts paid or incurred after such date."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 523 is as follows:

Organized crime has derived huge profits from certain businesses carried on illegally. It is obvious that a business conducted furtively and unlawfully will yield larger profits than one transacted openly by law-abiding citizens. It is equally clear that the furtive character of such a business increases the expense and difficulty of tax collection. The Government is entitled to be reimbursed for this drain of its resources, and to secure its full share of taxes from these illegal ventures.

One example of this type of business is organized crime's illegal gambling enterprises—perhaps its principal source of illgotten funds. Almost all of the States have laws prohibiting "bookmaking," "slot machines" and related activities of the organized gambling fraternity. Policing illegal gamblers is primarily a State and local responsibility.

There are, however, areas where the Federal Government can properly assist local authorities in the enforcement of their anti-racketeering and gambling laws. This bill is designed to deny persons engaged in illegal activity, such as gambling, certain tax deductions allowed to legitimate businesses. This would deal a severe blow to the organized racketeer by hitting him where it hurts most—in his pocketbook. (See *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 27).)

To the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 524. A bill to amend the Act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(a)(2) of the Act of January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. 1171), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) any other machine or mechanical device (including, but not limited to, roulette wheels and similar devices) designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, provided that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to parimutuel betting equipment or materials used or designed for use at racetracks where betting is legal under applicable State laws; or".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of such Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"(d) The term 'interstate commerce' includes commerce between one State, possession, or the District of Columbia and another State, possession, or the District of Columbia.

"(e) The term 'foreign commerce' includes commerce with a foreign country.

"(f) The term 'intrastate commerce' includes commerce wholly within one State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device in interstate or foreign commerce: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State if the State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person during any calendar year to engage in the business of manufacturing, repairing, reconditioning, dealing in, or operating any gambling device if in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, unless such person shall, during the month prior to engaging in such business in that year, register with the Attorney General of the United States his name and trade name and the address of each of his places of business, designating his principal place of business within the United States.

"(b) Every person required to register under the provision of this Act shall maintain an inventory record of all gambling devices owned, possessed, or in his custody as of the close of each calendar month. The record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, together with the location of each item listed thereon.

"(c) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices sold, delivered, or shipped in intrastate, interstate, or foreign commerce. The record of sales, deliveries, and shipments for each place of business shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and the description of each separate subassembly or essential part sold, delivered, or shipped, together with the name and address of the buyer and consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier.

"(d) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired. This record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired together with the name and address of the person from whom the device was purchased or acquired and the name and address of the carrier.

"(e) Every manufacturer required to register shall number seriatim each assembled or partially assembled gambling device which is to be sold, shipped, or delivered, and shall stamp on the outside front of each such assembled or partially assembled gambling device so as to be clearly visible the number of the device, the name of the manufacturer, and the date of manufacture. And every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall record the data herein designated in the records required to be kept.

"(f) Each record required to be maintained under the provisions of this Act shall be kept for a period of five years.

"(g)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person required to register under the provisions of this Act to sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device which is not marked and numbered as required by this Act or for any person to remove, obliterate, or alter the manufacturer's name, the date of manufacture, or the serial number on any gambling device;

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to make or cause to be made, any false entry in any record required to be kept under this section; and

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any person who has failed to register as required by this Act or who has failed to maintain the records required by this Act to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device.

"(h) Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, at the principal place of business within the United States of any person required to register by this Act, at all reasonable times have access to and the right to copy any of the records required to be kept by this Act, and in case of refusal by any person registered under this Act to allow inspection and copying of the records required to be kept, the United States district court where the principal place of business is located shall have jurisdiction to issue an appropriate order ocmpelling production.

"(i) No person shall be excused from maintaining the records designated herein, producing the same or testifying before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a criminal penalty or forfeiture. But upon asserting the privilege against self-incrimination any natural person may be required to open the records designated herein to inspection or to testify before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto: *Provided,* That no such person shall be criminally prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing disclosed as a result of the inspection of such records or testimony with respect thereto. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt com-

mitted while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this Act.

"(j) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to make and enforce such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and the breach of any of such regulations shall be punishable as provided in section 6 of this Act."

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 524 is as follows:

In 1951 Congress passed the Johnson Act (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. secs. 1171–1177), which in general forbids the interstate transportation of any gambling device and requires manufacturers of and dealers in gambling devices to register annually with the Attorney General.

Experience with the enforcement of this act has demonstrated a need for its amendment in several respects. It is proposed to broaden the definition of gambling device so that not only the slot machines would be covered, but also additional types of machines and mechanical devices designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling.

The proposal would also enlarge and more clearly define the categories of persons to whom the registration and filing provisions apply. It would require the maintenance of detailed records with respect to the acquisition and disposition of gambling devices, with provision for inspection and copying of such records by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Provision is made in the bill for the granting of immunity to persons who assert their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of the required records or testifying before a grand jury or court of the United States. Thus, our enforcement authorities would be able to compel the disclosure by underlings of information necessary for reaching the upper echelons of the crime syndicates.

Finally, the bill would extend the scope of the act to apply to the transportation of gambling devices in foreign commerce; at present it applies only to the interstate transportation of such devices. This extension would not only eliminate a possible area of gambling device activity, but would further strengthen enforcement of the act with respect to interstate violations, since it is difficult to segregate from an investigative standpoint interstate and foreign shipments.

S. 525. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for a crime, or an attempt to commit a crime, punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding one year under the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees, or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 525 is as follows:

Section 1073, the Fugitive Felon Act, now provides that "whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempt to commit any of the foregoing offenses as they are defined either at common law or by the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees * * * shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Prosecution under this section is now limited to those crimes listed above, whereas the proposed amendment would broaden the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act to include all felonies or offenses punishable by more than a year in prison. If this amendment is enacted, local law-enforcement agencies could seek Federal assistance in locating offenders who have fled interstate to avoid prosecution, custody, or confinement for a number of serious offenses not presently included within the statute. It is the view of the Department of Justice that this amendment will strengthen considerably the legal arsenal directed at curbing major criminal activities in the Nation. It will supplement the powers of the States to fight against crime by adding the force of the Federal Government's investigative and enforcement agencies to those of the States, with either Federal trials of persons apprehended or their return to the proper State jurisdiction for prosecution or other appropriate action.

S. 526. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1952. Immunity of witnesses.

"Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any violation of section 1951 of this title or of section 302 of the Act of June 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 157; 29 U.S.C. 186), or of any conspiracy involving the foregoing, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in the next sentence) against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under the provisions of this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"1951. Interference with commerce by threats or violence.

the following:

"1952. Immunity of witnesses."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 526 is as follows:

In labor racketeering cases the experience of the Department of Justice demonstrates an urgent need for legislation to permit the compelling of testimoney before grand juries and courts in Hobbs Act and certain Taft-Hartley Act cases. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) makes it unlawful to interfere with commerce by robbery or extortion, as defined in the act. Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C. 186) makes it unlawful for an employer in an industry affecting commerce to pay money or make gifts to representatives of any of his employees under circumstances that would constitute such action a bribe. The close connection between the offenses prescribed in these two acts often inhibits cooperation with law enforcement officers. For example, an employer who is a victim of labor extortion may be reluctant to testify in a Hobbs Act case for fear that he may be incriminating himself under section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This bill would add a new section to the "Racketeering" chapter of our criminal code, in which the Hobbs Act is contained. As amended, the chapter will provide that whenever in the opinion of a U.S. attorney it is necessary to the public interest that a witness testify or produce evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States, in a matter involving a violation of the Hobbs Act or section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, he may, with the approval of the Attorney General, seek an order of the court instructing the witness to do so. The witness may not then be excused from testifying or producing the evidence on the ground that the act required of him may be self-incriminating, for the measure would accord him immunity from prosecution (except for prejury or contempt) with respect to transactions concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence after claiming his privilege against self-incrimination. Legislation such as this is not uncommon; there are many such immunity statutes and they have been of considerable assistance in accomplishing the more effective administration of justice.

S. 527. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chapter 95 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1952. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

"Whoever except a common carrier in the usual course of its business carries or sends in interstate or foreign commerce any records or paraphernalia used or intended or designed for use in (a) bookmaking; or (b) wagering pools with respect to a sporting event; or (c) in a numbers, policy, bolita, or similar game shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years or both."

and by adding the following item to the analysis of the chapter:

"§ 1952. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 527 is as follows:

This bill would make it a felony to send or carry in interstate commerce numbers

slips or wagering paraphernalia and would be of inestimable aid in stamping out syndicate numbers operations which extend across State lines. This occurs more frequently when State lines are close to major metropolitan areas. A typical example would be Washington, D.C., with its close proximity to Maryland and Virginia or Cincinnati, Ohio, which is across the State line from Newport, Ky. Whereas many of the numbers operations are intrastate, if this bill were enacted the Federal Government would have jurisdiction to investigate and act in those instances in which there is some indication of interstate activity.

S. 528. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the purposes of this Act are to assist the various States, territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "Communication facility" means any and all instrumentalities, personnel, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like connection between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

(b) "Gambling information" means bets or wagers or related information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or transactions or information facilitating betting or wagering activities on any such sporting event or contest. In connection with horseracing, gambling information includes among other things entries, scratches, jockeys, jockey changes, weights, probable winners, scheduled starting time of race, actual starting time of race, track conditions, the betting odds, changes in the betting odds, the post positions, the results, and the prices paid.

(c) "Transmission in interstate commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from any place in any State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia to any place in any other State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(d) "Transmission in foreign commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from or to any place in the United States to or from a foreign country or ship at sea or in the air.

SEC. 3. (a) The use of, or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of any communication facility which is or will be used for the transmission of gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce is prohibited. When any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility, but no damages, penalty or forfeiture, civil or criminal, shall be found against any common carrier for any act done in compliance with any such notice. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prejudice the right of any person affected thereby to secure an appropriate determination, as otherwise provided by law, in a Federal court or in a State or local tribunal or agency, that such facility should not be discontinued or removed, or should be restored.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of information in connection with the news reporting of sporting events or contests, which might be gambling information as defined in this Act, if such information is intended, transmitted, supplied, delivered, and received only for printed news publications in newspapers, magazines, journals or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting.

(c) No radio or television broadcasting station, for which a license is required by any law of the United States, shall broadcast or permit to be broadcast any gambling information relating to horse racing before the start of any race on the day it is scheduled to be run, or during the one-hour period immediately following the finish of such race or before the start of the next race at that track whichever period is longer. This section shall not preclude the broadcasting of the progress of, or information concerning, a horse race where such broadcast is carried as a special event: *Provided,* That no more than two horse races shall be broadcast by any station or chain of stations per day.

SEC. 4. (a) Any person or persons who shall lease or otherwise obtain from a common carrier or other supplier a private line communication facility to be operated in interstate or foreign commerce for or in connection with the transmission of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests shall file with the Federal Communications Commission through its agent an affidavit that the communication facility so obtained is to be used for such purposes. For the purpose of receiving the affidavits required by this section the carrier or other supplier from whom the communication facility is obtained is designated the agent of the Federal Communications Commission. The affidavits on file with the Federal Communications Commission, through its agents, the carriers or other suppliers, shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

SEC. 5. (a) The interstate or foreign character of any transmission of gambling information in, or intended for transmission in, interstate or foreign commerce shall not create an immunity in respect of any criminal prosecution under the laws of any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses.

(b) Any remedies afforded by this Act are in addition to remedies now existing under State or Federal law, including law applicable within the territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 528 is as follows:

This bill would provide that whenever "any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility." Thus, it will approach the overall purpose of striking at organized crime by providing a means of preventing persons from using communication facilities for transmitting prohibited gambling information beyond State lines.

This legislative proposal would constitute a sensible exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It will assist the States and local governments in the dispatch of their law-enforcement responsibilities insofar as organized gambling and bookmaking are concerned, yet violations of local gambling laws will continue within the sole province of local law-enforcement officials.

It should be noted that the measure contains adequate safeguards to protect the operations of legitimate news-gathering and news-disseminating services. The proposal would permit the broadcasting of horseraces when such broadcasts are carried as special events, provided not more than two horseraces a day shall be broadcast by any station.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 65 other Senators, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States. This proposed legislation would establish a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of an equal number of Members from each of the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations. It would be staffed on a nonpolitical basis by outstanding experts and technicians and would provide the Appropriations Committees of the Congress with the same kind of expert staff facilities and technical information as the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation provides for the Committees on Finance and Ways and Means, and the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 529) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The Senators cosponsoring Senate bill 529 are as follows:

Senators MCCLELLAN, ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BIBLE, BLAKLEY, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BUSH, BUTLER, BYRD of Virginia, CANNON, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DODD, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, HICKENLOOPER, HOLLAND, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JAVITS, JOHNSTON, KEATING, KEFAUVER, LAUSCHE, LONG of Hawaii, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, MILLER, MONRONEY, MORSE, MORTON, MUNDT, MUSKIE, PASTORE, PELL, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, SCHOEPPEL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, TALMADGE, THURMOND, WILEY,

WILLIAMS of Delaware, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the basic objective of this measure is to remedy serious deficiencies in appropriations procedures and to improve the surveillance exercised by the Congress over the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes, in my judgment, a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in part:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

From the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood and accepted that this clause vested exclusively in the Congress the right to grant supplies of money to the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purpose for which the money shall be used.

The meaning of this clause of the Constitution has never been in issue. It was explained long ago by our first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, who was also a Founding Father, as follows:

> The design of the Constitution in this provision was, as I conceive, to secure these important ends—that the purpose, the limit, and the fund of every expenditure should be ascertained by a previous law. The public security is complete in this particular, if no money can be expended, but for an object, to an extent, and out of a fund, which the laws have prescribed.

Now I submit, Mr. President, that there is a very big difference between having duties and responsibilities and handling them wisely. Thus, the mere vesting in the Congress of unquestioned authority and responsibility for passing appropriations acts and determining the purposes for which public money may be used, does not necessarily guarantee that this function will be exercised either wisely or well.

If the Congress is to carry out this important responsibility, vested in it by the Constitution, it has the duty of informing itself as to the needs of the various departments and agencies of the Government, the reasonableness of their requests for funds, and whether or not the funds requested and obtained are being used for the purpose for which they have been requested.

Early in January of each year, the President submits the Federal budget to the Congress. It is usually a document of telephone directory dimensions, running more than 1,000 pages. It represents a full year of work on the part of the agencies and departments of the Government, as well as the Bureau of the Budget. The material contained in the budget has been developed and assembled by a vast number of persons in the departments and agencies, reviewed and reorganized by each department and agency and reviewed, revised and finalized by the Bureau of the Budget where some 500 persons are involved in the preparation and submission of the final document. In addition, available figures indicate that in the Washington headquarters area a total of some 2,000 persons in executive branch departments and agencies are involved in the preparation of the budget each year.

In addition to the Federal budget itself, a tremendous amount of detailed budget information is supplied in written form to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and presented orally at hearings which last for many months and cover thousands of typed and printed pages. Finally, when the requests are reduced to the form of legislative proposals, there are usually between 12 and 15 appropriations bills running many hundreds of pages and containing thousands of separate items. In the 84th Congress, there were 38 appropriation measures, including 13 supplementals. In the 85th Congress, these committees processed a total of 45 appropriation measures of which 29 were regular and 16 were supplemental. In the 86th Congress, there were a total of 41 such measures, of which 30 were regular and 11 were supplemental.

I realize, of course, that all Members of this body are thoroughly familiar with the actual procedures by which the Congress handles appropriations measures. However, I would like to review them briefly in order to demonstrate more graphically the urgent need for the enactment of the legislation which I have proposed today.

Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees perform their functions through subcommittees which deal with the appropriations requests of one or more departments or agencies. Hearings on budget requests are held by these subcommittees beginning sometime in January or early February and continue on until their work is completed. Subcommittee recommendations are submitted to the full Appropriations Committee in each House and final action is then taken by the respective committees. All along the line, the procedure is duplicated in both Houses in that following hearings by House subcommittees, identical hearings are held by Senate subcommittees.

Once again, I know that we are all familiar with the manner in which these proceedings are conducted. However, a detailed examination of them appears to be in order at this time. The usual procedure is for witnesses representing the executive branch department or agency making the request to appear before a subcommittee, usually accompanied by a corps of technical experts from that agency, as well as from the Bureau of the Budget. The entire proceeding is virtually ex parte in nature, and these witnesses represent exclusively the point of view of the executive branch of the Government. Since it is their duty as executive branch officials to support all of the budget items contained in the President's budget, it is their function and responsibility to demonstrate, both by oral and written justifications, that the amounts requested are absolutely necessary. For the most part, these requests are supported by elaborate justifications and exhibits, based upon extensive agency research, and by the testimony of technical experts who have devoted many years to the fields in which they have been working. As a rule, and it is not my intention to impugn their motives in any way, since these technicians have as their main objective the continuation or extension of programs and operations of their respective agencies which they sincerely believe are in the public interest.

Unlike hearings on substantive legislation, where witnesses appear for or against pending bills, at appropriations hearings testimony from the public is rarely, if ever, received. No witnesses are present to represent the taxpayer and the only manner in which the public interest can receive any consideration and protection, with respect to either the purpose for which the funds are sought or their need or adequacy, is through careful scrutiny of the requests and justifications by the one or two staff members assigned to handle each of the appropriations bills, and by members of the Appropriations Committees. Other Members of Congress who do not serve on the Appropriations Committees must, and generally do, rely largely on the recommendations of these committees when final action on appropriations measures is taken on the floor of each House.

Unfortunately, members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees are so heavily burdened by other legislative duties and responsibilities that they are unable personally to give adequate attention to each budget item. Equally important, however, is the fact that they do not have adequate facilities for obtaining the information necessary to enable them to pass judgment on the necessity for the funds requested. Thus, for the most part, they are forced to rely upon the representations made by the respective initiating agencies of the executive branch, whose representatives appear before these committees in an ex parte type of proceeding for the sole purpose of justifying their budget requests. As a result, the Congress is often unable to obtain impartial information and facts to enable it to effect needed economies in the operations of Government. Because the Congress is not adequately equipped to carry out its vital fiscal responsibilities, many millions of dollars have been appropriated in excess of the actual requirements of the Federal Government. These excesses have, in turn, added to the large recurring deficits which must be passed on to already overburdened taxpayers.

The duties and responsibilities of the Appropriations Committees, in connection with examining and passing upon budget requests for the operation of the Federal Government, have increased tremendously in recent years. These committees are presently staffed with competent personnel. It is almost impossible, however, for their relatively small staffs to examine and evaluate the annual budget with its many thousands of items, running in excess of 1,000 pages each year, within the very limited time available. This precludes

the detailed analysis which is so essential to the performance of the congressional function of controlling Federal expenditures.

Examining the results of a survey made by the Committee on Government Operations on the activities of the Senate in the 84th Congress, we find that exclusive of sessions called for the purpose of making up appropriations bills, the Senate Committee on Appropriations held some 300 open hearings consuming approximately 825 hours on appropriations measures. In addition, at least 30 executive sessions were held to consider other matters pertaining to the functions of the committee, involving approximately 67 hours. In summary, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in the 84th Congress, held a total of 330 meetings and consumed an estimated 900 hours on appropriations measures alone.

As a further illustration of the tremendous workload of this committee, during the 84th Congress, the committee had regular standing subcommittees for each of the 12 major appropriations bills. Each member of the committee had at least four subcommittee assignments, and, in most instances, five assignments, with some members serving on as many as six subcommittees. On many occasions, there were two or three hearings in progress simultaneously, and members sometimes found it necessary to attend one hearing for a limited time and then to participate, insofar as time permitted, in other hearings of subcommittees on which they served.

With this picture in mind, how do we stand? I have already pointed out that the hearings before the various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees are attended by representatives of the executive branch departments and agencies seeking funds. These men have often devoted a lifetime to a particular activity or group of activities; they are thoroughly familiar with every phase of the program for which they seek funds; and they are prepared to answer every possible question in justification of their demands.

What do we have on our side of the table? The truth of the matter is that we are forced to rely upon two major sources of information: First, the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their requests; and who tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose; and second, information media, such as newspapers, periodicals, books, radio, and television. Of course, there are some Members of Congress who have additional sources of information such as members of their own office staff, interested groups, confidential informants and reliable friends within the executive branch.

Now I raise this question, Mr. President: Is this the way for the Congress of the United States to obtain information necessary to enable it to formulate the considered judgment which is so vital if it is to carry out its responsibilities and obligations to the American people?

Is this the way to look after the interests of millions of American taxpayers who are struggling under a very heavy tax burden? Is this the way in which responsible legislators should vote on budget requests averaging between $78.4 and $80.7 billion during the past 3 fiscal years?

The answer is obvious. It is most definitely and emphatically not the way in which Congress should handle these tremendous responsibilities.

What can be done? What should be done?

Years of both study and practice convinced me long ago that it is absolutely imperative that the Congress equip itself with the machinery and tools necessary to enable it to do the job which needs to be done. In other words the Congress must have whatever it needs to enable it to secure detailed and accurate information concerning each item of proposed expenditure in the President's budget for which an appropriation is sought and a justification is presented. To do this, it must have the type of manpower and brainpower which the executive branch has at its disposal for the preparation, presentation, and defense of the President's budget.

It is my firm conviction that the best way this can be accomplished is by means of the legislation which I am introducing today. This bill, which represents many years of careful study, would establish a Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 14 members, 7 from the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and 7 from the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives; 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by the respective committees.

The Joint Committee would be authorized to elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session, with the chairman designated from among members who are Members of the House of Representatives, and the vice chairman from among members who are Members of the Senate in even-numbered years; and during odd-numbered years, the chairman would be selected from among members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman from among members who are Members of the House of Representatives. The Joint Committee would be authorized to adopt its own rules, except that provision is made that no measure or recommendation may be reported unless approved by a majority of the committee.

The proposed Joint Committee would be required to inform itself on all aspects of the annual budget of the agencies of the Government, to examine expenditure reports and to investigate the details of Federal operations in order that the Appropriations Committees may be provided with detailed information concerning each item in the budget and in the budget justification. It would also be required to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, and to utilize fully information emanating from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and from all other sources as to estimated revenues and changing economic conditions, in order that a well-considered fiscal program may be devised to hold expenditures to the minimum in relation to anticipated Federal revenues, and consistent with essential requirements of the Government operations and national security.

In addition, the Joint Committee would be authorized to report on and recommend appropriate legislative changes to standing jurisdictional committees so that they would be in a position to eliminate wasteful practices, correct deviations from programs authorized by the Congress, and recommend cutbacks in such programs as are consistent with the public interest.

To aid the Committees on Appropriations in determining the action necessary to conform to this program, the Joint Committee would be required to submit, at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, and periodically as deemed necessary, schedules of total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the current, succeeding and subsequent fiscal years, where the program extends for more than 1 year.

The most important feature of this measure would be the establishment of a permanent, full-time, nonpolitical staff of experts. The proposed legislation authorizes the appointment of a staff director, an associate staff director and such other professional, technical and clerical employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Joint Committee without regard to civil service rules or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director would be appointed by and responsible to members of the party of which the chairman of the Joint Committee is a member, and the associate staff director would be appointed by and be responsible to members of the opposition party. The members of the staff would be made available to the Committees on Appropriations and the several subcommittees thereof during periods in which appropriation bills are pending before the respective bodies, and staff members, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, would be authorized to examine fiscal books, documents, papers and reports of any Federal agency and data related to proposed appropriations included in the President's annual budget.

The bill would require further that the annual budget include an analysis of all long-term construction programs authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, the actual or estimated expenditures during prior, current, ensuing, and subsequent fiscal years. Also all grant-in-aid programs could be included in the analysis covering grants of an indefinite duration, and the annual cost for a 10-year period.

In addition, the bill would require the Comptroller General of the United States, at the direction of the chairman of the Joint Committee, to make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable the Joint Committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to the agency indicated. It would also require all committees rec-

ommending legislation which would authorize appropriations to include in their reports estimates as to the initial cost of the projects or programs and their continuing cost over the succeeding 5 years, based upon estimates from the department or agency primarily concerned, after review by the Bureau of the Budget. The Joint Committee would be required to maintain compilations of all such estimates and to print such compilations annually for the information of Members of Congress.

The bill would also authorize the Joint Committee to recommend joint hearings by the Appropriations Committees and subcommittees thereof, in the interest of expediting action on appropriation measures. This is designed to insure conservation of time and energy of the members of these committees and of administrative officials of the Government, without in any way interfering with the independence of separate committee deliberations and decisions. The importance of this provision lies in the fact that time is one of the major stumbling blocks to adequate consideration and deliberation of budget requests. Joint hearings would greatly ease the time problem, because members of the subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee would be able to participate at early dates each year in the joint hearings with their opposite numbers in the House Appropriations Committee, and would be prepared to act almost immediately on the many appropriations items which are frequently subjected to little or no change as reported and as passed by the House of Representatives. Further hearings would presumably be limited to those appropriations items concerning which the Senate Appropriations Subcommittees felt additional information was needed because of substantial cuts or increases in proposed appropriations as finally voted by the House of Representatives.

Finally, members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget would be authorized to be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to assist the subcommittees in connection with their consideration of proposed appropriations.

Mr. President, the approach I am suggesting is not new. Ample precedent is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which has provided joint expert staff facilities and technical information for the revenue committees of both Houses of Congress for more than a quarter of a century and with much success.

Nor is Senate consideration and action on this measure new. This bill, in virtually identical form, has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Government Operations and approved in the Senate during the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses. It was approved by a vote of 55 to 8 in the 82d Congress, and after the committee had adopted further perfecting amendments, passed the Senate under unanimous consent in the 83d and 84th Congresses. In the 85th Congress, the bill had 70 cosponsors and passed the Senate by unanimous consent, following debate.

In each Congress, Mr. President, following approval by the Senate, the House of Representatives withheld approval of these bills, although no vote has ever been permitted on the merits of the proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for the remainder of the day, so that any other Senators who desire to cosponsor the bill may be listed, and I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the RECORD along with the others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF CULTURE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 48 hours for other Senators to add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 535) to provide for a National Academy of Culture, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST NON-INDIAN-OWNED LANDS, WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 536) to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. HICKEY is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389–389e), there are enclosed a copy of a secretarial order canceling and adjusting irrigation charges of certain non-Indian landowners of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and a draft of a bill to approve the order. Congressional approval is required before the order may become effective.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Copies of schedules A, B, and C, which are referred to in the secretarial order, and copies of the individual justifications for each case listed in schedules A and B, were transmitted to your office with our letter dated February 24, 1958.

Schedule A involves a cancellation of charges totaling $15,745.12 for 17 non-Indian landowners, all of which charges accrued before December 31, 1946, and a deferral of payments of charges totaling $7,149.87, which accrued from 1947 through 1956. Deferred payment contracts have been signed by each of the landowners involved.

Schedule B involves a cancellation of charges totaling $2,093.14 for three non-Indian landowners, all of which charges accrued before December 31, 1946, and a deferral of payments of charges totaling $1,556.40, which accrued from 1947 through 1956. Deferred payment contracts have not been signed by the landowners involved, but the cancellation will not be effective until the contracts are signed.

Schedule C involves a cancellation of charges totaling $18,601.44 for 83 non-Indian landowners, all of which charges accrued prior to the Lien Act of March 7, 1928. No contracts were executed obligating the purchaser to pay the charges and they do not constitute liens against the land. Section 4 of the 1936 act directs the Secretary to cancel such charges.

The amounts listed in the schedules are principal amounts and do not include accrued interest. In most cases interest will be as much as the principal. Cancellation of the principal amounts is intended to cancel the accrued interest also.

The cancellation of the charges that accrued before December 31, 1946, is based upon an investigation and administrative determination that the repayment capabilities of the lands are such that the operators can reasonably be expected to pay current annual assessments and to liquidate over a 10-year period the delinquent assessments that accrued after 1946, but that the lands cannot be operated profitably unless the charges that accrued prior to December 31, 1946, are canceled.

The Bureau of the Budget on December 30, 1960, advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosures.

ORDER

Whereas, an act of Congress approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389–389e (1952)), authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to cause investigations to be made to determine whether the non-Indian owners of lands under an Indian irrigation project are unable to pay irrigation

charges, and provides that where the Secretary finds that "because of inability to operate such lands profitably by reason of lack of fertility of the soil, insufficiency of water supply, defects of irrigation works, or for any other causes he may adjust, defer or cancel such charges, in whole or in part, as the facts and conditions warrant," and may enter into contracts with landowners for the payments of past due charges over a period of not more than 10 years, and

Whereas, schedules A, B, and C of an investigation and report of conditions on the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, show that adjustments involving $45,-145.97 of operation and maintenance assessments against non-Indian-owned lands should be made and that all except three landowners have executed contracts agreeing to pay the adjusted balances of charges against their lands after canceling amounts justified under the said act: Now therefore

I find that the landowners are unable to operate such lands profitably because of seepage and other conditions covered by the Act and hereby (a) cancel $36,439.70 of delinquent charges shown on schedules A, B, and C of the said report, provided that the cancellation of $2,093.14 under schedule B shall not become effective until the landowners have executed contracts as provided in the act of June 22, 1936, agreeing to pay the balance, amounting to $1,556.40, of delinquent charges against their lands described as the W½SW¼, section 1, SE¼NE¼ of section 22, T. 1 S., R. 1 E., and the W½NW¼NW¼ of section 10, T. 1 S., R. 4 E, Wind River meridian; and (b) approve the contracts executed or to be executed by the landowners as provided in the said act of Congress providing for the payment of $8,706.27 of delinquent charges against their lands.

Done in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, this 12th day of November 1957.

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

REVISION OF RESTRICTION ON CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS LAND

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, at the request of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to facilitate the transfer of surplus land for historic-monument purposes.

Under existing law, before a State or political subdivision thereof may acquire surplus land from the United States for historic-monument purposes it must be determined suitable and recommended by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. The law requires that the area shall not exceed what is necessary for the preservation and observance of a historic monument, and that it was acquired by the United States prior to January 1, 1900. This bill is designed to remove the rigid restriction relating to the date of acquisition and substitute a requirement that no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes unless it has possessed historic significance for more than 50 years.

I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior under date of January 11, 1961, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 537) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would amend section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, so as to remove a technical restriction, relating to date of acquisition, presently imposed on the transfer of surplus land of the United States for historic-monument purposes.

Existing law places certain restrictions on the transfer without monetary consideration of any surplus land of the United States to a State, political subdivision, or municipality for historic-monument purposes. In the first instance, no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes except in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. Additionally, no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes if (1) its area exceeds that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the historic monument, or (2) it was acquired by the United States after January 1, 1900. The proposed amendment to existing law would remove the restriction relating to date of acquisition and substitute the restriction that no surplus land shall be determined to be suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes unless it has possessed historical significance for more than 50 years preceding the determination.

The rigid requirement that the acquisition date be a factor in determining the eligibility of surplus land for disposal has hampered seriously a number of desirable conveyances of land to States and political subdivisions on which historic events have occurred. For example, surplus acreage situated at Fort Moultrie Military Reservation, S.C., on which an outstanding historic event of the American Revolution occurred, could not be disposed of under existing law although it was found suitable and desirable for transfer for historic-monument purposes. Authority for the transfer was lacking because the land was not acquired by the United States and added to Fort Moultrie Military Reservation until after January 1, 1900. In other instances, the transfer of surplus land for historic-monument purposes is precluded because of the acquisition-date restriction, a factor having no relevancy to the historical significance of the land.

Under the proposed amendment no surplus land could be transferred unless it possessed historical significance relating to a period of time more than 50 years preceding the determination that the land was suitable and desirable for historic-monument purposes. Such a restriction would conform to one of the Advisory Board's criteria for consideration of historic sites. That standard is that "Structures or sites of recent historical importance relating to events or persons within 50 years will not as a rule be eligible for consideration." We believe this to be a well considered requirement because it is calculated to assure that by an appropriate lapse of time historic matters will be considered in their proper perspective. At the same time, it provides for some flexibility in the exercise of this function, which we consider essential in order to accomplish equitably the purposes of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would not result in any additional expenditures of Federal funds.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 5, 1961, advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosure.

A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last clause of section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 1622(h)(2)), is amended by striking out the words "it was acquired by the United States at any time subsequent to January 1, 1900", and substituting the words "its historical significance relates to a period of time within the 50 years immediately preceding the determination of suitability and desirability for such use."

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS TO WITNESSES BY CERTAIN OFFICERS OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses.

This bill is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961. I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Administrator of the General Services Administration under date of January 9, 1961, and a statement of justification, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 538) to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
January 9, 1961.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith draft of legislation "To amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961.

The proposed legislation would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377; 40 U.S.C. 486), as amended, by adding a new subsection to section 205, which would authorize and empower all officers and employees of the General Services Administration engaged in investigatory functions to administer oaths in the performance of their duties, when so designated by the Administrator.

Such legislation is urgently needed to enable GSA to improve its investigatory functions by administering oaths to persons prior to securing statements or in other capacities which will be beneficial in the protection of the Government's interests.

This statutory authority will aid GSA in carrying out its responsibilities with respect to protecting the Government's interest by a continuing administrative investigation and surveillance of the merchandise acquired by GSA for the use of all civil departments and agencies and the acquisition of strategic and critical materials for the Government's stockpile. GSA's tremendous construction program and the maintenance of Government owned or leased buildings also requires constant, thorough administrative investigation.

The specific citations above merely indicate some of the fields in which it is necessary for this agency to carry on investigations. During fiscal year 1960, this agency investigated 1,918 cases of law violations resulting in 36 arrests, 30 convictions, and 93 disciplinary actions. The fines and recoveries totaled $952,067. Enactment of this legislation would enable GSA's investigators to obtain statements which would be helpful in bringing to justice those who attempt to violate the law. In addition, it is believed that such authority would result in increased recoveries.

The enactment of the proposed legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds, but could result in increased revenue.

The General Services Administration urges prompt and favorable consideration of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget by letter dated December 28, 1960, advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

JUSTIFICATION

This proposed legislation would amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, by adding a new subsection. This subsection would authorize and empower all officers and employees of the General Services Administration who are engaged in investigative work to administer oaths, when so designated by the Administrator.

This authority is needed to enable the Administrator of General Services to carry out the responsibilities placed upon him by the Congress of the United States under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended. Among other things, the Administrator of General Services is required to acquire all common-use items for the use of all civilian departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government. Constant surveillance must be kept of the manner in which these items are acquired and of the quality of merchandise supplied by the contractors. The amount of Government funds expended is approximately $862 million annually. Due to the tremendous volume of this purchasing program and the variety of contractors with whom GSA can and does do business, problems requiring inspection and investigation arise frequently.

There is the further necessity of investigating cases involving employee misconduct, generally.

Due to the widespread activities of the General Services Administration in the construction of buildings for the use of the Federal Government, many contract violations arise. The demand for quarters for Government agency activities is very heavy. It is contemplated that it will be necessary for GSA to project a building program which will require the expenditure in excess of a billion dollars over a period of 5 to 10 years. Since the major portion of these buildings are erected by contractors and subcontractors, it is incumbent upon the Administrator to determine that no statutory authority has been violated by the contractors before Federal funds are expended. This particular field needs the protection of every phase of this investigation.

Since General Services Administration is charged with the responsibility of acquiring the strategic and critical materials for the Government's stockpile and the necessary rotation of much of this material, a constant inspection and investigation surveillance of the activities leading to the accomplishment of this function is necessary.

The statements above give some indication of the variety of investigatory and protective work that is required to carry out the programs and functions of this agency. During fiscal year 1960 GSA investigated 1,918 cases of all types of violations of law. The results of these preliminary administrative investigations were submitted to the Department of Justice for further handling. As a consequence, 36 arrests were made, 30 convictions obtained and 93 disciplinary actions were taken. The fines and civil recoveries totaled $952,067.

These investigations were made under the handicap of the investigator's not being able to place witnesses under oath at the time and place of taking statements. It is believed that the authority sought by this proposed legislation would enable this agency to secure a higher rate of recovery for the Government and assist in bringing to justice cases of actual violations. The persons interviewed in cases of this kind are found at many locations, sometimes after a difficult tracing and the statement taken by the investigator is all too frequently the only statement that can be obtained. A statement which is not made under oath does not result in a document that is of substantial weight in the prosecution of violations of the law. Furthermore, the person making the statement tends to be careless in his use of the truth when he realizes that he is not under oath and cannot be subjected to any penalty or legal action for any statement made, regardless of its falsity.

Upon the enactment of this much needed legislation, the Administrator of General Services will issue regulations setting forth the manner in which this amendment will be carried out. The Administrator is willing to assume the responsibility for making certain that the authority is not abused by those designated to exercise it. Only the officers and employees of this agency who are engaged in investigatory functions and will be so operating as to be able to use the authority effectively to secure sworn statements of witnesses, admissions, confessions, etc., will be designated as persons authorized and empowered to administer oaths.

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN NATIONALS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

This proposed legislation is introduced at the request of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior in order that the people of American Samoa, who are now excluded as nationals of the United States from the allocation of foreign scholarships which are financed from the proceeds of the sale of surplus property in foreign countries, a program established under a bill introduced by my colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for the benefit of Americans desiring to study abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, addressed to the President of the Senate requesting this legislation, be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, at this point.

The bill (S. 539) to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1961.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

By section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 1641(b)(2)), a system of foreign scholarships, to be financed from the proceeds of the sale of surplus property in foreign countries, was established for the benefit of Americans desiring to study abroad. The wording of the law restricts the benefits of this program to citizens, thus, perhaps unintentionally, excluding from consideration the very small class of persons, principally the indigenous inhabitants of our possession of American Samoa, who are legally classified as American nationals.

The people of American Samoa have demonstrated their complete loyalty to the United States and their dedication to American ideals, equally with the inhabitants of

any of the other territories of the United States. We believe that their exclusion from eligibility for these scholarships is an unfair discrimination against them. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to remove this discrimination by adding the words "or nationals" after the word "citizens" wherever it appears in such section.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 11, 1961, has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

PAYMENT IN ADVANCE BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR REQUIRED PUBLICATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the legislative program of that Department.

Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have full information relative to the objectives of the bill, I request that the letter transmitted to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 540) to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide agencies of the Government of the United States with authority to pay in advance for required publications."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) prohibits advance payment for articles purchased by the Federal Government. The act of June 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 580), permits the advance payment of "subscription charges" for "newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals." This language, however, does not cover charges for publications that do not fall into the category of periodicals.

The proposed legislation would permit advance payment of "subscription or other charges" for "newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and other publications."

Our acquisitions program has suffered as a result of our inability to make advance payment for publications. In some cases we have been unable to procure publications at all; in others we have had to pay a premium either to the publisher or to an agent.

For example, we were unable to obtain the Proceedings of the Fourth World Petroleum Congress held in Rome in 1955, since we were prohibited from complying with the fiscal requirements of the Congress for advance payment of $70. Likewise, we were unable to procure the Fifth Decennial Index of Chemical Abstracts published by the American Chemical Society at a prepublication price of $900. The post-publication price is likely to be $1,200 and in all probability more. The Comptroller General has ruled in 37 C.G. 720 that the Index is not a periodical and consequently advance payment cannot be made.

The Bonneville Power Administration has difficulty in purchasing the American Standards Association Standards which are published as separates at 25 cents to 50 cents each. It is the Association's practice to add 50 cents to each order not accompanied by a remittance. In order to facilitate advance payments of small amounts they sell coupon books, but the General Accounting Office has ruled that we cannot legally purchase them.

In recent years many State governments which formerly gave us their publications, such as session laws, have changed their policy and now require advance payment. These must now be ordered through a dealer, who charges a premium for advancing the money.

These are but a few examples of the difficulties encountered in attempting to procure with facility, and at savings, much needed and required publications for the offices of this Department.

There is ample precedent for liberalizing the statute to permit this Department, as well as other agencies, to pay in advance for required publications. Set forth below are the statutory exceptions which have previously been made for the Department of Agriculture, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration) to pay in advance for subscriptions to publications without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes:

1. The appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1910, approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054), provided that "hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the subscriptions for publications for the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of this Department."

2. The act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362), provided that the Quartermaster Corps may pay in advance for "other publications" from funds authorized for the corps.

3. The appropriation act for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, provided that "hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to subscriptions for publications for the U.S. Veterans' Bureau, and the Director is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of the Bureau."

The same authority should be given to this and other departments in the furtherance of our library services.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 6, 1961, has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress, but that the Comptroller General has recommended the inclusion of a section 2 that repeals the present special laws granting similar authority to specific agencies. We have no objection to the inclusion of a provision of this kind if the Congress believes it is advisable, and if the inclusion will not delay the consideration of our proposed legislation. The language suggested by the Comptroller General is as follows:

"SECTION 2. The following parts of acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

"(1) The proviso to the paragraph headed 'General Expenses, Library' under the caption 'Library, Department of Agriculture' in the act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1954);

"(2) The first proviso to the paragraph headed 'Regular Supplies, Quartermaster Corps' in the act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362);

"(3) The first parenthetical phrase under the caption 'Pay, Miscellaneous' in the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 929);

"(4) Section 5 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1049);

"(5) The 10th paragraph under the caption 'United States Veterans' Bureau' in the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 533)."

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior.

APPOINTMENT OF NONUNIFORMED SPECIAL POLICEMEN BY ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference.

This bill proposes to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1961.

Mr. President, I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Administrator of General Services under date of January 7, 1961, with a statement of justification, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 541) to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith draft of legislation, "To amend the act June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen." A statement of justification is also enclosed.

This proposed legislation is part of the legislative program of General Services Administration for 1961, and is identical to S. 2581 which passed the Senate on June 23, 1960.

This proposed legislation would amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281) by adding a new section which would authorize and empower the Administrator of General Services, or officials duly designated by him, to authorize officials and employees of GSA engaged in investigative functions to act as nonuniformed special policemen. This act now permits the Administrator to appoint uniformed guards as special policemen. This proposal is needed to enable General Services Administration to improve its effectiveness in protecting Federal property through the investigation of suspected criminal activities in and around buildings and property under the charge or control of the General Services Administration. The effective surveillance of individuals suspected of being engaged in illegal operations is impossible if the investigators may be identified readily by their conspicuous uniforms.

There is statutory authority (43 Stat. 174, 176) permitting nonuniformed policemen to make investigations within the District of Columbia. Amendment of the act of June 1, 1948, is sought for the purpose of extending to all GSA-controlled properties the authority of the Administrator of General Services to appoint and use nonuniformed special policemen as well as uniformed special policemen to protect Federal property. The experience of General Services Administration is that nonuniformed special policemen have proved valuable for such protection purposes with respect to the Government land and buildings within the District of Columbia, and it is believed that other Government properties could be better protected by GSA's investigative personnel possessing the additional authority of special policemen.

The proposed legislation would also authorize such special policemen to carry firearms, whether on Federal property or in travel status, and they would also have the power to enforce Federal laws and make arrests while on real property under the charge and control of the General Services Administration.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds.

The General Services Administration urges prompt and favorable consideration of this draft bill.

The Bureau of the Budget by letter dated December 28, 1960, advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

JUSTIFICATION

This proposed legislation would amend the Act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281, 5 U.S.C. 318), by adding a new section which would authorize and empower the Administrator of General Services, or certain officials designated by him, to appoint employees of the General Services Administration engaged in investigative functions, to act as nonuniformed special police. Such employees would be empowered to enforce Federal laws for the protection of persons and property, and to enforce rules and regulations issued by the General Services Administration for protection of such property. The policemen so designated under this proposed bill would also be authorized to make arrests without warrant for any offense constituting a felony when committed on Government property, if such police had reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested is guilty of such offense. They would also be authorized to carry firearms while on duty whether in travel status or on Federal real property under the charge or control of the United States.

This authority is needed to enable the Administrator of General Services to meet the requirements placed upon him by the Congress of the United States under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (63 Stat. 377), as amended. In the prevention of crime and the protection of buildings and grounds under the control of this agency, it is essential that certain civilian employees engaged in investigative activities be empowered to act as special policemen without being required to wear uniforms. The effective surveillance of individuals suspected of being engaged in illegal operations is enhanced if these investigators are not readily identified by their uniforms.

Since special policemen with their arresting powers carry firearms and may frequently be reassigned from one public building or area to another, and may even be required to cross State lines, it is essential that they be specifically authorized to carry their firearms while in travel status. This will help to clarify their right to do so while within State and local jurisdiction.

The authority to these nonuniformed employees to exercise the powers of special policemen is a necessary adjunct to their investigative activities, since it is frequently of prime importance to make an immediate arrest of an offender whose identity is not known or who may have incriminating evidence in his possession. The services of these nonuniformed policemen have proved valuable in the District of Columbia where they are now operating pursuant to the Act of May 27, 1924 (43 Stat. 174, 176).

The reasons for utilizing nonuniformed special policemen are valid throughout the Nation. In the past, such investigators have not had the authority of special policemen in such areas as that of the Pentagon and are not able to cope with suspected gambling offenses and other similar problems. Careful surveillance and immediate arrest are almost prerequisite to successful prosecution when such offenders have incriminating documents in their possession.

ALLOCATION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to limit the distribution of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense to educational institutions conducting military training programs at standards acceptable to the Department of Defense, and to transfer the responsibility for administering the request of other educational activities now receiving such surplus property to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Defense by letter dated January 3, 1961, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The letter from the Secretary of Defense in support of the proposal sets forth the purpose and need for this legislation, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 542) to amend section 203(j), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that Act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961, and the Bureau of the Budget advised by letter dated December 23, 1960, that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to limit distribution of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense to educational institutions conducting military training programs at standards acceptable to the Department of Defense and to transfer the responsibility for administering the requests of other educational activities now receiving such surplus property to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under criteria developed over the past years within the scope of the present statute, the Department of Defense has found certain fine organizations eligible to receive surplus property. It is unnecessary to emphasize the worth to this country of organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, and the Boys Club of America; however, it is believed that determinations with respect to the distribution of such property to such organizations more properly belong within the purview of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On the other hand, the Department of Defense has a direct responsibility for military training programs conducted at educational institutions maintaining and conducting military programs at standards acceptable to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Armed Forces benefit from these programs by receiving militarily trained manpower. It is therefore entirely reasonable that a direct responsibility for supplying needed surplus property to institutions of this nature should be imposed upon the Department of Defense.

Similar reasoning impels the inclusion of the proviso in the bill which would preserve the present eligibility of the Civil Air Patrol to receive surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense.

The Civil Air Patrol maintains a capability to assist both civil and military activities during emergency and during periods when no emergency exists, by the voluntary efforts of the Civil Air Patrol senior members who operate and maintain light aircraft, mobile support units, and a nationwide radio communication network. Therefore, it is the position of the Department of Defense that the Civil Air Patrol should continue to receive support of their overall program through the donation feature as heretofore.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Deputy.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that Act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) In the case of any surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall determine whether such property is usable and necessary for educational institutions which are of special interest to the armed services because they maintain military training programs which are approved by the Secretary

of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as the case may be, and which apply for such property: *Provided*, That any organization established by law of the United States whose object is to encourage and foster the development of aviation that was eligible to receive surplus property under this paragraph on the day before the enactment of this proviso continues to be so eligible to receive surplus property under this paragraph. If the Secretary of Defense shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to the appropriate State agency for distribution to such educational institutions. If the Secretary determines that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of this subsection."; and

(2) by amending the first sentence of paragraph (3) by striking out the word "and" before the designation "(B)" and inserting before the period at the end thereof the words ", and (C) any other tax-supported or nonprofit activity which, under a designation effective on the day before the date of enactment of this clause, received property under paragraph (2) and which is not eligible to receive property under that paragraph after that date."

COST OF LIVING INCREASES FOR ANNUITIES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Public Law 85–465 authorized cost-of-living increases for certain persons receiving annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. This law also provided annuities for certain survivors of former employees or annuitants deceased prior to February 29, 1948. Public Law 85–465 stipulated that these benefits would terminate after July 1, 1960, if Congress did not make an appropriation to reimburse the civil service fund for the cost of such payment. On January 17, 1961, the Civil Service Commission recommended that the increases and annuities provided under Public Law 85–465 be made permanent. I, therefore, introduce a bill to make permanent certain increases and annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 549) to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and orderd 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 section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide increases in certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 219; Public Law 85–465), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annuities and increases in annuities provided by the preceding sections of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and Senators MORSE, SALTONSTALL, CASE OF New Jersey, and SCOTT, a bill to amend the immigration and nationality laws of the United States, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 551) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. I also send to the desk a summary of the measure and ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT)—PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONGRESS

SHORT TITLE: "IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961"

Title I

Section 101: Amends sections 212(a)(15) and 241(a)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212(a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental process the probability of future proscribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287(a)(1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353, and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. Repeals section 350 of Public Law 414 which provides for divestiture of nationality in the case of dual nationality of natural-born Americans. Repeals section 355 of Public Law 414, which deals with loss of American nationality through the expatriation of a parent.

Section 105: Amends sections 101(2)(37), 212(a)(28)(D), 241(a)(6)(D) and 313(a)(3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244(a)(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Section 107: Amends section 201(e) of Public Law 414, eliminating provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 108: By amending section 202(a)(5) and 202(e) and repealing section 202(b), (c) and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota area. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

Section 109: Amends section 222 of Public Law 414 to eliminate the requirement that an applicant designate "his race and ethnic classification."

Title II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101(a)(6) of Public Law 414, restores preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose.)

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212(c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204: Repeals section 235(c) of Public Law 414 which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241(d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206. (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 207. Repeals section 260(a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 208. Amends section 260(c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by the Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360(b).

Section 209. Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

Title III

Section 301. Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation by Executive order of the President the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists. Such reallocations are subject to disapproval by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1960 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

Title IV

Section 401: Amends Public Law 85-316. Petitions for admission by fourth preference quota immigrants which were approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, will be admitted to the United States without reference to quota. For those filing petitions subsequent to July 1, 1957, therefore, the waiting time for admittance would be greatly diminished.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate very briefly. The measure which I am introducing must be taken together with the measure introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] as part of a package on immigration legislation.

My colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], with the same cosponsors, will introduce a bill to cover the phase which relates to refugees, displaced persons and escapees from various forms of tyranny, including the Castro tyranny. That part which I am introducing as the principal sponsor relates to the amendment of the immigration laws to realine the quota system and to eliminate many injustices now contained in the present immigration laws.

Mr. President, under the provisions of the bill being introduced by my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the cosponsors on his bill, nonquota visas for up to 40,000 refugee-escapees would be provided. These would include those fleeing from Communist persecution or from the Middle East and other areas where forces are at work against the free world.

The undiminished flow of such refugees is confirmed by the latest estimates based on State Department information: In 1960, 200,000 East Germans escaped to West Germany, more than half of them through the great door to liberty provided by West Berlin; and 10,000 non-German refugees also fled from European Iron Curtain countries; 110,000 Chinese sought refugee in Hong Kong. Right next door to the United States at least 30,000 Cubans fled the Castro regime, mostly to this country.

In addition, this bill would authorize the President to parole into the United States refugee-escapees from future upheavals, such as the Hungarian uprising of 1956. This power could be employed to aid people fleeing from the tyranny of a Castro or similar tyrant, the Senators indicated.

The second bill, which is being introduced by me, my colleague [Mr. KEATING], and Senators CASE of New Jersey, MORSE, SALTONSTALL, and SCOTT, deals primarily with immigration matters. It would revise and modernize the national quota system to reflect the 1960 rather than the 1920 census.

During the past 40 years, the U.S. population increased by some 75 million people and this would be reflected in the increase of annual immigration to the United States from 155,000 to about 300,000—an expansion fully justified by the greater absorption of our population and of our national wealth which had quadrupled in these four decades.

This bill would also permit the pooling of unused quotas and their reallocation by Executive order of the President. Another provision would allow the admission of fourth-preference quota immigrants approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, without reference to quota.

During the past 6 years, only 574,000 quota numbers—or 62 percent of the potential U.S. quota of 930,000 over that period—were actually used for immigration. The reason for the large percentage of unused quota numbers is that the two quota areas located in the British Isles do not use the major part of the quotas allotted to them. In fiscal 1960, these two areas accounted for 48,000 unused quota numbers—or 94 percent of all the quota numbers not used.

Under this new legislation, these two areas would receive an additional 38,000 quota numbers, thus making a total of up to 90,000 unused quota numbers available for redistribution annually, if the performance during the past few years continues.

Furthermore, the annual quotas of most countries, especially those most in need of them, would be increased substantially. For example, Italy's quota would be increased by 252 percent, and Greece's by 846 percent.

No more important service could be performed in the name of justice, humanity and our own national self-interest than substantial revision of our immigration statutes. The bills we offer are a most reasonable and realistic program which would remove glaring inequities and shortcomings in our present laws.

We must never forget that the world watches closely to see what this country does with regard to helping immigrants, just as it follows closely what we do in the field of civil rights. In our view, reform of the immigration laws is an integral part of our responsibility as leader of the free world. It is essential if we are to remove the black eye we receive abroad because of the discriminatory nature of the present statutes. It is also vital if we are to remain true to our proud national heritage of offering haven for the world's homeless and oppressed.

No fundamental revision in this field would be complete without a refugee-escapee provision which indicates by its very adequacy that we will not abandon opponents of communism and other forms of totalitarianism. We can hold out the bright hope for the world's homeless that at least some of them can find a haven in our land, by means of these proposed reforms.

In addition, our immigration proposals recognize the fact of life that we are living under a 1960 census, not the outdated figures of 1920. This provision and that providing for the reallocation of unused quotas to oversubscribed countries would go a long way in improving the unjust, inequitable and hopelessly archaic national origins quota system. Progress in this area is the most urgently needed revision.

Enactment of legislation such as we have proposed would strike a tremendous blow for American prestige the world over. It would be of immeasurable assistance in the conduct of our foreign relations and would improve substantially our position in the struggle for peace. Finally, these changes in the immigration laws would permit America to remain true to its proud traditions by proving to a watching world that we care and care deeply about the plight of humanity and are prepared to do our part to alleviate this suffering.

Mr. President, so far as my action is concerned, I wish to emphasize it is in pursuance of a pledge which I made on the floor of the Senate, which I intend to honor. The pledge was that I shall not sit by again at the point of a legislative gun and let a general immigration bill of a very limited character go through the Senate without seeking to do something fundamental about the immigration laws.

Mr. President, I am introducing the measure now to give clear notice of what I have in mind. I am fully cognizant of the fact that the effort to get a just immigration policy may result in 1,500, 1,700, or 2,000 very deserving immigrants from some particular place or other suffering seemingly a temporary hardship—that was the type of bill we had with respect to the Azores, which made a special exception, which was the only bill permitted to be passed in the last session. Mr. President, we have to call an end to that kind of thing, because our national policy simply cannot stand for this limited way of approaching what must be done on immigration.

Mr. President, the immigration laws of the United States are one of the worst refutations against us when we say we want an open society and an open world. They represent a closed society and a closed world. The laws discriminate against Asiatics and against Negroes. They allow thousands of quota numbers to go unused. They give relatively minuscule quotas to countries such as Italy and Greece, in regard to which there is the greatest need for a just immigration policy.

Nobody is suggesting that we should be inundated with immigrants, but we are suggesting that the United States take its fair share of immigrants in a working and just world.

As an example, Mr. President, over the past 6 years only 62 percent of the potential U.S. quota has been used. Why? One reason is because for immigration quotas we are using the 1920 census, though we have had censuses every 10 years up until 1960. This tends to depress and to distort the immigration quotas.

There is a minuscule quota of 100 for the so-called Pacific triangle, excluding those who have an Asiatic background to the extent of 50 percent, which is an unheard of provision under the Constitution of the United States and under the attitudes of the American people.

Mr. President, it is a time to bring an end to the procedure we have followed. The only way to bring an end to it is to stop being put upon by the idea that we can pass only one particular immigration bill and that if a Senator suggests any amendments the bill will be withdrawn or will be defeated, or will get nowhere in the other body. It is time to have a showdown. I propose we shall have it.

Mr. President, that is the reason I am introducing this proposed legislation. I am very pleased that my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is joining with me in this effort and will join to carry the fight for the bill.

This is a bipartisan bill in its very fundamental essence and approach, as will be noted from its sponsors, and I have a deep feeling that it will receive bipartisan support in the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to join in sponsoring and cosponsoring bills dealing with our Nation's laws on immigration.

During the last few months, it has not been uncommon to hear remarks directed to the U.S. position of world leadership. In order to maintain this position, all are in agreement that affirmative action must be taken both at home and abroad.

I would suggest at this time that one area for early action is in the sphere of immigration laws. In many instances a warped reflection of the United States is cast overseas because of discriminatory immigration laws at home. In order to cross over this barrier of distrust and to extend freedom abroad, it is imperative that we first establish and record our faith in the peoples of all nations by legislative action in the Congress. If we are willing to continue laws discriminating against individuals because of race or national origin, what trust can we in turn expect from the emerging nations of Asia and Africa?

The proposals which we offer today are designed to allow this country to share fully in its world responsibilities and reform many of the discriminating features of our immigration laws.

The bill pertaining to refugees cosponsored by the Senators named, would authorize the issuance of 40,000 special non-quota-immigrant visas for refugee-escapees from the trouble spots around the world. People subject to persecution or fear on account of race, religion, or political opinion who have fled from a Communist-dominated nation would come within the definition of refugee-escapees. In addition, individuals fleeing from Middle Eastern countries or other areas where forces against the free world are at work would be defined as refugee-escapees.

The bill also has measures which would empower the President to direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees, should future world developments create another situation similar to the Hungarian uprising. The provisions would also provide relief, at the discretion of the President and subject to the approval of Congress, to people fleeing from the tyranny of a Castro or a similar tyrant.

The provisions of the bill with respect to immigration are similar to proposals which President Eisenhower repeatedly made to bring our immigration laws up to date. These proposals were in substance strongly endorsed in both the Republican and Democratic platforms. They would provide revision of our national quota system to reflect the 1960 census rather than the census of 1920, on which the law is presently based. The bill would also provide for the pooling of unused quota numbers and their reallocation by Executive order of the President. The reallocation of unused quota numbers by the President would be subject to disapproval by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress.

Another important provision of our proposal is to allow the admission of fourth-preference-quota immigrants approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957, without reference to quota.

In considering these various proposals for eliminating inequities and shortcomings in our immigration laws, we have given serious thought to the effect such changes might have on employment in the United States. At the present time, this Nation has a work force of more than 72 million people. Should these proposals be enacted into law, the resulting increase in our work force would be less than two-tenths of 1 percent.

When we take into consideration that in many cases immigrants with special skills actually provide work for other Americans, we see that the impact on our domestic economy of a broadened and more humanitarian immigration law might well be to increase rather than decrease job opportunities for American workers. As an example, Mr. President, in my hometown of Rochester, which is an important clothing manufacturing center, there is a serious shortage of skilled tailors. Every skilled tailor brought from Italy or other countries to fill these positions is able to create work for eight additional people in related skills.

It should also be noted that immigrants to this country have in the past been a source of some of our best technical know-how, scientific research and philosophical thought. Immigrants have, throughout the history of America, provided the stimulus for unparalleled development in all areas of our national growth. There is no reason to believe that this will be untrue today.

As we broaden our horizons of world leadership, it is fitting and appropriate that we should attempt to eliminate the anachronistic blemishes of our domestic complexion, which serve only to bar complete faith and trust in the United States.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the bill to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, and a short analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 552) to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and 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 paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188), is amended (1) by inserting "(A)" after "(5)" at the beginning of such paragraph, and (2) by adding the following additional subparagraphs:

"(B) (i) As used in this paragraph, the term 'refugee-escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (1) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, (2) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, or (3) from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world and free institutions are at work, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion.

"(ii) Whenever the President shall find that a situation has arisen causing the creation of a class or classes of aliens who fall within the meaning of the term 'refugee-escapee' and that it would be in the interests of the United States to permit the prompt entry into the United States of refugee-escapees, he may by proclamation, direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees selected by the Secretary of State, who are within the limits of any country which is not Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied and who are not nationals in the area in which they reside.

"(C) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act or any other law, any alien who is or has been paroled into the United States by the Attorney General under the authority of this paragraph and has not otherwise acquired permanent residence status in the United States may apply to the Attorney General for adjustment of his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(D) If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien has remained in the United States for at least two years, is a person of good moral character, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety or security, the Attorney General, in his discretion, may record the alien's lawful admis-

sion for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. A complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such adjustment of status. Such reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the adjustment of status of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon require the departure of such alien in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives passes such a resolution within the time above specified, the alien shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) In addition to any refugee-escapees paroled into the United States by the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5 of subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188), or the provisions of Public Law 86-648 of the Eighty-sixth Congress (74 Stat. 504), there are authorized to be issued during the two fiscal years beginning July 1, 1961 a total of forty thousand special nonquota immigrant visas to aliens who are refugee-escapees seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and children, if accompanying them.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of law which would exclude from the United States any alien who (1) has or has had a mental or physical disability, (2) has a physical defect, disease or disability of such a nature that it may affect the ability of the alien to earn a living, or (3) is likely at any time to become a public charge, five thousand of the visas authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be made available for issuance to nonsettled hard-core refugees.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act, no visa shall be issued pursuant to this title to any alien unless such alien is found to be eligible to be issued an immigrant visa and to be admitted to the United States under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act, any special nonquota immigrant visa authorized to be issued under this title shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make grants, not to exceed $5,000,000 in the aggregate, to public or private agencies in the United States to be used by such agencies for the purpose of financing the resettlement in the United States, including care and rehabilitation, of any nonresettled hard-core refugees receiving visas under subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act who lack the resources to finance the expenses involved. Such grants shall be made subject to such conditions and limitations as the Secretary of State may deem necessary to impose in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 6. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "refugee-escapee" means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, has fled or shall flee (1) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, (2) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, or (3) from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world and free institutions are at work, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion;

(b) the term "nonresettled hard-core refugee" means any refugee-escapee listed as a nonsettled hard-core refugee by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, including those who suffer from conditions not responsive to treatment and requiring institutionalization; and

(c) the term "child" means any unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age, including a stepson or stepdaughter and a son or daughter adopted prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL PROVIDING FOR ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS FOR REFUGEES

Section 1 empowers the President to direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugee-escapees, selected by the Secretary of State, who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, have fled or shall flee from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area from a Middle Eastern country, or from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world are at work, and who cannot return on account of race, religion, or political opinion. Sets up a procedure whereby the immigration status of parolees may be adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident by permitting the Attorney General to grant such adjustment in his discretion after the alien has been in the United States for 2 years and if the applicant is of good character, and if the adjustment would not be contrary to the national interest. Requires a report of such adjustment to be submitted to the Congress and if Congress does not register disapproval then the alien's entry would be recorded as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States.

Section 2 authorizes the issuance of 40,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to refugee-escapees for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1963, of which 5,000 may be nonresettled hard-core refugees. This is pointed to the reservoir of refugees presently awaiting settlement and would be in addition to the refugees to be admitted under Public Law 86-648 enacted in 1960.

Section 3: Refugee-escapees under section 2 to be admitted only if eligible under the Immigration and Nationality Act except for nonresettled hard-core refugees.

Section 4: Special nonquota immigrant visas authorized in section 2 shall be issued in accordance with section 221 ("Issuance of Visas") of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except for nonresettled hard-core refugees.

Section 5 authorizes $5 million in grants to U.S. public or private agencies for resettlement in the United States of nonresettled hard-core refugees admitted under section 2.

Section 6: Definitions.

Section 7 authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out provisions of this title.

REGULATION OF RATES FOR CERTAIN INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on August 29, 1960, our distinguished former colleague, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, introduced a bill to repeal the fire and casualty laws for the District of Columbia and to substitute therefor a single comprehensive bill providing a totally new and more competitive approach to the regulation of fire and casualty insurance rates. As chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I was most happy to join with Senator O'Mahoney, together with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], from the Committee on the District of Columbia, in cosponsoring the proposed legislation. It is my pleasure to reintroduce the bill in amended form today and to again have as cosponsors the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

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

The bill (S. 568) providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds and for all forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and of rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Senator O'Mahoney presided over the insurance study conducted by the Antitrust Subcommittee during the last several years. This study represents the first appraisal by the Congress of the effectiveness of State regulation of insurance since the passage of the 1945 McCarran-Ferguson Act. This law acknowledged that the business of insurance was in fact interstate commerce. Its essential feature provides that the Federal antitrust laws shall apply to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by the States. The present Senate inquiry seeks to ascertain how the States have exercised this mandate from the Congress to regulate the insurance business in the public interest.

The bill introduced by Senator O'Mahoney in the closing days of the last Congress reflected the results of the intensive study by this subcommittee into the problems of State rate regulation. During these hearings, spokesmen for the National Association of Insurance Commissioners—NAIC—together with individual witnesses on behalf of various States testified as to the different approaches by the States to the regulation of fire and casualty rates. In addition, numerous witnesses from the industry testified and brought to the attention of this subcommittee a great number of complaints concerning defects in the State rating laws and their administration. For the first time Congress was able to ascertain whether the regulation of rates by the States was in conformity with the spirit of the McCarran Act in preserving the maximum degree of competition in insurance consistent with the public interest.

The attention of the Antitrust Subcommittee was immediately called to a provision in the District of Columbia fire insurance rate law which is in open conflict with the philosophy of that basic

body of law adopted by the Congress over the years for the regulation of business. In plain disregard of the salutary influence of competition in our free-enterprise system, this law makes it mandatory that all insurers be members of a single rating bureau in which lower rates occur only by means of a cumbersome deviation procedure.

This fire-rate law has been detrimental to insurance buyers in the District of Columbia. Moreover, its ominous overtones have been felt in other areas of the country. In seeking to preserve the status quo which existed prior to the South-Eastern Underwriters decision, many insurance officials argued that Congress, in adopting the District of Columbia law, had sanctioned similar restrictive laws in other jurisdictions.

The bill which I am offering today is not directed solely at this defect in the fire-rate law. It is a bold new approach covering both the fire and casualty fields and designed to bring rate regulation in tune with the times.

In introducing the bill Senator O'Mahoney summarized the essential purpose of the proposed District of Columbia rate law as follows:

> The ability of insurance companies to be free to provide less costly insurance to the public is the very heart of competition. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this measure to make the free play of competition the chief arbiter over the rate level at which fire and casualty insurance will be sold in the District of Columbia.

However, he further cautioned:

> While the measure places chief reliance upon competition in the determination of rates, it nevertheless recognizes the vital importance of the Insurance Superintendent's office and fortifies his authority in the areas where it should properly be exercised.

The present Superintendent of Insurance in the District of Columbia has discharged his responsibilities in administering these rate laws in a highly creditable fashion. Because of his enlightened administration of these acts, the harmful effects of objectionable features in both the fire and casualty acts have been kept to a minimum. But the Congress can scarcely afford to rely upon the judgment of good administrators to overcome the defects of laws which are faulty in their inception. Nor do I think it a valid position that we should be content with the form of the casualty rate law against which no substantial volume of criticism has been directed. The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has completed its study of the rate problem, and its declarations will be watched with considerable interest by all the States. Therefore, to correct only the obvious inadequacies of the law and to ignore others merely because complaints have not arisen would be a plain breach of our duty. What we are proposing here is a basic revision of the approaches to the regulation of rates adopted by the States and for the District of Columbia. The impact of such a law will be great since it will represent the first expression by the Congress of its intentions concerning the kind of rate regulation which conforms most closely to the purposes of the McCarran Act.

This bill would prevent rating organizations from adopting any rules or engaging in any practices requiring either members or subscribers to agree to adhere to the rates filed. The bill provides greater latitude for independence of action than now contained in the District of Columbia fire or casualty laws. Section 5(d) provides that a rating organization shall have authority to make a filing on behalf of any member or subscriber only where officially authorized in writing by such member or subscriber. Therefore, if a member or subscriber does not so authorize a bureau to make a rate filing, said insurer, whether a member or a subscriber, may then make its own independent rate filing. With the elimination of the adherence rules, the need for any deviation section is obviated.

In addition, this bill would correct the disastrous consequences of the aggrieved persons provision which appears in most State rating laws and would resolve the uncertainty concerning similar language employed in the District of Columbia casualty rate law. Such provisions have seemingly served no other purpose than to frustrate or delay the healthy processes of competition. The bill I am introducing today strips from the rating bureaus and from any competitor their status as an aggrieved party in any hearing or suit involving a competitor's rate filing. Only a policyholder or the company whose rate is involved is recognized as an aggrieved party who would be a party in interest in any hearing or appeal from the Superintendent's ruling. Of course, the bill preserves the right of any person, including rating bureaus, to bring to the attention of the Superintendent facts leading him to believe that any rate filing does not comply with the standards of the act.

A vast amount of criticism of the various regulatory laws enacted in the wake of the McCarran Act was directed at the provisions which, in effect, have required prior approval by the Insurance Superintendent before rates become effective. Such provisions have in many cases perverted the function of the office of the Insurance Superintendent. The cumbersome and uninformed processes of State bureaucracy have been substituted for the normal workings of the competitive market in the establishing of rate levels. More often than not, politics rather than healthy competitive processes have become the touchstone for rate approval.

This problem apparently had its genesis in the belief that the McCarran Act's exemption from Federal antitrust action could be achieved only by affirmative regulation. Thus, motivated more by the desire to obtain antitrust immunity than the need for obtaining the best regulatory system, the States seized upon the requirement of advance approval before rates become effective. Unfortunately, certain of the deliberations of the Congress prior to the enactment of the McCarran Act gave weight to this argument. The history of these prior approval provisions has clearly demonstrated that the insurance departments possess neither the budget, the manpower, nor the necessary competence effectively to carry out the responsibilities inherent in such provisions. The infinitely complex processes involved in the setting of rates are better suited to the workings of the marketplace.

Under the bill which I am introducing, rates become effective automatically upon filing with the Insurance Superintendent. The bill reposes sole responsibility in each insurer for the making of rates. However, the Superintendent retains comprehensive powers to protect the public interest by reviewing these filings, and disapproving them wherever he finds them to be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. In providing that rates become automatically effective upon filing, the bill accomplishes the following purposes:

First. It removes from the ratemaking area the bureaucratic system which obstructs and delays innovation, and interferes with private initiative.

Second. It eliminates the impossibly burdensome review of routine filings which involve the Insurance Superintendent in clerical details to the detriment of more important regulatory responsibilities.

Third. Rates are determined by each insurer through the operation of competition, and the judgment of the Superintendent is thus not substituted for the underwriter in the determination of rates.

Fourth. It eliminates the political pressures upon the Superintendent to reject meritorious rate increases and thus focuses the responsibility, and blame, if any, upon the companies, not the Superintendent, for rate increases.

Unlike the various laws adopted by the States and for the District of Columbia, this bill for the first time would subject advisory organizations to the careful scrutiny of insurance departments. No effective supervision over advisory organizations has been maintained by the States or by the District of Columbia, despite the disclosure in the subcommittee's hearings that such bodies are the real repositories of ratemaking responsibilities throughout the country. This has been particularly true in the fire insurance field. However, the subcommittee's record has clearly demonstrated that the offices of these advisory organizations, operating on a nationwide scale, have been carefully utilized in an attempt to restrict and otherwise delay competitive rate filings.

These same national advisory organizations which have pursued such noncompetitive policies have exercised their influence in the District of Columbia. The subcommittee discovered in the course of its study that there was a very tight interlock among the companies making up the governing boards of the various State and regional rating bureaus and the national advisory organizations who were instrumental in establishing fundamental rate policies. This interlock exists for companies operating in the District of Columbia the same as in the many other jurisdictions throughout the country. Therefore, it behooves the Superintendent of Insurance in the District to be fully ap-

prised of the activities of national organizations engaged in the implementing of policies which fundamentally affect the rate structures in the District of Columbia. This bill provides adequate safeguards for protecting the public interest against such national advisory organizations.

In introducing this bill Senator O'Mahoney realized that no action was possible in the 86th Congress, but expressed the hope that it would provide a working model on which careful public hearings could be held. Since then, certain defects in the bill have been brought to the attention of our subcommittee, and I have incorporated perfecting amendments directed at these objections. While these revisions do not affect the basic philosophy of the bill, I am satisfied they improve the measure.

A new title has been added to the bill which is directed primarily at the features of the present law permitting the costs of examination to be assessed against companies or bureaus being examined. The elimination of such provisions conforms with the position adopted by the Judiciary Committee in its Report No. 1834 entitled "Insurance: Aviation, Ocean Marine, and State Regulation," issued on August 10, 1960. This report noted that an effective system of examinations cannot be predicated on the assumption of any part of the cost by the companies or organizations being examined.

In its report the committee urged that the great responsibilities of insurance regulation cannot be achieved unless adequate funds are appropriated and sufficient salaries are paid to attract competent personnel. Therefore, I believe that for the Congress to urge such a course upon the States would be hypocrisy unless it were willing to take the lead in appropriating adequate funds for the District of Columbia and in fixing the salary of the Superintendent at a rate commensurate with his responsibility. Therefore, I shall urge that the District of Columbia Committee consider the feasibility of establishing the same salary for the Insurance Superintendent as Congress set for the Director under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 when this post was created.

INCREASED AMOUNT INDIVIDUALS ARE PERMITTED TO EARN UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits.

The purpose of this bill is to allow social security annuitants to earn up to $1,800 per year without sustaining a loss in their social security benefits.

During the closing days of the 86th Congress, the Social Security Act was amended in this regard establishing a complex sliding scale system of allowing social security recipients to exceed the previous $1,200 limitation. This was a step in the right direction but I submit that it remains inadequate.

Mr. President, during these days of inflated prices and a depreciated dollar, it is folly to suggest that $1,200 represents sufficient annual earnings even when supplemented by social security benefits. Additionally, at a time when this country needs to utilize its human resources to the fullest, it is wasteful to force inactivity upon our senior citizens by penalizing them for earnings in excess of $1,200.

I would hope, Mr. President, that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

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

The bill (S. 569) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REGULATION OF DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING OF AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose and need for same, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 575) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter, together with the statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers."

The Board has been advised by letter from the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 28, 1960, that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WHITNEY GILLILLAND,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

In common with other regulatory acts, and carrying forward the provision of section 407(d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 directs that the Board shall prescribe a system of accounts to be kept by air carriers.

Under the authority of section 407(d) to "prescribe the forms of any and all accounts," the Board has proceeded, since its establishment to prescribe the uniform system of accounts required to be kept by all certificated air carriers. The controlling purpose of such a uniform system of accounts is to provide the Board with financial statements which fairly reflect the financial condition of the air carrier, on the one hand, and the operating results of the carrier for a given period of time, on the other hand. The purpose of the system of accounts is to prescribe uniform practices which will provide, in general substance, comparable information in respect to each of the various carriers subject to the accounting regulations. Financial statements would, of course, be useless to the Board unless they fairly reflected the actual financial condition of the carriers and the actual operating results of the services performed for the period reported.

In the past, the Board has, in general, prescribed rates of depreciation as a part of its ratemaking process. The depreciation rates so prescribed through the ratemaking proceedings of the Board have generally been used by air carriers for accounting purposes. So long as the depreciation rates used by the various air carriers for accounting purposes fairly reflected the depreciation costs as determined in the rate proceedings, further prescription of these rates through accounting regulation would have served no useful purpose. Moreover, until recent years, the widespread dependence of the industry upon Federal subsidies necessitated the frequent review by the Board of the operating results of the carriers, including an appraisal of the reasonableness of charges to expense for depreciation on property and equipment which resulted in bringing the depreciation practices of the carriers under frequent review by the Board.

However, with the emergence of a large part of the industry from dependence upon subsidy, the opportunity for such frequent review of the reasonableness of depreciation charges to expense by the Board no longer exists. Nevertheless, the need for reliable financial data from which to appraise the true financial condition and operating results of the various air carriers continues. In recognition of this need, the Board undertook to prescribe the depreciation accounting practices of air carriers by the issuance of appropriate regulations. (E.R. 224, adopted Nov. 18, 1957.) However, the Board's authority to issue such a regulation was challenged and appealed to the courts. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia sustained the action of the Board, but on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit this decision was reversed. The Board sought review of this decision by the Supreme Court, but that Court declined to take the case and the Board's application for writ of certiorari was denied on November 10, 1958.[1] Consequently, in order that the Board may effectively carry out its functions with respect to the depreciation accounting practices of air carriers, legislation is essential.

The requested legislation would not involve any departure from well established concepts pertaining to the regulated industries generally. On the contrary, it would bring the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in this field in line with similar powers already expressly given to other agencies such as the

[1] *Alaska Airlines et al* v. *C.A.B.*, case No. 3638-56,, dec. June 25, 1957 (D.C.D.C.); rev. 257 F. 2d 299 (C.A.D.C., 1958); cert. den. Nov. 10, 1958.

Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. (See 49 U.S.C. sec. 20(4), sec. 220(c), and sec. 913(d), 15 U.S.C. 717h(a), 16 U.S.C. 825a(a), and 47 U.S.C. 220(b).)

Depreciation expense constitutes probably the most critical element in the determination of the financial condition of a business inasmuch as, unlike virtually all other elements, it does not lend itself to objective physical measurement. Unless uniformly reported by the carriers in the manner recognized by the Board for regulatory purposes the Board will be left unprotected against potential misinterpretation of the reported data. This would necessarily follow from the fact that the Board's staff could not be reasonably expected to independently recast each carrier's report each and every reporting period on a time basis which would meet the Board's recurrent operating needs.

The amount of depreciation charged to expense involves the substance of the accounts, the control over which is necessary to provide financial statements that produce a fair presentation of the carriers' financial condition and operating results for the periods reported to the Board. Insofar as the impact upon the carriers' financial condition and operating results is concerned, improper charges to expense for depreciation would undermine the integrity of the financial statements in exactly the same manner as inaccurate charges for salaries, rents, and other operating expenses of the carriers. Depreciation is becoming an increasingly important operating expense for air carriers with the addition of new and more expensive aircraft equipment. Errors in the reporting of depreciation tend to accumulate over a period of years and are difficult to correct in the accounts of carriers once the inaccuracies have become rooted over an extended period of time. Improper reporting of depreciation expense will distort the accounts and financial statements of air carriers to such an extent that comparability will be seriously undermined or completely destroyed. Since the property and equipment on which depreciation is computed will continue in service over a period of years the distortion from misstatement of depreciation charges accumulates with the passage of time. Accordingly, the prescription of depreciation rates by the Board will prevent such comparative distortion and thus increase proportionately the relative reliability of the financial statements of certificated air carriers from the point of view of both the industry and the Board as well as the general public.

Vice Chairman Gurney is opposed to any legislation which would empower the Board to prescribe depreciation accounting practices of the air carriers. He believes that depreciation practices are primarily a function of management and any regulatory supervision over the details thereof constitutes an unnecessary interference with the operation of an air carrier. In view of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which afford business a choice of different methods of depreciation for tax purposes, he sees no reason for any additional legislation.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

[New matter in black brackets]

Title IV—Air carrier economic regulation

Accounts, Records, and Reports

Depreciation accounting

SEC. 407 [(e). The Board may prescribe for air carriers the classes of property for which depreciation charges may properly be included under operating expenses, the method of depreciation accounting, the rate or rates of depreciation which shall be charged, the depreciation period and the residual value, with respect to each of such classes of property, classifying the air carriers as it may deem proper for this purpose. The Board may, when it deems necessary, modify the classes and rates so prescribed. To the extent that the Board shall have exercised its authority under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, air carriers shall not charge to, or in any form include under, operations expenses any depreciation charges other than those prescribed by the Board, or employ a method of depreciation, depreciation period, or residual value other than those prescribed by the Board.]

Inspection of accounts and property

SEC. 407(e) [(f)]. The Board shall at all times have access to all lands, buildings, and equipment of any carrier and to all accounts, records, and memoranda, including all documents, papers, and correspondence, now or hereafter existing, and kept or required to be kept by air carriers; and it may employ special agents or auditors, who shall have authority under the orders of the Board to inspect and examine any and all such lands, buildings, equipment, accounts, records, and memoranda. The provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this Act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill 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. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 576) 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, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter, statement, and analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a draft bill, and a statement of the purpose and need for legislation, 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, and to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel. This legislation is designed to accord with the recommendations of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the Academy, and the recommendations of the Advisory Board to the Academy.

The proposed legislation involves primarily conversion of positions of executive, administrative, custodial, and service personnel to positions subject to the civil service laws generally applicable to other civilian employees of the United States, and to establish an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation for the faculty at the Academy comparable to that provided for the civilian faculty at the U.S. Naval Academy.

The accompanying statement sets forth the need for and the purpose and provisions of, the proposed legislation. The draft legislation was developed by the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission.

On December 29, 1960, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 216, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

GENERAL PURPOSE

In the administration of the maritime training program under section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126) since 1942, it has been the practice of the former Maritime Commission and of the Department of Commerce (to which the Maritime Commission was transferred in 1950) to enroll in the U.S. maritime service not only volunteers for training and reserve purposes, known as trainee enrollees, but also other persons assigned to administrative duties, known as administrative enrollees. The term "administrative enrollees" includes the employees service as the permanent cadre at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., which comprises the executive staff, administrative force, faculty, custodial, and service groups.

These administrative enrollees have been employed (i.e., enrolled) under the authority of the above-mentioned section of the Merchant Marine Act. They have been given ranks and ratings, and have been compensated and granted allowances at rates similar to those provided by law for the Coast Guard under authority of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, the annual appropriation acts, and section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by the act of May 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 79). The enrollees have been granted leave under a leave system prescribed by regulations pursuant to implied power under the Merchant Marine Act. Insofar as circumstances and applicable laws have permitted, administrative enrollees have been administered on the same basis as members of a military-type organization performing similar duties.

Over the years a number of questions have been considered by the Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, and Department of Justice concerning the employment status of these employees. In order to clarify and regularize the employment status of administrative enrollees, it has become apparent that it would be administratively desirable to convert the enrollees, as far as practicable and appropriate, to positions subject to the same civil service, compensation, and leave laws, which are generally applicable to other civilian employees of the United States.

In the interest of simplified and more efficient administration, and of making available and preserving to these employees the same benefits as are granted to other civilian

employees of the United States, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission have reached agreement (1) that an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation should be provided by law for the faculty of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, similar to that now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy; (2) that future appointments to nonfaculty positions should be made in accordance with the civil service and classification laws (except as otherwise authorized by law, e.g., to wage board positions); and (3) that present administrative enrollees should be converted to positions subject to the civil service, classification, and leave laws under provisions of law which will authorize adjustments to be made that will avoid undue personal hardship or inequity to the employees and avoid any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Academy.

As a result of careful study for several years of the problems involved in effecting this transition for persons presently serving as administrative enrollees, the Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office have reached agreement that legislation is necessary to,

(1) Provide an appropriate compensation system of the type described above for faculty members at the Merchant Marine Academy;

(2) Avoid serious loss of compensation to nonfaculty administrative enrollees upon conversion to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to wage-board positions;

(3) Avoid serious curtailment of enrollees' existing leave benefits upon conversion to a position under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended; and

(4) Provide for creditability of prior service as administrative enrollees for all purposes.

The proposed legislation would accomplish these purposes and enable the Department to administer these positions on the same basis as other comparable civilian positions in the Government service. Upon enactment of this legislation, it is contemplated that faculty members will be employed under excepted appointments authorized by the Civil Service Commission under schedule A of the civil service rules, and that they will be compensated under a system of compensation appropriate to the requirements of an accredited educational institution and similar to that now provided for the faculty of the Naval Academy. It is contemplated that nonfaculty administrative enrollees will be employed under the civil service laws, and that they will be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or an appropriate prevailing wage schedule, as appropriate. Both groups of employees will receive leave, medical, and other benefits under the same laws as apply generally to other civilian employees of the Government.

In view of the fact that the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, currenly the only federally operated maritime training installation, was made a permanent institution by Public Law 415, 84th Congress, the Department recommends favorable consideration of the attached proposed legislation in order that basic personnel policies and problems in administering the maritime training program may be considered and acted upon by the Congress. The need for clarifying the status of administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service in order that present uncertainties may be eliminated and the Merchant Marine Academy may proceed on a stable basis in personnel matters was recognized in the Report of the 12th Congressional Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. The report included the following provision:

"The Board urges those charged with carrying on the discussions directed toward establishing the status of the administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service to make every effort to bring about an appropriate resolution of this problem, to the end that suitable personnel policies may be established."

Additionally, the report of the Advisory Board to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, made to the Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, May 2, 1957, stated, among other things, "The Maritime Administrator has issued appropriate orders defining the status of the existing faculty and setting forth probationary periods for those to be appointed to the faculty in the future. This is all that could have been done and it has been well done. But the position of the faculty at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy will not be thoroughly satisfactory until appropriate legislation has been enacted."

Later Advisory Board reports in 1958, 1959, and 1960, again affirm this position.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 216(a): This section is amended to—

1. Make clear that henceforth enrollments will be made only for training and reserve purposes in the U.S. maritime service, as distinguished from administrative duty purposes such as instruction of trainees, clerical work, maintenance work, and the like;

2. Make clear that the Secretary's authority to fix the rates of pay for trainees also includes authority to fix their allowances;

3. Provide clear authority for the Secretary to prescribe and regulate the furnishing and wearing of uniforms of persons in the Service;

4. Transfer to a new subsection (e) the existing provision for employment of instructors; and

5. Make an appropriate, minor correction in a pronoun in the second sentence to refer to discretion transferred to the Secretary from the former Maritime Commission.

Section 216(e): This subsection would provide authority for the employment, and compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of all levels of civilian professors, lecturers, and instructors as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended. Such professors, lecturers, and instructors would be considered civilian officers and employees of the United States for purposes of laws of general application to civilian employees of the United States.

Under existing law the Civil Service Commission is empowered to authorize the Department to employ professors, lecturers, and instructors under excepted appointments, on the same basis (schedule A) as is now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy. This section will also make possible the establishment of an appropriate compensation system for the faculty of the Merchant Marine Academy, similar to that provided for faculty of the Naval Academy.

Section 216(f): This subsection provides for (1) conversion of existing administrative enrollees, both faculty and nonfaculty on a date mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission, in order to effect an orderly transition; (2) clear-cut legal recognition that after conversion, former administrative enrollees will be subject to laws of general applicability to civilian employees of the United States except as otherwise authorized by law; and (3) certain authority necessary to make possible the conversion of enrollees without undue personal hardship or inequity, and without any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Merchant Marine Academy, with particular reference to compensation, leave, and creditability of prior service for various purposes.

Section 216(f)(1): This subsection defines how the basic compensation of administrative enrollees shall be determined upon conversion and provides for salary-saving and related safeguards in order to avoid reducing the compensation of enrollees as a result of conversion. For example, if an administrative enrollee's total basic pay, quarters, and subsistence allowances amount to $9,570.96, and his position is classified at grade GS–11, he would have his salary set at GS–11, $9,640, which is the next longevity rate over the total amount he is receiving for basic pay, quarters, and subsistence. An enrollee receiving a total of $8,105.76 for basic pay, subsistence, and quarters allowances whose position is classified at GS–9, for which the maximum longevity rate of the grade is $7,920, will have his salary set at $8,150, which is the first longevity step at GS–10, until he leaves such position, or otherwise is entitled to receive a higher rate by reason of operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or other applicable law, as indicated below.

This subsection applies only to persons serving as administrative enrollees on the date preceding the date of conversion. It does not provide retroactive benefits to any person.

Section 216(f)(2): This paragraph makes provision to specifically insure what is commonly referred to as salary saving by establishing the fact that the basic compensation as set upon conversion, as provided for in section 216(f)(1), will continue until the employee affected thereby is either separated from his position or receives a higher rate of basic compensation by operation of law or regulation as might occur in the case of promotion, Federal salary adjustments, etc.

Section 216(f)(3): This paragraph takes cognizance of the fact that administrative enrollees have earned, accumulated and used annual leave on a calendar day basis, and most enrollees have a much greater leave accumulation than the accumulation which would be authorized on conversion of such personnel under provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act. This paragraph would provide for the conversion of all unused annual leave without actual loss of leave for purposes of future use to the enrollee on the basis of 5 work days' leave for each 7 calendar days of leave.

Administrative enrollees are authorized to take sick leave, up to 4 months in emergencies, as may be necessary, but do not accumulate sick leave. If they had been permitted to accumulate sick leave, most administrative enrollees by reason of their length of service would now have a large accumulation of sick leave. To minimize the effect of losing the sick leave benefits to which administrative enrollees have been entitled, it is proposed that they be credited on the date of conversion with 13 days' sick leave. Thereafter, sick leave credits would accrue on the same basis as for other employees subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act.

Section 216(f)(4): This paragraph makes specific provisions to recognize active service as an administrative enrollee performed prior to the date fixed for conversion as civilian employment creditable for all purposes in the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the exception that in computing length of service as used under the Classification Act for the determination of one periodic step increase or one longevity step increase, all such prior service shall be counted toward the attainment of same which occurred immediately preceding the date fixed for conversion, as provided in subsection (f). Thus, for such basic purposes as retirement, leave accruals, seniority, length-of-service awards, etc., all previous active service as an administrative enrollee would be creditable as civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for every purpose, except that in computation of length of service for salary step increases or longevity step increases, only such service as was continuous and uninterrupted immediately prior to the date

fixed for conversion would be creditable in the determination of said step increases. Under these circumstances, an employee's salary thus established which is less than the maximum scheduled rate of the grade would be immediately considered against the requirements for one periodic step increase; and, as provided in subsection (f)(1), for purposes of determining eligibility for a periodic step increase, the basic compensation as an administrative enrollee would be considered as the total amount of value of basic pay, subsistence and quarters allowances. Such prior service and basic compensation would also be considered in determining eligibility toward the 10-year aggregate period and 3-year waiting periods for one longevity step increase.

Section 216(f)(5): Administrative enrollees disenrolled from the maritime service are entitled to payment of travel and transportation expenses to their place of enrollment, etc., whether or not such transportation is actually furnished in kind. Administrative enrollees on active duty also receive free medical, dental, surgical, and hospital care under the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 696; 42 U.S.C. 249).

This paragraph is for the purpose of making two practical provisions. First, it provides that administrative enrollees who accept conversion shall forfeit such rights to travel and transportation expenses. Those who elect to resign prior to conversion will be entitled to such benefits in keeping with the terms under which they were enrolled as administrative enrollees. Second, it provides that administrative enrollees after the effective date of conversion as authorized by this legislation shall not continue to receive free medical, dental, surgical, and hospital care pursuant to paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944. After conversion, however, these employees and their immediate families will be eligible for health benefits on the same basis as other civilian employees of the Government under the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of September 28, 1959 (73 Stat. 709; 5 U.S.C. 3001).

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATIVE TO RETIREMENT OF MEN, WITH REDUCED BENEFITS, AT AGE 62

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will permit men to retire under social security at the age of 62.

LOWER AGE REQUIREMENT

The Senate has already indicated its approval of retirement of men at age 62 at reduced benefits. The Senate Finance Committee and the Senate last year voted to permit this earlier retirement, but we were unable to get final approval because of the opposition of the Eisenhower administration.

Our laws permit women to retire at age 62. We should recognize that earlier retirement of men may also be necessary because of illness, unemployment, or other reasons. The cost of such reduction would not affect the solvency of the social security trust fund because earlier retirement would be at actuarily reduced benefits.

The earlier retirement would be completely voluntary. The worker would retire or not at this earlier age as he desires. These workers paid into the social security fund—this is not a Government dole—and they should be permitted to receive the benefits of the program when they need them most.

When Congress permitted the earlier retirement of women it was contended that this would encourage employers to retire their older workers at the earlier age. But, experience has proven that this argument was wrong then and it is wrong now.

Many of our elderly citizens are confronted with the problems of illness and unemployment. I think we would make a real stride in the right direction and improve these conditions by permitting men to retire at age 62 when these and other personal reasons necessitate their retirement at this age.

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

The bill (S. 577) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS WHILE RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will completely remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

REMOVE EARNINGS LIMITATION

I believe, Mr. President, that the Senate recognizes the inequity of the limited ceiling set on earnings of social security beneficiaries. Last year in the Senate Finance Committee I offered a series of amendments to either remove or increase the amount which persons receiving social security could earn. The committee and the Senate voted to increase the limitation to $1,800, but this was not acceptable to the Eisenhower administration. It was necessary, therefore, to get any improvement to compromise and permit only a slight modification of the earnings limitation.

The social security bill approved by Congress last year provided that a social security recipient who earns up to $1,500 will lose $1 of benefit for each $2 of earnings over $1,200. For earnings over $1,500 the bill provided for a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 earned.

But, this does not go far enough. We are still penalizing our great American initiative. The earnings limitation continues to apply the brakes to national growth. Contributing individuals to social security are not treated equally. Those receiving income from so-called unearned sources, dividends, rents, et cetera, are preferred in the law. They have no limitation on income received, their resources may be unlimited and they still may receive their monthly social security checks. But those actually in need, those desiring to continue to work and supplement their meager social security benefits may not earn more than $1,200 without being penalized.

In 1940 when social security coverage was much more limited in scope, the retirement test applied only to covered employment. The cost of living index was 59.9. In 1954, when the $1,200 annual earned income retirement test was first enacted, the cost of living was 114.4. The present cost of living, according to figures published recently by the Department of Commerce, is at an alltime high—over a 100-percent increase since the program was enacted and more than 10 percent higher than in 1954.

There is a definite need for this legislation and it would make a substantial difference in the lives and standards of living of several million of our senior citizens. There are over 15 million individuals in this country who are 65 years old or over. Over 11 million are receiving OASI benefits or could receive them if they were not working.

Is a retirement program equitable which restricts an individual's earning capacity? Our great social security program was enacted to provide some measure of security for our elderly citizens. So long as this earnings limitation remains we are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need this protection. The limitation is inequitable and unrealistic. We cannot continue to penalize the healthy and vigorous members of our society who would like to continue working in jobs for which they are qualified and needed in order to supplement the bare subsistence income they receive under social security.

Can we continue to penalize individuals who find it necessary to continue working during their retirement? Perhaps a better and more logical way of looking at this matter would be to consider the increases in Federal revenue which will result from increased employment and utilization of our Nation's resources. An individual who is over 65 and earns $1,200 or less pays no income tax. Obviously, the Government will profit by increased revenues if the retirement test is removed, and the brakes are removed from one of the great impediments to expanded national growth.

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

The bill (S. 578) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN DISTRICTS OF INDIANA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for one additional judge for the U.S. court for the southern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the northern district of Indiana.

A tremendous burden is now being imposed on the judges of these courts due to their heavy dockets and the fact that courts in these districts are held in several divisions.

The dockets of these courts are much heavier than the great majority of the courts for which additional judges have been requested.

An additional judge for each of these districts has been unanimously approved by the Judicial Council of the Seventh Circuit, consisting of all the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and by the house of delegates of the Indiana State Bar Association.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT

Jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana covers 60 Indiana counties. It has been necessary for the court to be divided into four divisions, with the court sitting in Indianapolis, Terre Haute, Evansville, and New Albany.

Total civil cases commenced for each judge in the southern district during the last year numbered 279. This is almost 30 percent higher than the national average of the other U.S. district courts.

The present two judges must operate five courts, two in Indianapolis, the State capital, and three in the other divisions. The caseload of the Indianapolis division, the largest metropolitan area in the State, is sufficient to keep two judges busy. It is necessary, therefore, that one of the present judges remain in Indianapolis, while the other judge must tour the circuit and hold court in another division. Regardless of this arrangement, it has been impossible for the judges to sit in one of the divisions in Terre Haute, Evansville, or New Albany more than twice a year—and then only for a very limited time.

Should an additional judge be authorized, he could take care of the business in Terre Haute, Evansville, and New Albany divisions while the other two judges would tend to the business of the Indianapolis division.

NORTHERN DISTRICT

The northern district of Indiana comprises a heavily industrialized area of Indiana. The court is divided into three divisions, the South Bend division, the Fort Wayne division, and the Hammond division. Court is held in both Hammond and Lafayette for the Hammond division.

Total civil cases commenced for each judge in the northern district during the last year numbered 243. This is almost 20 percent higher than the national average of the other U.S. district courts.

The present two judges must operate four courts. They run into the same difficulties which confront the judges of the southern district.

CONCLUSION

The present heavy caseload has required day and night work by our U.S. judges. An additional judge for each of our Indiana districts would help solve the problem and the tremendous burden now imposed upon the present judges. I am certain that additional judgeships are enthusiastically supported by the practicing bar and the citizens of Indiana. I earnestly hope that the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress will give early consideration to our needs, and that the heavy dockets of the U.S. district courts for Indiana's southern and northern districts will be relieved by the approval of this legislation.

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

The bill (S. 579) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district of Indiana, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, all informed persons agree that we are at present locked in a death struggle with the Communists, who now say, according to the press of yesterday, they are going to defeat us by economic means, that they no longer have to depend on military accomplishments alone, because their system of productivity and their system of economy is better than the free enterprise system.

It seems to us that all of us must recognize that this actually is the case, not that they are better, but that we are in this enormous struggle. To win this battle of survival, we must be able to keep pace with the rapid scientific and technological developments that render obsolete machinery and equipment in a considerably shorter period of time than was the case in the postwar period. Our economic growth must be stimulated and substantially increased. For us time has now become of the essence. We cannot afford to fall behind in our productivity.

It appears to be generally agreed that methods of depreciation authorized under existing law have a stultifying effect on our economic growth and are rendering economic growth impossible.

Recently there appeared in the Washington Star under date of January 14 an editorial entitled "Needed Tax Reform," in which it was pointed out that the great and rapid technological developments have quickened the pace of obsolescence and that compensating modernization carried a price tag that has moved steadily and sharply higher. The editorial suggests strongly the need for constructive reform in tax depreciation allowances in order to stimulate economic growth and keep pace with scientific know-how which we have presently at our disposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial 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:

NEEDED TAX REFORM

At this time of keen interest in governmental action which might stimulate economic growth, the Treasury Department has available an informative cross-section of business opinion on the current impact of tax-depreciation allowances and the possibilities of constructive reform—either by statute or by regulation—in this area. The information is contained in approximately 3,500 answers to Department questionnaires sent out last summer, both to large corporations and small business firms. Additional answers are expected and all the material is subject to further analysis before specific recommendations are made by the Department.

Among the large concerns particularly, accounting for more than $200 billion worth of depreciable property, there was a heavy response that the alternative methods currently permitted for estimating depreciation allowances are unsatisfactory. For the most part, their objections centered on two points, namely, insufficient allowance during the early years of service of plant or equipment and inadequate total allowance to cover the rising costs of replacement. Other studies have provided support for these same complaints. The great and rapid technological developments of the postwar period, for example, have quickened the pace of obsolescence. At the same time, compensating modernization carries a price tag that has moved steadily and sharply higher.

Not surprisingly, among eight alternatives on which the Treasury asked for reaction, the solution favored by most companies, large and small, was to permit the exercise of their own judgment in calculating the useful life of equipment and how much of its cost should be written off each year. In exchange for greater flexibility in this respect, most respondents indicated a willingness to pay a higher tax rate on the sale of old equipment—treating such proceeds as income, for example, rather than capital gain. The second most popular choice was some form of depreciation adjustment to reflect increased replacement costs.

Suggestions for liberalization of depreciation allowances inevitably become subject to political considerations as well as economic ones. During his campaign, Senator Kennedy indicated an interest in some changes in depreciation rules but did not spell out his specific views. It is generally argued, however, that capital investment would be stimulated by liberalization in some degree and that the end effect would be expanded employment and higher net tax revenues. The subject is one that the incoming administration and the new Congress should consider carefully.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, to resolve this dilemma in which we find ourselves and recognize the crying need for giving the economy of this country a necessary shot in the arm, as well as to provide the necessary incentive for taxpayers to replace wornout equipment, I am introducing at this time proposed legislation designed to provide the taxpayer an election to utilize existing methods of depreciation, or to write off at a more rapid pace property acquired after December 31, 1960. The measure would permit a taxpayer to write off new equipment in a period of 5 years and used equipment in a period of 3 years.

Specifically, the proposed legislation, in my opinion, would eliminate the objections to the present system of depreciation allowance by providing as follows:

First. A taxpayer may elect any period of depreciation he desires, so long as that period is not less than 5 years on all new machinery and equipment purchased after December 31, 1960.

Second. With respect to all used equipment, and this applies primarily to many of the small businesses throughout the Nation, the taxpayer may elect any period of depreciation he desires so long as that period is not less than 3 years. Used property is defined as being

property at least 2 years old in order to prevent the resale of new property immediately after its acquisition in order to get a more favorable tax writeoff.

Third. Under its provisions, the salvage value of any property will remain the same as if the normal method of depreciation had been used.

Fourth. On the sale of depreciable property under existing law, any gain is treated as capital gain. Since the new election would provide for a more rapid writeoff, this would not result in giving the taxpayer an unintended additional capital gain. Thus on the sale of property where the taxpayer elected to use the rapid depreciation under the proposed bill only that portion of the profits will be treated as capital gain which would have been so regarded if normal depreciation had been elected. The balance would be treated as ordinary income.

For example, let us assume a piece of property is purchased in 1961 for $10,000. Let us assume further that it has a normal life of 10 years, and that it will have no salvage value at the end of this period. If the taxpayer elects to depreciate the property over a 5-year period, and at the end of the 5-year period, sells the property for $6,000, the results under the proposed legislation would be as follows:

Over the 5-year period the taxpayer would write off his entire cost under the rapid depreciation provisions. If he had used normal depreciation under existing law he would have written off only $5,000 for that period. Of the $6,000 obtained on the sale of the property, $1,000 would be treated as capital gain and $5,000 as ordinary income in the year of the sale.

The bill provides further that the election to use rapid depreciation may be made within the time prescribed by law for filing the return for the year in which the property is acquired. Once the election is made by the taxpayer it is irrevocable with respect to the particular property. However, the election may be made on a selective basis, that is for only those acquisitions which the taxpayer designates. In other words, it need not be made for all property acquired by the taxpayer in a given year.

This measure will, in my opinion, permit taxpayers to write off new and used property just as quickly as they deem appropriate subject to the safeguards described. This does not mean that a taxpayer must elect to use the shortest period. Nor, as under the present system, must he use the so-called normal life of the property. He may elect any period that fits his own situation so long as it is not shorter than the statutory minimum. This will encourage the replacement of old and obsolete plants with modern equipment since taxpayers will be able to write off the cost over a period selected by them and based on their own individual financial and profit positions.

It must be evident to all people, regardless of political complexion, that this country is in a period of recession. In certain economic areas, many will feel that the word "recession" is too mild.

The Department of Labor announced recently that unemployment rose by one-half million in December to 5,540,000. This is the highest December total in 20 years. Compared with a year ago, unemployment is up about 1 million. This trend has a serious adverse impact on our economy.

We know too that the heavy goods industry—the people who make machinery and equipment—is probably in the worst shape it has been since before World War II.

Because of increased costs of replacement and unrealistic depreciation allowances, many corporations are not able to replace their old machines fast enough to keep up with technological advances. This affects not only that segment of our economy. People employed in that field cannot buy the goods produced by others. Soon the whole cycle of recession accelerates its pace and other groups are affected adversely.

We also have seen that today the flow of gold from this country abroad has assumed alarming proportions. Measures are being conceived to stem the critical drain on Treasury gold reserves.

One major factor contributing to this has been the shift in the direction of goods. After World War II, our goods were dominant in most world markets; today the trend has been reversed. Germany, Italy, and Japan had to start from scratch in rebuilding war-torn industries. They put in modern machinery and equipment, adopting all the technological improvements conceived after the war. As these new foreign plants developed, our plants were no match for them in turning out products at lower costs. The result in terms of foreign trade and the effect on our employment are now obvious.

In my opinion, all of this—the rise in unemployment, the recession in the heavy goods industry, the unfavorable flow of gold—stems from the reluctance or inability of American business to replace old, wornout, and obsolete machinery and equipment with the most modern equipment available.

What is one of the principal causes of this reluctance on the part of American business? I believe it is the repressive and unrealistic depreciation provisions we now have on the tax books. This is borne out by a recent study conducted by the Treasury Department in cooperation with the Small Business Administration. The overwhelming majority of those contacted—both large and small businesses—agreed on the inadequacy of the present depreciation allowance, including the so-called accelerated provisions authorized under the 1954 Internal Revenue Code.

By liberalizing depreciation rates and encouraging the revitalizing of our plants, we will be going a long way to restoring the heavy-goods industry to its normal and healthy status. Employment will rise with the concomitant effect on the rest of our economy.

Finally, our industry, so revitalized, will be able to compete in the world markets. Labor will not be at a disadvantage with its cheaper foreign competitors. And the unfavorable flow of gold reserves will in time be reversed. This measure thus affords, in my opinion, a simple solution to a whole spectrum of economic problems without adversely affecting the revenues. In fact it will have the ultimate effect of increasing revenues.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent also to have inserted in the RECORD an excellent editorial by David Lawrence, dealing with the same subject matter, entitled "What Samuelson Report Omits," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 9, 1961.

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

WHAT SAMUELSON REPORT OMITS—KENNEDY TASK FORCE HELD OVERLOOKING RECESSION CAUSES, TAX AID TO BUSINESS

(By David Lawrence)

What shall one think of a 9,000-word report to President-elect Kennedy by a special task force studying the current economic situation that doesn't throw any light on the basic causes of the current recession?

What shall be said of a report which recommends that the Federal Government increase the amount of personal income available to the citizens through temporary tax reductions when the American people today continue to save a large part of their disposable income anyhow instead of spending all of it?

What encouragement can there be for the development of a formula to solve the Nation's economic ills when today—as in the 1930's—there is such conspicuous indifference to the problems of the heavy-goods industries?

Temporary measures in New Deal days failed for 7 consecutive years to bring the unemployment figure below 8 million as "leaf-raking" and other crackpot schemes were adopted, while the heavy-goods industries were not able to begin their important task of job creation until the Second World War started.

Not a single sentence in the report issued by Professor Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology discusses the all-important subject of tax allowances on depreciation which, if adjusted on a replacement-value basis, would do so much to renovate and modernize America's plants and create millions of new jobs. It is estimated that $96 billion is required to replace obsolete equipment in American industry over the next several years.

Toward the end of the report is a rather significant confession that a solution for the wage-price spiral is really vital. The report says:

"It is important, though, to realize that there are some problems that fiscal and monetary policy cannot themselves come to grips with. Thus, if there is, indeed, a tendency for prices and wages to rise long before we reach high employment, neither monetary nor fiscal policy can be used to the degree necessary to promote desired growth.

"What then may be needed are new approaches to the problem of productivity, wages, and price formation. Will it not be possible to bring Government influence to bear on this vital matter without invoking direct controls on wages and prices? Neither labor nor management nor the consumer can gain from an increase in price tags. Just as we pioneered in the 1920's in creating potent monetary mechanisms and in the 1930's in forging the tools of effective fiscal policy, so may it be necessary in the 1960's to meet head on the problem of a price creep. This is a challenge to mixed economies all over

the free world, and is not to be met by Government alone."

High-sounding statements like the above are often heard, but nothing concrete is ever done about the wage-price problem. Government controls could only worsen the situation and bring on a controlled economy. What is needed is some task forces to get at the reasons why big labor-union monopolies are as shortsighted as the steel union was in 1959 in forcing a strike and increased wage benefits at a time when the workers were getting very high incomes and when the economy, to use Professor Samuelson's phrase, was "tired and sluggish."

On the whole, the Samuelson report is not as radical as might have been expected from politically motivated economists. But the document is noted for its contradictions. It warns against "a massive program of hastily devised public works whose primary purpose is merely that of making jobs and getting money pumped into the economy." Then it turns around and advocates "expansions and accelerations in expenditure programs that are desirable for their own sake." The politicians on Capitol Hill usually interpret what is desirable for their own sake in their own congressional districts. Included in these proposals is a sizable item for teachers' salaries. Adding it all up, it might mean the biggest deficit in peacetime.

There's one lesson which has yet to be learned by the theorists. It's that a planned economy will not overcome the hard facts of a free market and that, if America refuses to tackle her wage-price problem, none of the remedial measures being suggested in the Samuelson report will help this country out of its recession.

When the American people finally demand pitiless publicity and a thoroughgoing exposure of the misuse of power by big labor unions, acting sometimes in collaboration with timid or complacent management, there will begin to be a clue to what wrecked the American economy in 1959 and 1960 and what set off the chain reaction which is now increasing the unemployment figure.

For until some stability in prices can be achieved and plants can be modernized on an efficient basis so as to permit cost reduction and a downward revision of prices in many products, there isn't much hope for a cure to the recurring recessions in America. Of what good, for instance, are low mortgage rates and easy installment terms if the house costs too much?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the proposed legislation will be acted on promptly and favorably. Obviously, it is in the national interest.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 580) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPOSITION OF USE TAX ASSESSMENTS WITH RESPECT TO SALES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill may be printed in the RECORD, following the text of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 581) to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and 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 the Act entitled "An Act relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of matters pertaining thereto", approved September 14, 1959 (Public Law 86-272), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE III—SALES AND USE TAX MINIMUM STANDARD

"SEC. 301. (a) No State, or political subdivision thereof, shall have power to impose, after the date of the enactment of this title, a use tax assessment upon any person with respect to sales in interstate commerce if the only business activities within such State by or on behalf of such person during the period for which such assessment is imposed were or are either, or both, of the following:

"(1) The solicitation of orders by such person, or his representative, in such State for sales of tangible personal property, which orders are sent outside the State for approval or rejection, and, if approved, are filled by shipment or delivery from a point outside the State; and

"(2) The solicitation of orders by such person, or his representative, in such State in the name of or for the benefit of a prospective customer of such person, if orders by such customer to such person to enable such customer to fill orders resulting from such solicitation are orders described in paragraph (1).

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to the imposition of a use tax assessment by any State, or political subdivision thereof, with respect to—

"(1) any corporation which is incorporated under the laws of such State; or

"(2) any individual who, under the laws of such State, is domiciled in, or a resident of, such State.

"(c) For purposes of subsection (a), a person shall not be considered to have engaged in business activities within a State merely by reason of sales in such State, or the solicitation of orders for sales in such State, of tangible personal property on behalf of such person by one or more independent contractors, or by reason of the maintenance of an office in such State by one or more independent contractors whose activities on behalf of such person in such State consist solely of making sales, or soliciting orders for sales, of tangible personal property.

"(d) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'independent contractor' means a commission agent, broker, or other independent contractor who is engaged in selling, or soliciting orders for the sale of, tangible personal property for more than one principal and who holds himself out as such in the regular course of his business activities;

"(2) the term 'representative' does not include an independent contractor; and

"(3) the term 'use tax assessment' means any assessment, fine, or penalty imposed or levied under the provisions of the retail sales and use tax law of any State because of the failure or refusal of a seller either to: (A) register as a seller or dealer; (B) collect a use tax from a purchaser; (C) file a use tax return; or (D) remit the use tax to such State.

"(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be construed to prohibit the collection, after the date of the enactment of this title, of any use tax assessment which was assessed on or before such date for a period ending on or before such date.

"SEC. 302. If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this title or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"TITLE IV—STUDY AND REPORT BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 401. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, acting separately or jointly, or both, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the imposition of sales and use taxes by the States on sales and other business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce, or which are a part of interstate commerce, for the purpose of recommending to Congress proposed legislation providing uniform standards to be observed by the States in imposing sales and use taxes on such sales and business activities.

"SEC. 402. The committees shall report to their respective Houses the results of the studies authorized by this title together with their proposals for legislation on or before July 1, 1962."

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 23.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH said today he is introducing a bill to exempt certain business concerns engaged in interstate commerce from any obligation to collect State use taxes.

Senator BUSH's bill was drafted as a result of a 1960 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Scripto, Inc.* v. *Carson,* which upheld a Florida statute requiring a corporation to collect the Florida use tax even though its sales in the States were solicited by independent representatives or brokers, were consummated outside the State and the products shipped in interstate commerce from a plant outside the State. The Scripto decision was an extension of an earlier Supreme Court decision that had held that a State has the right to demand that an out-of-State seller act as a use tax collector where it has a salesman operating in the State.

"Businessmen and manufacturers in my own State of Connecticut, as well as in other States, have been alarmed by the predicament in which they have been placed by these two decisions," Senator BUSH said. "Unless Congress takes prompt corrective action, they face the prospect of learning the details of the sales-and-use tax laws of every State in which they do business, collecting use taxes from their customers, and filing periodic tax returns. This imposes an impossible burden, particularly on small businesses, and is a serious interference with interstate commerce."

A companion bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut's First District.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK AND HOMEOWNERS LOAN ACTS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, when the mutual security authorization bill was considered last year, the Congress expressed its sense that the Development Loan Fund be utilized to foster and encourage an FHA-type housing program in underdeveloped countries of the free world. Primarily, this sense of the Congress was designed to combat the Communist economic offensive and gains in Latin American countries. The start of pilot housing projects along this line would be invaluable in promoting economic stability which in turn would be a force against Communist tyranny.

Little if anything has been done about starting these pilot housing projects. I am hopeful that the new administration will give programs of this nature priority attention.

To permit the maximum utilization of free enterprise facilities in fostering this type of program, I am introducing at this time a bill which would amend section 5 of the Homeowners Loan Act of 1933 and section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set up an International Home Loan Bank which in turn would serve mutual institutions whose main purpose would be to encourage savings and finance homeownership. The bank would assist and participate in the establishment and development of mutual savings and loan associations in underdeveloped countries consistent with the foreign economic policies of the United States.

Funds for the bank would be raised from investments in its stocks and shares by Federal and State savings and loan associations in the United States.

The funds would be invested in shares, accounts, deposits, or certificates of indebtedness of mutual thrift and home financing institutions in other countries.

Federal and State savings and loan associations would be authorized to invest funds in stock, accounts, and securities of the International Home Loan Bank and in shares, accounts, deposits, and certificates of indebtedness of mutual thrift home-financing institutions located outside of the United States.

With the enactment of this proposed legislation we will encourage needed housing programs which will in turn raise the standard of living of the peoples of these countries and strengthen the cause of freedom throughout the world. We can achieve this objective through the facilities of private enterprise in cooperation with our Government. It is an essential program which will drive a striking blow for the cause of freedom in those areas where the seeds of the Communist menace have a readymade formula to succeed.

The economic and social fabric of the United States carries the indelible imprint of the thrift and homeownership functions performed in large measure by the savings and loan industry.

America's more than 4,000 insured savings associations provide a saving repository for the savings of more than 27 million Americans. These savings—amounting to more than $60 billion—represent funds set aside for future use by Americans largely of modest means. These people are interested mainly in the safety and easy availability of their savings rather than the quick profits of speculation.

This legislation seeks to extend the principle of massive accumulation of small savings to those areas of the world where capital starvation is a major stumbling block on the road to economic and social advancement.

I believe, and experience confirms, that the savings and loan principle will be warmly received beyond the continental limits of the United States. The primary needs of the underdeveloped world are for seed capital and know-how.

To a limited extent, the amendment which I sponsored last year to the Mutual Security Act will help to satisfy the seed capital requirement. This amendment received enthusiastic support from an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body.

I believe, however, that the current legislation is even more necessary to the realization of our purposes than was the mutual security amendment of last year. This is so not only because the current bill would make seed capital available in a continuing stream, but also because it will bring to bear upon the task of establishing savings and loan associations outside the continental United States the professional know-how of the U.S. savings and loan industry. For the simple truth of the matter is that the United States has at the present time a virtual monopoly on knowledge in this very important field.

We must remember that even in the United States itself the phenomenal growth of the savings and loan industry has occurred relatively recently. Since the end of World War II the savings and loan business has increased ninefold. In 1945 total industry resources amounted to $9 billion. Today the aggregate assets of the industry exceed $72 billion. Eight of every ten of these dollars are invested in homes. The savings and loan business is by far the primary source of home finance in this country. Along with the various guarantee programs undertaken by the U.S. Government the savings and loan principle, I think it fair to say, is the chief reason, the United States is a land of homeowners.

More than 7 million Americans now have home mortgage loans from insured savings associations. These loans totaling more than $60 billion, represent over 40 percent of the Nation's total home mortgage debt.

The recent growth of the savings and loan industry goes a long way to explain how it is that the United States has been able to construct some 15 million homes since World War II.

I believe that extension of the savings and loan principle overseas would materially strengthen the free world against the threat of communism and do much to improve the Western World's position economically, socially, and politically.

Much progress along this line has already been achieved. In cooperation with the Housing Division of the International Cooperation Administration, many leading executives of the savings and loan industry are now providing technical know-how to fledgling savings and loan associations around the world.

The ICA and the International League of Insurance Savings Associations which has sponsored industry participation in this program are to be congratulated for their efforts.

However, we have not even begun to meet the enormous need. I am aware, as all other Senators are aware, that the economic requirements of the underdeveloped world are very great indeed.

The United States, with unexampled generosity, has given freely of its resources to assist the underdeveloped countries along the way to economic progress. Most of our effort has gone toward the building of what the economists refer to as the infrastructure—roads, harbors, airports, and so forth, which are required before economic progress can take place and which cannot normally be financed by private capital.

We have been concentrating on projects of this kind in the belief that solidly based economic progress would eventually bring social and political stability.

Increasingly, however, it has become obvious that such an approach is dangerously lopsided. Without immediate attention to the causes of social and political instability, slow economic advance will not by itself overcome the steady drumfire of Communist propaganda. The lesson of recent years in Latin America and elsewhere is that the disinherited are impatient and that they will pull down the entire social structure if they do not see immediate gains in prospect.

The Senate recognized this reality in the last Congress when adopting my amendment to the Mutual Security Act. We also recognized it by approving the vigorous social reform program envisaged in the $500 million special authorization for Latin America requested by the Eisenhower administration and later, embodied in the Act of Bogotá.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The future is very precarious indeed unless a measure of social stability can be attained in the underdeveloped countries to permit the hard labor of economic advance to take place without social resentments and frustrations exploding and bringing the entire structure tumbling to the ground.

Anyone who has traveled around the world as I have traveled in Latin America can tell you that the wretched living conditions of the laboring and middle classes are a primary source of social tension.

The slums which fester like great sores in Lima, Santiago, Buenos Aires, Rio, Caracas, and the other cities of this hemisphere not only disfigure these cities; they disfigure the souls of the people who inhabit them; they disfigure the politics of the entire area.

These slums are the favorite territory of Communist agitators, the breeding

ground of maggots which bid to destroy the society.

The alarm bells have been ringing with rising urgency during the last 2 years. We cannot afford to ignore their meaning. The future depends on a prompt and effective response.

I am not going to pretend that this proposal will sweep away all of the problems confronting us and turn the future into a clear and open highway toward the dawn. However, I do believe that it will contribute importantly to the solution of our difficulties. I do believe that the time has come to loose the productive intelligence of the great American savings and loan industry on the problem which their experience qualifies them to tackle.

We cannot rely alone on government-to-government grants and loans. We must mobilize the ingenuity and knowledge of private citizens, working on a person-to-person basis. Savings and loan industry can perform an important task in the service of our larger national purposes. I hope that the Housing Committee of Banking and Currency will give early attention to this measure and that we may see its passage early in this session of the Congress.

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

The bill (S. 582) to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JOINT COMMITTEE FOR COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S FIRST INAUGURATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, March 4 will mark the 100th anniversary of the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. In view of the difficulties which the Nation faced at that time, with a divided country, I think perhaps we can obtain inspiration in our endeavors to solve the problems of a divided world, which we face today.

I think the inaugural address of President Kennedy last Friday will rank as one of the three or four great inaugural addresses of all time and as well worthy to rank with Lincoln's second inaugural and Franklin Roosevelt's first inaugural.

Mr. President, I therefore introduce a joint resolution to provide that the 100th anniversary of the taking of the oath of office by Abraham Lincoln as the 16th President of the United States may be commemorated with fitting ceremonies, and that a joint committee be created for the planning and the conduct of such a commemorative service. I hope this will be done. It would be splendid to have such a man as Raymond Massey repeat at least a part of Lincoln's inaugural address, and to have other features reenacted.

Mr. President, Representative SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, is introducing a similar resolution in the House today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the table until the conclusion of the session today so that any Senators who care to associate themselves with it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the table, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) to create a Joint Committee for the Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROJECT HOPE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution commending Project Hope, an organization bringing medical training and teaching to the newly developed countries in southeast Asia.

The vehicle for this mission is the good ship *Hope*, which is now touring the outlying islands of Indonesia, helping the native medical population there learn modern medical techniques from American doctors, nurses, dentists, and other trained personnel.

Project Hope, a part of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., was founded by Dr. William B. Walsh, who has long lived and practiced here in the Capital. His concept of a floating school to teach and train the medical personnel of the new nations is now an actuality. The vessel which is the former Navy hospital ship U.S.S. *Consolation* arrived in Jakarta, capital of Indonesia, on October 16 last year, and has so far visited the islands of Surabaya, Bali, and Sumbawa. The ship is scheduled for six more stops in Indonesia before it completes its maiden 7-month tour in that nation.

All of us can feel particularly proud of the reception which has greeted this mercy ship. One of the Indonesian newspapers said: "She represents the heart of a mighty Nation."

In his year-end report, Dr. Walsh said that invitations have been extended to the *Hope* vessel from Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Korea.

The Project Hope report also notes that the organization has been asked to aid in staffing the School of Tropical Medicine in Dacca, East Pakistan; and to help establish a cardiac clinic equipped with trained teachers and modern scientific appliances in Karachi, capital of Pakistan. The Indonesian Government has also asked aid in staffing the new 600-bed Ibu Sukarno hospital outside of Jakarta.

In addition, Project Hope has recruited and cataloged more than 2,000 American medical volunteers, including doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel, who are willing to serve for short terms wherever they are needed; it has aided the Pakistan flood victims of 1960 with shipments of drugs and medical supplies; established a manufacturing and training center for artificial limbs at the Solo Rehabilitation Center in Indonesia; and Project Hope has helped to establish and train the staff of a 50-bed orthopedic clinic in Jakarta.

But, according to Dr. Walsh, this is only a beginning. He says:

> There is no limit to the work that needs to be done and there is no change in our concept that floating teaching and training ships are the basis of our operation.

With new frontiers opening throughout the world for millions of people in the newly developing countries, we find that we can prove to these nations that Americans remember the stresses and the strains of our pioneer days. The good ship *Hope* is a symbol to all of southeast Asia that Americans are willing to help the new countries learn to help themselves. It is through the teaching and training aid of dedicated American medical personnel, like Dr. Walsh and those now aboard the SS *Hope I*, as well as those who will board her in the future, that we can show the vision and the idealism of our way of life. And, in order to help millions of other persons Project Hope looks to 1961 to outfit *Hope* vessels for Africa and South America.

Project Hope sponsors its vessel through the contributions of individual Americans as well as through the financial assistance of American business, industry, labor, and civic organizations.

Consequently, in presenting this resolution of commendation, I ask my colleagues to vote unanimously for its passage and to let Americans, as well as the people of the world, know that we are all together in backing this most humanitarian work—Project Hope and the SS *Hope I*.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> Whereas the need for ever-increasing peaceful, humanitarian cooperation between the peoples of the United States and the people of other nations of the world is apparent; and
>
> Whereas under the authorization of the President of the United States the United States Navy has furnished a mothballed hospital ship to the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, under private charter; and
>
> Whereas the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, has engaged and staffed and equipped the hospital ship *Consolation*—now known as the steamship *Hope I*—as a floating medical training-teaching center currently serving in southeast Asia; and
>
> Whereas the chief purpose of this undertaking, called Project Hope, is to bring to the medical professions of these developing nations the latest skills and techniques developed by the American medical and dental professions; and
>
> Whereas the medical ship is staffed with medical personnel selected from among the top men and women of our medical, dental and health professions; and
>
> Whereas the $3,500,000 needed to staff and operate this hospital ship for a year is being raised from private sources throughout the country; and
>
> Whereas Project Hope has received the enthusiastic support of Government, industry, business, labor, the medical and dental professions and private citizens throughout the country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Project Hope be commended as another step forward in increasing good will throughout the world and in bringing the people of all nations together in a bond of mutual trust, friendship, and cooperation.

INVESTIGATION OF AMERICA'S GOLD LOSS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for a study of our Nation's balance of international payments, with a view to determining the extent of its imbalance, recent changes that have occurred in it, the causes of such changes and the significance of these factors in terms of our gold reserves, the maintenance of a sound economy, and the realization of the goals spelled out in the 1946 Employment Act.

Mr. President, the reason for such a study and investigation is plain. In recent months wide public attention has been focused on various aspects of the U.S. balance of payments, and on the outflow of gold from our banks and reserves. It is essential that Congress and the public be fully informed with respect to this situation. Only after careful study of all the relevant factors will it be possibe to know what measures may be desirable. If legislation is called for, it should be enacted only after very careful, thorough, and thoughtful study.

Since 1950, the United States has been spending more abroad than other nations have spent here. Thus our international payments have long been out of balance. Until 1958, the American deficit was not alarming, averaging about $1 billion per year. During the period when the free world as a whole was experiencing a dollar shortage this small imbalance was probably healthy. It enabled our allies, particularly in Western Europe, to build up their foreign exchange reserves of dollars and gold, which in the period after World War II were so low as to make ordinary international trade very difficult.

Beginning around 1958, however, this *mild imbalance* in our international payments sharply worsened. In that year the United States paid out $3.4 billion more than it took in. This imbalance was accompanied by a gold outflow of $2.3 billion. In 1959 the deficit in our balance of payments was $3.7 billion, and the figure for 1960 is approximately $3.5 billion. Substantial losses of gold accompanied both these unfavorable imbalances. In 1960 for the first time since World War II possible foreign claims against the U.S. supply of gold exceeded our domestic gold reserve. Residents of other nations now hold claims on the dollar which amount to more than $21 billion, while our gold stock stands at around $18 billion.

Questions have been raised and new proposals advanced in several areas connected with our balance of payments. Among those which Congress should study and investigate are these:

First. In recent months there has been strong speculative pressure on gold at the expense of the dollar. At one point in mid-November heavy trading in the London market caused the gold price to rise to $41 an ounce, $6 above the established price. In the opinion of British analysts there continues to be a substantial and widespread demand for gold, which is reflected in a persistent slow rise in the gold price, in spite of the fact that the Bank of England has been releasing into the market gold purchased from the U.S. Treasury. It has been reported that part of our gold stock has been leaking into the hands of private hoarders. If this should continue it could result in a serious snowball effect, leading to loss of confidence in the dollar as a store of value. The study and investigation which I am proposing would provide full information on the nature and extent of the pressure on gold.

Second. The cost in dollars of maintaining our Military Establishment abroad and financing our foreign aid programs has stood between $4 and $5 billion per year for the past several years. How much of this total dollar cost results in a net loss of gold is not at present known. We do not have precise figures on how much of the approximately $1.5 billion which we give each year as nonmilitary grant aid is in the form of dollars. The amount expended for offshore procurement, roughly one-third, does require dollars. But an overall statistical picture of the balance of payments consequences of these programs is not at present available. This is a subject about which precise information should be made available.

Third. It has been proposed that payments in kind be substituted where possible for dollar payments, to finance foreign aid and military support costs. We do not know to what extent this could be accomplished without interfering with other goals of these programs. Nor do we know what effect this would have on our balance of payments. This is another subject on which the study and investigation which I am proposing could cast light.

Fourth. In November, President Eisenhower issued directives designed to cut overseas expenditure by ordering home 284,000 of the 484,000 dependents of American servicemen overseas. It is not immediately clear how much of a saving will result in terms of dollars and gold from this shift in policy. To the extent that the military dependents use goods and materials shipped from the United States, the cost of maintaining them overseas is not a drain on our gold and dollar reserves. It has been pointed out that many of the servicemen affected may attempt to keep their families with them. If these families decide to live overseas, even though military facilities are no longer available to them, the directive could result in an actual increase in the outflow of gold and dollars. The ramifications of this Presidential directive need careful study and investigation before their consequences for our balance of payments can be understood.

Fifth. At the same time the President sent Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson and Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon on an unsuccessful mission to Bonn to obtain West German financial assistance to pay support costs of U.S. troops in Europe. A number of conflicting statements about this mission have appeared, but it is clear that it did not succeed in its primary purpose. It has been reported that the State Department and the Treasury did not see eye to eye on the advisability of making this request in the form it took. The pros and cons of this argument have by no means been fully explained. If a contribution from the German Government is now considered necessary to reduce the imbalance in our international payments, then it would be helpful to know what further steps are being taken in view of the lack of success of the Anderson-Dillon mission. Congress has a duty to inform itself with regard to this situation.

Sixth. At the end of 1960 the Ford Motor Co. invested some $357 million in its British subsidiary. This is one of a large number of recent examples of American firms investing capital overseas. It was reported that high officials in the administration attempted to dissuade the Ford leaders from taking this step, coming as it did on the heels of the Eisenhower directives to reduce the dollar costs of maintaining our forces in Europe. It is argued that a large percentage of direct foreign investment of dollars usually returns to the United States to purchase American capital equipment and exports. At a time of serious and widespread domestic unemployment it is not clear that this kind of capital movement is wise. The consequences, both long and short run, for our balance of payments also stand in need of clarification.

Seventh. On January 14, President Eisenhower prohibited the holding of gold overseas by American citizens and businesses, effective June 1. This is another action prompted by the deficit in our international payments and the accompanying gold outflow. Its effectiveness as a means of combating our payments deficit and gold loss cannot be determined without additional information concerning foreign reactions.

These actions of our Government have caused considerable concern and unease both at home and abroad. It must continue to be a cornerstone of our policies to insure that confidence in the dollar is not impaired. Full and accurate information about the exact state of affairs can help maintain that confidence.

During the 86th Congress the Banking and Currency Committee conducted a study and hearings pursuant to Senate Resolution 105, which I introduced, calling for an investigation of the investment of U.S. capital overseas. Hearings took place on July 13, 14, and 15, 1959, and were published under the title "U.S. Private Foreign Investment." They served to make available information on the scope and impact of such investment.

Private investment overseas is one aspect, and an important one, of our balance of payments. Other subjects which should be studied in connection with an investigation of our balance of payments position include: interest rates, especially those on short-term securities; bank reserve requirements; the nature of

the international gold market; American-owned gold overseas; and related subjects.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution, for consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 65) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the unfavorable balance of international payments with a view to determining (1) the extent of the imbalance in such payments, (2) the changes which have occurred therein in recent years, and (3) the causes thereof and their significance in terms of the gold reserves of the United States Government, the maintenance of a sound domestic economy, and the realization of the goals set forth in section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY (S. DOC. NO. 9)

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the inaugural address of President Kennedy be printed as a Senate document.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2) to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] (for himself and other Senators) on January 5, 1961, and the bill (S. 378) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] (for himself and other Senators) on January 13, 1961.

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

SUPPORT IS GIVEN TO FUELS STUDY RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy, was introduced January 9, 1961, by the Senator from West Virginia now addressing the Senate.

In the period since the date of introduction, the number of cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 has reached 46.

Likewise, in the interim period the Journal of Commerce on January 18, 1961, carried the fact that the American Petroleum Institute and the Independent Petroleum Association of America concurred in general to the proposed fuels study. The National Coal Policy Conference previously had endorsed it.

Today, I am informed that substantial segments of the major fuels industries have consulted and are agreeable to recommending establishment of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study.

I am informed further that spokesmen for the coal, oil, and gas industries will appear jointly before the committee to which Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 will be referred and at such time will recommend agreed language. This is good news because it presages the elimination of all prior major obstacles to the accomplishment of a national fuels study as a basis for the possible establishment of a vitally needed national fuels policy at an earlier date in history than otherwise might have been anticipated.

Also, I point out that, on January 17, 1961, a Kennedy-Johnson Advisory Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by Representative FRANK SMITH of Mississippi, issued a report which was said to have been endorsed by over 100 Members of Congress and which declared:

Long-range energy resource development objectives based upon forecasts of need and public interest should be established by the Federal Government. A national energy and fuels policy to guide Federal agencies responsible for resource development should be enacted by Congress.

Mr. President, in view of these important developments, and in order to accord our colleagues additional time to evaluate all factors involved, I ask unanimous consent to have Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 remain at the desk through Friday, January 27, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask further for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, the Journal of Commerce news stories to which I previously referred.

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

OIL INDUSTRY OFFERS SUPPORT TO FUELS STUDY

(By Lewis Brigham)

The Nation's oil industry has made a major switch in position and now appears ready to take part in a study of U.S. energy resources, although it still retains its opposition to some aspects of the study which it feels are inimical to its long-range welfare.

The abrupt change in oil thinking was disclosed in a letter sent President-elect Kennedy by Frank M. Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute.

SUPPORT PROMISED

In his letter, Mr. Porter promised the incoming administration full support of any "impartial and objective investigation of our energy position."

But at the same time the API head reiterated oil industry opposition to end-use controls on fuel which would stake out certain portions of the Nation's energy market as a special province for specific fuels.

Over the past few years, the coal industry has generally been recognized as seeking legislation which would lead to this sort of fuel-market allocations. Coal spokesmen have cited declining production and severe unemployment in coal mining areas of the country in seeking support for such fuel study measures.

SEVERAL STUDIES

In his West Virginia primary race, President-elect Kennedy promised support of such a fuels study. Since his election, Mr. Kennedy has also received reports from several special study groups backing the fuels policy investigation.

Because of the pressures building up for a study, oil industry officials were understood to have decided early this week in Washington that the study was inevitable. Accordingly, it was felt the industry should participate in it.

In his letter to President-elect Kennedy, Mr. Porter promised support of any "impartial and objective investigation of our energy position."

LETTER QUOTED

"As producer and supplier of over 70 percent of the energy needs of the Nation," the letter said, "the American petroleum industry is keenly aware of the importance to this country of the continued availability of low cost and abundant fuel resources."

He said the industry in the past had participated in similar studies, and would continue to do so whenever the President, the Congress, or the public deems them necessary.

"However," he said, "while any objective study of energy resources is fully in accord with the public interest, certain recent proposals urging that such a study be designed to create a so-called new, 'national fuels policy' are subject to grave question and are the source of deep concern to many segments of the industrial community and the public."

CITES COAL ROLE

Mr. Porter said the leading supporter of fuels policy proposals was the coal industry "which through legislative flats and the imposition of Government-enforced 'on-use controls' hopes to gain advantages over its competitors, despite the overwhelming consumer preference for a cheaper and more convenient oil and gas."

Mr. Porter referred to a statement by the National Coal Association which said Government action would enable the industry to sell more coal and which endorsed a national fuels policy as an integral part of such action.

INDUSTRY VIEW

He said any policy that forced consumers to switch to less desirable fuels would be dangerous to the public well-being and inimical to the principles on which this Nation and its economy are founded.

"The petroleum industry has long taken the position that the Nation's policy of free consumer choice among competing fuels is in itself a successful fuels policy, and that only within the framework of an economy free to grow and compete can the best interest of the Nation be served and the problems faced by it be met," the letter said.

"Regardless of the route decided upon or the body assigned to the subject by the President and/or Congress, the petroleum industry stands ready to offer its fullest cooperation and participation."

BACK STUDY PLANS

HOUSTON.—Independent oil and gas producers backed congressional efforts to study the Nation's fuels policy, it was announced after an executive session here.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America said it never opposed such a study and will back efforts to assure "sound energy policy."

It said there have been many proposals, citing those in Congress and reports to President-elect Kennedy, but did not specify which of them it would support.

IPAA said that the United States' "energy supremacy" is at stake.

Meanwhile in Congress, Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, father of unsuccessful bills to end utility regulation of the gas industry, told the Journal of Commerce he favors a fuels policy study.

Mr. HARRIS' testimony last year before the House Rules Committee was considered influential in killing a coal-sponsored move to set up a joint committee to look into fuels policy.

PRAISED BY COALMEN

The National Coal Policy Conference praised the American Petroleum Institute and the Independent Petroleum Association of America for favoring a fuels policy study, it was learned.

NCPC, speaking for coal producers, marketers, workers, and railroads, said it hopes the oil groups will back Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 setting up a joint congressional committee to make the fuels study.

The proposal urges that the information developed by such a committee would lead to specific legislative recommendations.

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. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement by him before Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1, the area redevelopment bill of Senator DOUGLAS, dealing with the importance of enacting distressed areas legislation.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts of address delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations.

TRIBUTES TO VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the finest things that can be said of any man is that he is an intelligent and hard worker. That simple, direct statement expresses the many praiseworthy attributes which have been typical of Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. President, I have known Vice President Nixon for more than 14 years of his long and useful career. I knew him, first, as a Member of the House of Representatives; later, as a Member of the U.S. Senate; and, for the last 8 years, as the Vice President of the United States, and, therefore, the President of the Senate.

During World War II, Vice President Nixon served with distinction in the Armed Forces of our nation.

Vice President Nixon has made outstanding contributions by his display of dignity and courage while he has represented our country abroad.

This Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude for the help he has given in uncovering international communism and the international Communist conspiracy which existed in some high places.

I am sure everyone acknowledges that in presiding over the Senate, Vice President Nixon has generally been impartial and fair in his rulings. At no time during the 8 years he has occupied the chair have any of his rulings been reversed, following an appeal.

Vice President Nixon's family life has been exemplary and outstanding.

Thus, Mr. President, as Dick Nixon leaves public office, he can be proud of a job very well done—first, in the House of Representatives; subsequently, in the Senate, as one of its Members; and, during the last 8 years, as Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate. Certainly his outstanding services are deeply appreciated by all American citizens, of both political parties. I am sure he appreciates the statements made by Senators on both sides of the aisle in paying him tribute.

Mr. President, undoubtedly in his new endeavors, Dick Nixon will demonstrate the same courage, the same conviction, and the same leadership that he has shown so outstandingly throughout the years we have known him.

As he puts aside his official duties, Mrs. Bridges and I wish him and his gracious and charming wife, Pat, Godspeed and a happy and fruitful future.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, and though we will be unable to so address you outside as well as inside this Chamber, your contributions to the United States and the Republican Party over the past 14 years may be summed up in one word: Dedication.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and then the Senate, you dedicated yourself to the preservation and expansion of the traditions of this Nation. Through your work as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, you helped to awaken America to an internal threat which few believed could happen here. It was my privilege to serve with you as a Member of this body for 2 years, and then, as now, your energy and determination marked you for success.

Your record of the past 8 years is well known to every American—the trips and tours abroad, the unending study and illumination of issues at home, the campaigns of 1952, 1956, and 1960. Caracas, Moscow, Warsaw, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles—there are many names and cities and dates that come to mind. Most significantly, Mr. President, your public career has coincided with the emergence of the United States as the leader of the free world. Your efforts have helped to lead her there and to keep her there.

But all of this is past—and the best is yet to come. My colleagues and I are not tolling the end of a career, but listing a few of the accomplishments of a man who has been a leader and who will continue to be a leader of his country and his party.

None of us can predict the future, but one thing is certain, Mr. President: The coming decade holds great promise, and its promise will be fulfilled through the leadership of men like yourself.

THE VALIANT WARRIOR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in their tribute to you. I shall treasure the many years which we have shared in the House and then later here in the Senate.

Your service and dedication throughout these past 8 years as Vice President of the United States and as Presiding Officer of this body have earned the respect and admiration of those of us who have been fortunate enough to be Members of the Senate during these years.

The American people and peoples all over the world have a deep sense of gratitude for your labors for the cause of peace; labors which I am assured you will as diligently pursue in the future as you have in the past.

I shall particularly cherish our personal association during these years of service together. First was membership on the Select Committee of Foreign Aid, the so-called Herter Committee which went to Europe in the fall of 1947 to study the needs for economic rehabilitation of the war-devastated countries and our reports which provided the background for congressional action to terminate some of the ill-advised limitations on postwar recovery and to lay the framework for constructive action.

That was followed by our joint service in the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1949 and 1950, marked by successful enactment of the Internal Security Act.

And then, our common experience in becoming candidates for the Senate which again brought us together in this body in January 1951.

Through both the House and the Senate, I took pride in the growing responsibilities assigned you and was glad to be among those who applauded your selection as the vice-presidential nominee in 1952.

In your service as vice president, you have abundantly displayed courage to a very high degree. You shrank from no assignment. You comported yourself with a clear sense of responsibility yet, modestly, participated in the emergency situations that confronted you in the illness of the President. Your administration of your duties of Presiding Officer of the Senate was accomplished with a sense of fairness and impartiality that won and deserved the respect of every Member.

As you now retire from these halls, Mr. President, I would like to suggest that you are worthy of a term similar to that which was given another candidate for the Presidency some years ago, who, although he did not win the election, left the scene with the sobriquet "The Happy Warrior."

I should like to say that in my book, Mr. President, you will always be "The Valiant Warrior," and I express the hope that it will not be too long before you return to the scene of active political endeavor.

Now as you are about to enter private life, may I extend to you best wishes for success in whatever you choose to do. As recent indications show, South Dakota, as always, has the welcome mat out for you. We should be pleased to have you honor us with your presence whether in the scenic Black Hills and the Badlands or the wonderful Missouri River Valley country with its chain of great lakes or the prairie country with fertile farms and teeming towns and cities. Come anytime, Dick; the welcome mat is always out.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Vice President Richard M. Nixon, by offering words of praise and appreciation.

Here, in Richard Nixon, we have the kind of greatness which has become a symbol of American opportunity and achievement. Here we have one born to humble surroundings. He worked in his father's general store. Early in life he learned the lessons of hard work, thrift, and the kind of life which builds moral character. He attended public schools like most American boys. From early in life, Richard Nixon had high ideals and, like the typical American boy, high ambition. His story is a Horatio Alger story.

One cannot talk about Richard Nixon without mentioning his wonderful wife, affectionately called Pat. Pat Nixon worked in hospitals and department stores to gain a college education, and, after her marriage to Dick, taught school to help him through his law course.

By their own efforts, the Nixons rose in esteem and prominence. While still quite young, Richard Nixon was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, then to the Senate, and then to the Vice-Presidency.

He is still a young man. I am sure the best part of his life is ahead. He has much to offer a troubled world. The world is going to hear a lot about Richard M. Nixon for years to come. Of that, I feel sure.

To Richard Nixon, whom I am proud to call "a friend," I say farewell for now.

NOMINATION OF STEWART LEE UDALL TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in commendation of the action of the Senate on Saturday in confirming the nomination of Stewart Udall to be Secretary of the Interior.

I know of no nomination which more typifies the spirit of President Kennedy's new administration of new frontiers than that of Stewart Udall. Coming from that part of our country which historically has breathed the spirit of frontier challenges, Stewart Udall, during his years as a Congressman, distinguished himself by becoming one of the foremost authorities in this country on our natural resources.

Stewart Udall brings freshness of vision, zeal of spirit, and a disciplined determination to this position. We can surely expect from him new programs for a new age. I heartily endorse the nomination of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak in commendation of the action of the Senate on Saturday in confirming the nomination of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior.

There is no person in this country more erudite in the entire field of natural resources than this outstanding man. No one has perceived more clearly or expressed more eloquently the fact that the many problems associated with our natural resources are in truth God-sent opportunities.

This country can look forward to a new era and a new spirit in this country's development of its national riches under Stewart Udall. My congratulations to our new Secretary of the Interior, and also my sincerest pledge of close cooperation.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP FOR POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the history and progress of our country depends, to an inestimable degree, upon the many unsung heroes who serve us individually, and as a people.

Today, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to one such corps of unsung heroes in our national life—the police officers of America.

Upon these public servants, we depend greatly for the attainment of the goals set forth in the preamble of our Constitution, that of insuring domestic tranquillity.

As sentinels of law, order, and domestic peace, these officers protect life and property; promote safety; and generally serve as a major stabilizing force in the community, providing a real sense of security for our citizens.

However, these patrol officers of our highways and byways of life do not have an easy beat.

Their services, all too often at inadequate pay, involve duties of great sacrifice and dedication, including the imperiling, and sometimes loss, of life.

Over the years, commemorative stamps have been issued to honor individuals or groups, playing a significant role in our national heritage.

Recently, I received a letter from Michael T. Feider, State secretary of the National Police Officers of America, Wisconsin chapter, recommending the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring policemen in communities throughout the country.

A tribute of this nature, I believe, would be a well-deserved recognition of outstanding public service, enhancing respect for police officers individually, and it would also stimulate a higher public esteem for the system of law and order in the Nation.

Commemorative stamps, of course, are chosen by citizens advisory committees, and then issued under the auspices of the Post Office Department.

I sincerely, hope, however, that the advisory group will give favorable consideration to this well-warranted recognition of our police officers.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Secretary Michael T. Feider printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 16, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As State secretary for the National Police Officers Association of America, I urge you to support the resolution which will order the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the policemen in every community throughout the United States.

The National Police Officers Association of America has built a National Police Hall of Fame which is located in Port Charlotte, Fla. This shrine has been erected to the memory of our valiant dead. We feel that the commemorative stamp should be issued from this building in appropriate ceremonies.

Thanking you for your support, I remain,

Respectfully,

MICHAEL T. FEIDER,
State Secretary.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, President Kennedy's first official order directing Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to increase the distribution of food to poor people is most commendable.

It is my earnest hope that Secretary Freeman will not confine this increase to what are now surplus commodities such as cornmeal, flour, and powdered skim milk, but will include in the distribution program such protein foods as meats and dairy and poultry products, as well as fresh fruits and vegetables, when available.

I am sure he has both the legal authority and the funds with which to do this at least for the most distressed people and areas.

Such a course would do more than merely reduce want in distressed areas and among individuals elsewhere. It would be an economic booster, providing more business for processors, more markets for farmers, and more employment for all. It would serve to reduce the accumulation of surplus grains through increased feeding of poultry and livestock.

In the long run, this program, aimed at reducing want and improving health among American people, will prove to be less costly than a program which merely suffices to keep body and soul together for several million deserving but unfortunate people.

For almost 20 years I have been urging a program of this sort. I am glad that President Kennedy has shown that he possesses the foresight to order it effected.

I do not expect it to end distress and be fully effective all at once. It will have

to be developed carefully, and possibly some legislation may be needed later.

With the backing of the President, Secretary Freeman has a great opportunity to apply a program which will raise both our social and economic standards to a higher level and at the same time permit our farmers to continue to produce bountifully and without the fear of stricter Government regulations and controls.

I will say that President Kennedy has started out on the right track.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for what he has just said, because I know how long he has worked over the past years—I may say the past decade—to bring about the culmination of a program of this kind. I am particularly gratified that President Kennedy has seen fit to follow this procedure and to put the program into operation so soon after his inauguration.

RECENT TUGBOAT STRIKE IN NEW YORK

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the tugboat strike in New York has now been settled, but only after it paralyzed the Northeast and caused intolerable inconvenience and hardship to commuters, including 30,000 in Connecticut, who are dependent upon train service to travel to work.

This unfortunate dispute has dramatized the need for better ways of settling differences between labor and management, and for preventing strikes which make the public at large their victims.

A thoughtful editorial in the Hartford Courant of Friday, January 20, entitled "Something Is Wrong," reflects widespread public indignation because of strikes of this kind. I commend it to all, but particularly to the attention of my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

SOMETHING IS WRONG

There is something radically wrong with a social system that allows a handful of strikers to disrupt the transportation of a third of the country inconvenience millions of people, and threaten the food supplies of our largest city.

There is something radically wrong with three small unions that have no more sense of responsibility than to launch a guerrilla war against the whole eastern seaboard. And why? Over the question whether there should be five men, needed or not, on every railway tugboat in New York harbor.

There is something radically wrong with labor leaders who allow this to happen. There is indeed something wrong with a government that is helpless in the face of such a situation. Or with a people who will tolerate such helplessness.

Only 664 men are members of the three marine unions that started the strike against 11 railroads serving the immense transportation complex in New York. In one of those fantastic, nightmarish moves that mark too many union operations today, this handful was given the dutiful support of other unions, and so brought basic operations in the most thickly settled part of the United States to a standstill.

For a whole generation now the position of labor has been secure. No one in his right mind would seek again to make it insecure. Indeed, we can now see it as a shame that the ownership and management of past generations were so insensitive, so shortsighted, as to leave labor no way to achieve a decent life except to resort to industrial warfare. And warfare is what a strike is. But it is one thing to strike a single plant. It is another to strike a third of a nation—to empty the Hartford railroad station because of a tugboat dispute in Manhattan.

We hear much nowadays about the social responsibility of labor. It is about time we saw some of it. It is obvious, indeed, that we need to rethink our whole philosophy about relations among labor, management, government, and the public. Repeatedly in the postwar years we have seen management in such big industries as steel and automobiles make the mistake of simply resigning itself to labor demands for ever more. Labor should get more. But it should get no more than is justified by its fair share in increased productivity. When management has accepted labor demands beyond this it has passed along the cost to the public. And so the vicious wheel of inflation was given another turn until we suddenly find our gold draining away and our goods priced out of the world market.

If this situation requires a new statesmanship on the part of management and labor, and perhaps new legislation as well, its beginning must be a realization that at least in the big national industries, and also in complex situations like that in New York harbor today, the strike is outmoded.

Through a long and bloody history Western man learned that a system of impartial courts achieved justice far more readily than allowing adversaries to club each other over the head. Once upon a time labor had no recourse but to club management on the head. But today it clubs not only its adversary but a vast general public as well. And that is what must be stopped.

Surely it is time we learned how to use justice rather than force in labor disputes. Whether through negotiation or arbitration or labor courts, or some wholly new way of having third-party experts settle these issues on the basis of facts, there must be a way. We cannot much longer tolerate such outrages against public decency and commonsense as the present strike in New York, and the nationwide strikes that have preceded it. And if labor does not assume responsibility for realizing the harm it is doing, then it risks having an outraged public lose its perspective and strike back. And then we are likely to see not the new and just philosophy of labor relations our complex society demands, but a retrogression into the bitterness of the past.

DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we know, last Wednesday evening Dr. Thomas Dooley died in New York City. His loss is deeply felt by all who knew him, and knew of him—for he was one of the Nation's most distinguished young men.

Dr. Dooley was a native of the State of Missouri. He was also one of those rare Americans who was truly a citizen of the world.

His work among the peoples of southeast Asia is already a legend. Humanity, vigor, and tenacity characterized all that Tom Dooley did. He treated the sick in jungle villages; he built hospitals; he found time to write three books; and he toured this country raising money to support an expanding group of hospitals and medical facilities in the less fortunate nations of the world.

Dr. Dooley himself once remarked about his travels and constant work, "I figure what I have crammed into my life makes me really 65."

When he was stricken by cancer, Tom Dooley said, "I am not going to quit." He had the judgment and foresight to make this statement come true. His work will go on.

The organization which he founded, Medico, is made up of men and women with the dedication and spirit of Dr. Dooley. Under their guidance, Medico will continue to bring the blessings of modern medicine to sick and unfortunate peoples throughout the world.

This is what Tom Dooley wanted. His ideas, his projects are moving ahead.

His loss is deeply felt by everyone. But we are all very fortunate to have had such a man among us.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, the following editorials: "The Beautiful American," from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 20, 1961; "Exemplar for a Generation," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 20, 1961; "Thomas Dooley, Humanitarian," from the Kansas City Times of January 20, 1961; "Dr. Thomas A. Dooley," from the Washington Post of January 20, 1961; and "Dr. Thomas Dooley," from the Washington Star of January 20, 1961.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 20, 1961]

THE BEAUTIFUL AMERICAN

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep.
And miles to go before I sleep."

In 6 short years, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley became one of the best known and best loved Americans in the world. Now he is dead.

Wednesday night, at Memorial Hospital in New York, cancer did what tropical diseases, primitive jungles and sometimes deep discouragement couldn't do—it stopped this zealous, energetic young St. Louisan who set out to show a sometimes doubting world what Americans are really like.

Tom Dooley, bright, handsome and born with a silver spoon in his mouth, found what he wanted to do in life aboard a U.S. Navy transport in the Gulf of Tonking. There the U.S.S. *Montague* was picking up refugees fleeing from North Vietnam Communist troops.

The refugees were wretched, fearful and often bore on their bodies the marks of the cruel treatment dealt to them by the Red soldiers. There, amid the poverty-striken and mutilated, Tom Dooley decided to help.

He ran the Navy refugee camp at Haiphong, healing the sick, comforting the afflicted, harboring the homeless. Through his efforts, hundreds, perhaps thousands, who would otherwise have been too ill or too weak for evacuation, made the journey to freedom.

When the Communists took over Haiphong, Dooley and the three Navy corpsmen with him stayed till the last refugee left. Later, they returned to Laos to continue their work. To extend the benefits of American medicine to other far, neglected corners of the world, he and Dr. Peter Comanduros founded Medico.

At a time when our nationals abroad were being depicted in a popular bestseller as the "ugly" Americans, Dr. Dooley soon became known as "the beautiful American." His courage, charity and idealism made that somewhat embarrassing compliment inevitable.

Early in his life, the words quoted above from the poem of Robert Frost made a deep impression on the quick-witted, quick-tempered, warm-hearted Tom Dooley.

"I am not going to quit," he said, when he arrived a few weeks ago at Memorial Hospital for treatment of the malignant cancer that killed him. But before it did, Tom Dooley kept magnificently his promises to himself, to his God and to humanity, and traveled many, many miles before he slept.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 20, 1961]

EXEMPLAR FOR A GENERATION

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley's 6 years as a doctor in Asia form a substantial offset to the indifference and irresponsibility which are the themes of those who deplore the "postwar generation" and its gadget-dull future. With the practice of a "society doctor" open to him, young Tom Dooley was on the U.S.S. *Montague* when she picked up the first refugees from beyond the Bamboo Curtain. After that, he never was away very long from the sick, the hungry and the uprooted. His concern for them was the beginning of Medico, now responsible for 17 projects in 12 countries.

To write this "success story," he used the methods of contemporary success-hunters—books, radio, and television appeals, appearances at dinners and conventions. He did not hide his light under a bushel, but the methods were transformed by his purpose. And he was understood. A little more than a year ago he told the Missouri State Teachers Federation that "you must arouse in your students a sense of duty toward all men." This was not a hat-passing occasion, yet the audience spontaneously showered the platform with money.

Dr. Dooley might never have become a philosopher like his model, Dr. Schweitzer. He probably would not have found time. He was a man who had encountered the sight, sound and smell of poverty, pain and fear—and he would not turn from them. This is a thought for keeping in bounds the not unjustifiable good feeling which comes with writing a check to help work such as Tom Dooley's.

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 20, 1961]

THOMAS DOOLEY, HUMANITARIAN

Dr. Howard Rusk of New York University called Dr. Thomas A. Dooley "the splendid American." The splendor was not of pomp or fortune, but of humility and dedication. The selfless career of young Dr. Dooley must go down in history as one of true compassion toward fellow men.

An articulate and talented youth from St. Louis, Dr. Dooley had the promise of a brilliant future in medicine. But he abandoned personal ambition and wealth for the jungles of southeast Asia. Within 5 miles of Communist China, he healed weary and broken refugees who had escaped from tyranny.

The profound experience that changed his life came in the mid-1950's. Assigned as a naval doctor to help evacuate exiles, he learned firsthand of the shocking suffering and multiple needs of an impoverished region. Promptly he decided to give his life to the cause. After building his first hospital in Nam Tha, he wrote and lectured to gain funds for new medical centers. Even after cancer put his life in danger, he carried on his jungle work.

With the death of Dr. Dooley, suffering humanity in southeast Asia lost a friend. A reverent man, his was the spirit of human charity. As a modern apostle of good will, he went "to heal the sick." The world is better because of Dr. Dooley.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1961]

DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Dr. Tom Dooley was an exemplar of the American humanitarian impulse at its best. He was a showman and promoter of sorts, but a showman and promoter for a cause beyond himself—that of the refugees from communism in Vietnam, or of his hospital at Muong Sing in the mountains of northern Laos, or of Medico, the organization he helped found to take medical care to the people of remote countries where it is not available. The slim young doctor, now dead of cancer at 34, lived altogether too short a life; but it was long enough to enable him to carry a bright gift of concern, brotherhood, and practical assistance to thousands of human beings who might not otherwise have known them.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 20, 1961]

DR. THOMAS DOOLEY

Youthful Tom Dooley is dead, but his selfless good works for the sick and maimed in far parts of the world will be long remembered. More than that, the memory of what this dedicated doctor accomplished in providing hospital and medical care for the victims of disease in Laos, in Kenya, and in other distant places should inspire others to carry on the work he started.

It was Dr. Dooley's fate to be cut down at 34 by one of the diseases he had battled in others—cancer. Even when it became clear to him and to his own physicians that the dread killer at work in his chest could not be stopped, Dr. Dooley continued to raise funds for new clinics and hospitals. In fact, he redoubled his efforts in apparent realization that he must make every minute count. "I am not going to quit," he said after being flown back to a New York hospital from Hong Kong last December. "I will continue to guide and lead my hospitals until my back, my blood, and my bones collapse." He did just that. The American people will join with those of many distant lands in mourning the untimely passing of this zealous benefactor of suffering mankind.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I think it is well that we take a few minutes to note that January 22 marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. These proud and gallant people maintained their independence for just over 2 years until the Russian Communists overran the country in 1920. However, the spirit of nationalism and fierce dedication of the Ukrainians to the ideals of freedom and justice has lived on despite the Communist yoke.

Americans of Ukrainian descent everywhere, including my State of North Dakota, celebrated this anniversary last week in a fitting and solemn manner. Under the leadership of Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, North Dakota president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as well as under his predecessors, these people have long carried the banner of freedom which they cherish so much. Their devotion to the cause of liberty is a source of inspiration to all Americans.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, January 22, the Ukrainian people celebrated the 43d anniversary of their independence. On this date, in the year 1918, they threw off the centuries-old yoke of Muscovite domination, and proudly proclaimed themselves a sovereign nation.

But their freedom was short lived. A few years later the Bolsheviks hurled the Red army against the newborn Ukrainian state. The Ukrainian people resisted bravely, but they were vanquished by overwhelming odds. Night again descended on this heroic and long-suffering people.

There has been too great a tendency to accept the Soviet Union as a monolithic state. The Soviet Union is not a monolith, but a gigantic prison house of nations, where men are persecuted as individuals and where peoples are persecuted as peoples. And the chief of the imprisoned nations within the confines of the U.S.S.R. is the Ukrainian nation.

The Ukrainian people have never reconciled themselves to the Bolshevik regime. Time and time again they have resisted—and resisted to the death. Five million Ukrainians died resisting the forced collectivization in the thirties. They rose again against the Bolsheviks during World War II. Even in recent years, the Soviet press has been constrained to admit that Ukrainian guerrillas were still active.

Let us remember these things when Khrushchev threatens the West with nuclear blackmail; and let us remind Khrushchev that we are aware of these things.

We have made a practice of observing Ukrainian Independence Day on the floor of the Senate, and it is fitting that we should do so.

It is fitting that we should join with the millions of Americans of Ukrainian descent who today commemorate their day of liberation.

It is fitting that we should tell the 35 million Ukrainians, who groan under the cruelest yoke in their history, that we have not forgotten them, that we do not accept their enslavement as final, that we are confident the sun of freedom will again shine on them and that they will take their place, as is their God-given right, among the community of sovereign nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in pride mixed with sorrow, Americans of Ukrainian extraction and friends of liberty everywhere yesterday observed the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The democratic Ukrainian Republic was established in 1918 after the Ukraine had remained for more than 2½ centuries under the authoritarian rule of Czarist Russia. But this welcome flowering of freedom was unhappily short lived. Less than 3 years later the Ukraine was overrun by the Communist armies, and the Ukraine remains today, against its will, a Soviet Socialist Republic.

Despite all suffering and oppression, the Ukrainian people have shown great

strength and resourcefulness, and the desire for liberty burns as fiercely as ever in their hearts. In the light of this spirit, and in tribute to the outstanding Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko, Congress last year authorized a statue of this patriot, long the acknowledged spokesman of national independence of the enslaved Ukrainian nation.

In noting the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, friends of liberty are serving notice that the valiant struggles of the Ukrainians have not been forgotten. With the support of liberty-loving peoples everywhere, those who cherish Ukrainian freedom so dearly, persisting through all adversity, must yet see the realization of their fondest hope, a brighter future for their beloved land.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence is marked this week in official proclamations, in words uttered in Congress and elsewhere, and in the hearts of all who hope that the Ukraine will once again join the free nations of the world.

The anniversary is an important event because once again it reminds us of their hope. It reminds us, too, that the frontiers of freedom are not lines on a map; they exist wherever men have the power to maintain freedom or to seek its return.

I would like to join, therefore, with those who specifically ask the world to remember that the Ukraine won its independence 43 years ago, only to lose it soon afterward. When we remember this and other occasions when the aspirations of a free people were smothered by the expansionist policies of the U.S.S.R., then we are better able to understand the reasons for Premier Khrushchev's propaganda campaign against "colonial powers." He is attempting to throw a smokescreen over the history of his own nation while he presents imagined or actual abuses by other nations. We should be capable of making the distinction between truth and reality in this dispute.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, yesterday in Seattle and countless other communities in America, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America observed the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. I should like to take this opportunity to join other colleagues in calling attention to this anniversary of the proclamation which set forth the national desires and aspiration of the Ukrainian people to be free.

The observances in American communities are by those of Ukrainian descent who enjoy the blessings of liberty and freedom within our shores. Theirs is an expression of sympathy and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

We are familiar with the valiant fight of the freedom-loving people of the Ukraine, who despite being overrun by Communist troops of Moscow have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to press for their liberation. It is only proper that we note this occasion and our high regard for the Ukrainian people who have demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, since time immemorial, the rugged and industrious Ukranian people have lived in their historic homeland, the fertile country extending from the Black Sea to the heart of today's Poland. Throughout their long history theirs has been an endless struggle in defense of their freedom. They fought valiantly, against heavy odds and powerful adversaries, but in the end, in the mid-17th century, they were brought under czarist Russia. Since then, except for the brief but glorious period of 1918–20, freedom and independence have been denied to the unfortunate people of the Ukraine.

The democratic forces let loose by the First World War and the Russian revolution of 1917 offered the Ukranian people the long-cherished chance to free themselves. In the midst of that war, on January 22, 1918, while their oppressors were preoccupied with fighting, they proclaimed their independence. A year later, when western Ukraine was freed from Austro-Hungarian rule, both eastern and western Ukraine formed a united Ukrainian National Republic. Thus, on January 22, 1919, the national dream of the Ukrainians was realized. They attained their independence as a united nation. Unfortunately, however, this period of joy and jubilation did not endure.

The freedom promised and proclaimed by the Russian revolutionary leaders proved to be devoid of meaning, and no sooner had they established themselves in Russia than they began to pursue the oppressive policy of the czars. In the fall of 1920 the Red army overran the Ukraine and put an end to the Ukrainian National Republic in October of that year. Then Ukraine became a Soviet Socialist Republic, thus placing the fate and fortune of some 40 milion Ukrainians into the hands of Communist leaders in the Kremlin.

For four decades the Ukraine and its stouthearted, liberty-loving people have been a reluctant and unwilling part of the huge Soviet Empire. They are part of the Soviet Union, but they fervently cherish their freedom and independence. On this 43d anniversary of their independence day we hope and pray for the realization of their dream, freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

BROADWAY PRESENTATION OF "ADVISE AND CONSENT"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the outstanding book "Advise and Consent," written by Mr. Allen Drury. Like all of my colleagues, I had read the book and enjoyed it immensely. But just last week it was my pleasure to have had the opportunity to see the play by the same name now showing in New York. Naturally I sat through the performance in a critical mood, first as a Senator trying to see how others would depict this body, and second, as a reader of the book to see how closely the play would follow its excellent portrayal of the Senate and Government. I am happy to say that on both counts the score is superior.

The play gives the viewer the feeling that he is actually sitting in the U.S. Senate, so closely and accurately do the players follow the customs and traditions of this body. I know that it is not usual to extol the virtues of a Broadway production on the floor of the Senate, but because this one is so outstanding and because it concerns this body, I feel it perfectly proper to stand this morning as a Member of the Senate and commend this play highly to my colleagues.

CANDIDACY OF SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently our esteemed colleague, Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, announced his candidacy for reelection in 1962.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has brought to that group a lifelong experience in banking which has been invaluable during consideration of bills by that committee.

He serves with equal distinction on the Armed Services Committee. I am sure that all Senators will agree that the editorial which appeared in the Greenwich Times on January 3, 1961:

> What is apparent, however, is that Senator BUSH is among the best Senators that ever represented Connecticut in Washington. We are happy to see that he has removed an uncertainty about his future plans.

That feeling seems to prevail across the great State of Connecticut, and I have selected a few of the many editorials that have appeared in the newspapers of that great State extolling the virtues of Senator BUSH, and indicating a unanimous opinion among the people of the State of Connecticut that they are happy that Senator BUSH will seek reelection.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Waterbury American-Republican, Dec. 31, 1960]

HAT IN THE RING

Republicans in particular, and thousands of Connecticut people who hold to other political convictions, will be delighted to know that PRESCOTT BUSH, of Greenwich, U.S. Senator from Connecticut since 1952, has announced his intention to run for reelection in 1962.

For Senator BUSH has proved, in many ways, that he has the interests of the whole State of Connecticut at heart, and especially with respect to Connecticut's position in the national picture.

He was first named to the upper House of Congress in a special election in 1952, and was reelected for a full 6-year term in 1956. His plurality in that year, 130,894, exceeded all previous totals recorded in this State by a candidate for the U.S. Senate of either party.

During his service in the Senate, Senator BUSH has received national recognition as an authority on Government finance, and

as an effective advocate of fiscal responsibility in Government and of measures to curb the rising cost of living. Since 1953 he has been a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. For 4 years he has been a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works in the 83d and 84th Congresses, he was the author of legislation to permit closer cooperation among the New England States in dealing with flood control problems. He also played a leading part in the drafting of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which authorized construction of a national system of interstate and defense highways.

The Senator has also showed particular interest in the problems of slum clearance and urban renewal. He has assisted many Connecticut towns and cities in their urban renewal and redevelopment programs. As a result of his interest, Federal grants totaling almost $100 million have been earmarked for 25 Connecticut communities. Today Connecticut has per capita the largest renewal program of any State in the Nation.

Frankly, we are delighted that Senator BUSH has announced at this early date his candidacy for reelection; that he has not seen fit to play the coy politician. Not that we would have expected such from him. He is too much an honest man to play the coy role. We hope that he will be nominated and reelected. He has given his State and his Nation exemplary service. He is entirely deserving of reelection.

[From the Greenwich Times, Jan. 3, 1961]

BUSH ANNOUNCES

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH is a credit to the Nation, the State, and the town. He has served and is serving the people of Connecticut extremely well and we are happy that he has decided to continue his distinguished career in Washington.

Despite Senator BUSH's statement in December that he was "weighing a decision" as to whether he would seek renomination, we never had any doubts he would seek another term. His formal announcement on Friday that he will run in 1962 is good news for the Republican Party and for the people of Connecticut whom he has served so well.

There has been a great deal of speculation about 1962, especially since Gov. Abraham Ribicoff will not be a factor. Some were of the opinion Governor Ribicoff, had he not been named to a Cabinet post, would have run against Senator BUSH.

There are extreme partisans in both the Republican and Democratic Parties who would consider it heresy for a party member to admit that someone in an opposition party is good. These are narrow-minded, small people. It is interesting to note that Senator BUSH, in the course of Friday's news conference in Washington, praised the appointment by President-elect Kennedy of Governor Ribicoff as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He said Ribicoff's appointment "is one of the better ones. He is able, with a broad political background and experience in health, education, and welfare matters."

It is well known that Governor Ribicoff has a high regard for Senator BUSH's ability. The two men, despite political differences, highly respect each other.

Regardless of what the political experts say, no one knows at this time what will happen in 1962. The contest for the Senate seat will depend on the man selected by the Democrats. It will depend on the political atmosphere 2 years hence. It will depend on a great many factors not now apparent. What is apparent, however, is that Senator BUSH is among the best Senators that ever represented Connecticut in Washington. We are happy to see that he has removed an uncertainty about his future plans.

[From the Hartford Courant, Jan. 3, 1961]

SENATOR BUSH ANNOUNCES HE WILL RUN AGAIN

The announcement by Senator BUSH that he plans to seek reelection in 1962 is good news. Senator BUSH never engages in the pettier kind of publicitymaking. Instead he has been a hard-working, intelligent, and forthright Senator. History shows us, however, that this is not always enough to insure reelection. The Nation's highest legislative forum has often enough been the goal of some of the country's most energetic demagogs. Senator BUSH falls into that other category of Senator, a man dedicated to doing what he considers to be the right thing. Nor is he a rubberstamp, as some representatives in Congress become on election. While he has kept in contact with the electorate, in signal contrast to some other recent Republican officeholders, he has in the final moment made his own decisions.

In a fully matured country, with a completely thoughtful electorate we would have an end to the nonsense of voting tables compiled by the various pressure groups to indicate the degree of subservience to their advantage of each representative in Congress. And that is precisely what these tables show, subserviency rather than rightness. Senator BUSH rarely scores high on these tables, because he follows the ancient and honorable tradition of making up his own mind.

One may not always agree with Mr. BUSH. But there can never be any question as to how he arrives at his decisions, and what matters he considers important in reaching them. Paramount at all times is his belief in what he considers to be right and most advantageous for the country, not for any special group.

As an honestly avowed candidate to succeed himself, Mr. BUSH now has 2 more years in which to inform the electorate as to his record and the reasons why he should be reelected. One must be realistic and agree that his chances have been greatly enhanced now that Governor Ribicoff has withdrawn from State politics to assume a seat in the Cabinet. Mr. Ribicoff was a real threat to Mr. BUSH's reelection. Pending further developments, his withdrawal, leaves the field open to several others who are perfectly willing, but who have nothing like the pulling power of Governor Ribicoff.

Senator BUSH has been a member of the important Armed Services Committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has become recognized as an authority on Government finance. His range of interest has been wide and diversified. He is an active advocate of fiscal responsibility in Government, and at the same time has taken an especial interest in the national slum and urban renewal programs, among other things.

Senator BUSH is a broad-gaged man in every sense of the word. He has been a Senator of which this State can be proud. If we know what is good for us, we shall reelect him 2 years hence.

[From the Meriden Record, Jan. 9, 1961]

SENATOR BUSH'S CANDIDACY

The announcement by U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH that he will be a candidate for reelection in 1962 is good news for the people of Connecticut and for the Nation.

Senator BUSH has served with credit in the U.S. Senate for 8 years. He has distinguished himself by his forthrightness and his courage in support of progressive legislation. He has won the admiration and respect of colleagues of both parties. At the same time he has served his own Republican Party well by his enlightened leadership. Senator BUSH has been in the vanguard of progressive Republicanism, a position which has not always endeared him to some of the diehard elements within the party.

Regardless of whom the Democrats may nominate to oppose him—and there are some able Democrats who are eligible—the voters will do well to heed Senator BUSH's personal qualifications, his record, his experience, and the advantage to his constituents arising from his seniority in the Senate.

It is good to know that Senator BUSH will run again. The people of Connecticut are fortunate to have the opportunity to vote for such an able and diligent public servant.

[From the New Haven Register, Jan. 1, 1961]

SENATOR BUSH DECIDES TO RUN AGAIN

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH's decision to run again for the U.S. Senate in 1962 is good news for Connecticut.

The Senator has given this State effective representation in Washington for the past 10 years, and his early announcement assures Connecticut citizens of both parties that they will continue to receive vigorous, forthright, and fair spokesmanship at a time when the new Kennedy administration poses something of a challenge for all lawmakers.

It will be a long time between this weekend's announcement and the 1962 campaign. But the Senator's hat in the ring is more than a declaration of intent for Republican ticketmakers. It reminds Connecticut voters of the fact that there is now a fortunate balance in this State's Republican-Democratic representation in the Nation's Capital—and it invites them to consider a retention of Senator BUSH's basically conservative viewpoints at a time when experiment, and innovation, and heedless dollar juggling may well become the order of the day. We welcome Senator BUSH's renewed candidacy.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is the first that I have heard definitely that Senator BUSH is a candidate for reelection, and I join with the Senator from Arizona in congratulating the State of Connecticut upon its desire to have him serve another term.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] said the other day, "Me, too."

The distinguished record of the senior Senator from Connecticut is well known to all of us. He has conscientiously and ably served his Nation and State for many years, and I certainly hope that privilege will be accorded him, and that benefit be extended to his State and Nation for many years to come.

MEMORIALS SHOULD MAKE PEOPLE AWARE OF THE MAN

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, last summer I took occasion to express some thoughts on what might or might not make a worthy memorial to Theodore Roosevelt. It will be recalled that others did likewise. In the end, the Congress agreed to my suggestion that the living children of the 26th President should have a veto on any design accepted for placement on Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Within the past few weeks plans for another memorial have been unveiled for another Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Models and drawings are currently on display at the Corcoran Art Gallery downtown. I hope all Senators may see them.

Whether they do or not, however, I think all Senators will find it worth while to read the observations of George Kennedy who writes the very readable column in the Washington Evening Star under the heading "The Rambler."

I hope all memorial committees will heed the thought expressed in the Rambler's closing paragraph:

Let's insure that future generations will not go away from the memorial unaware of the man for whom it was constructed.

Whether for President or player in baseball's Hall of Fame, that is a sound and prudent guideline.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

THE RAMBLER—PONDERS ON MEMORIAL FORM

(By George Kennedy)

What form should a modern memorial to a great leader take?

That question became paramount yesterday in viewing the models and drawings entered in the contest for a design for a Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial to be erected in West Potomac Park between the Tidal Basin and the river.

The models are being exhibited by the American Institute of Architects in the Corcoran Gallery.

The show opens today with some ceremony.

But William F. Pederson, the winner of the $50,000 prize, will not be on hand. His office is in New York.

In the days of the New Deal, leaders of commerce and industry had an understandable complaint that the Washington atmosphere was not friendly to business.

Apparently Mr. Pederson feels, with much justification, that the Washington atmosphere is not friendly to modern art or architecture.

His suggested monument has been mockingly called a 20th-century Stonehenge, after the prehistoric megalithic memorials, to something everyone has forgotten that rise from Salisbury Plain.

Creative spirits are very sensitive. I am sure Mr. Pederson has been hurt by the reception accorded his design. The $50,000 prize he won is insufficient balm.

As Henry Dorra, assistant director of the Corcoran, suggested yesterday, Pederson's team—there are a landscape architect and a sculptor in on the plan—probably spent more than that working on their design.

You can realize that when you see the model and the drawings submitted.

As everyone knows by this time the suggested memorial is a number of stone hinges (that's as good a term to describe them as any) of various breadth and height. The largest ones will be over 165 feet high.

They would make an interesting addition to the Washington skyline where everything conforms to the classical except the towers of the old Smithsonian and a few steeples.

The drawing states that they are to be "incised"—I like that word—with the writings and speeches of F.D.R.

What should a modern memorial be? Lincoln sits comfortably within his colonnade. Jefferson stands nobly in his rotunda.

If bronze were used F.D.R. with his legs in painful braces could be coming down the ramp of his plane with the long cigarette holder and the famous smile that showed his indomitable spirit.

But that's out. Anything representational is not modern. None of the drawings I examined suggested a sculptured figure.

A Mr. Barnett of the Corcoran staff pointed out that several of the contestants had been shooting in the same direction as the winner. One suggested a number of masonry pylons (for want of a better word) of varying rectangular cross section and varying height.

Apparently pilgrims could enter rooms in the bases. The lettering on the drawing suggested that this memorial would provide for vocal and visual reproduction of the great events in F.D.R.'s career.

Now to this journalistic mind that suggestion makes sense.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was Governor in New York when the great change came in the movies—sound.

Sound was immediately successful in the newsreels. There used to be little theaters that showed newsreels only.

More than 10 years ago selected newsreels were strung together into a full-length movie called "The Roosevelt Story." It was a good picture for those interested in recent history.

Let the monument take what form distinguished architects and laymen decide on. But let's not be content with the great F.D.R. phrases "incised" in stone. We have something more modern than that.

Let's make use of it to insure that future generations of schoolchildren visiting Washington will not go away from the memorial unaware of the man for whom it was constructed.

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on January 11 I reported to the Senate on the hearings in the case of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. I reported that on that precious day the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security had been presented with proof that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee had, from its inception, violated the Foreign Agents' Registration Act, and that Mr. Robert Taber, the head of the committee, had acted in collusion with the Castro government and had committed perjury when he testified before the subcommittee on May 5.

In the same statement, I replied to some of the lying charges that had been made in Harper's magazine by the British playwright, Kenneth Tynan; and I took Harper's to task for printing this mendacious and clearly libelous article without troubling to check on the facts.

I also pointed out in my statement that the real purpose of Mr. Tynan's article was not so much to defend himself as to ridicule the subcommittee's investigation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and to turn public opinion in this country and abroad against the Senate subcommittee.

Finally, I pointed out that many American editors, because they accepted Harper's as a responsible and authoritative magazine, swallowed Mr. Tynan's mendacious account and wrote columns criticizing and ridiculing the subcommittee.

I regret that some of the prominent national newspapers which featured Mr. Tynan's libelous attack on the subcommittee and, accepting it at face value, criticized the subcommittee editorially, failed to devote a single inch of space to my rebuttal. I am not so much hurt by this unequal treatment as I am baffled. Apparently the rule is that when a Senator is maligned by a fellow-traveling British playwright, it is news. But when the same Senator attempts to defend himself by proving conclusively that the fellow-traveling British playwright has lied on point after point, it is not news.

I am happy to report, however, that there were many American newspapers that dealt with the entire matter fairly and that responded with indignation when the facts about the Tynan article were made public. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks two of the several editorials that have already come to my attention—the first from the Ansonia, Conn. Sentinel of January 13, the second from the Stamford, Conn., Advocate of January 14.

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

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, Jan. 14, 1961]

SENATOR TOM AND THE UGLY BRITISHER

Senator TOM DODD, when he was conducting a hearing for his Senate Subcommittee on Subversion, called on a British drama critic, named Kenneth Tynan, to explain his activities in connection with something called the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In the course of questioning, some of Mr. Tynan's other activities, especially a British TV program which presented such Americans as Arnold Johnson, a Smith Act Communist, Clinton Jencks, head of a union expelled from the AFL–CIO for being Communist-controlled, and Alger Hiss, were explored. Mr. Tynan was indignant. The very idea of even being questioned about his activities threw him into a tizzy. He thought the whole thing beastly.

When he returned home, he wrote an article about the episode. This article, full of typical fuzzy thinking, and some downright inaccuracy, was published in full in Harper's magazine. When Senator TOM protested, Harper's, in fairness, gave him its editorial columns for rebuttal. He used the space well.

He bearded the intellectuals in their own literary den, and came off a clear winner. By the time he had used his razor on the argumentative clothing of Mr. Tynan, this personification of Socialist thought was so cut apart that even Harper's felt it necessary to come to his aid, despite his opportunity for reply.

The editor decided he had had enough of the whole thing. He yelled uncle by falling back on an attack on the purpose of the congressional committee. This resulted in the suggestion that, in committee, the legislative branch takes on judicial and police powers which break down the boundaries between the three branches of Government. This argument had nothing to do with the Tynan affair, but we always thought that the right of a congressional committee to ask questions, so that it could draft legislation, had been adequately tested. We are sure that Senator DODD, a former prosecutor of Nazis, would never violate his constitutional restrictions.

Affairs of this sort are unfortunate. They paint a sort of ugly Britisher picture of our most important ally. But we are sure that most Americans wouldn't dream of judging all Englishmen by the antics of a drama critic who used such questionable taste while a guest on our shores. At the same time, we are pleased with our Senator. He met the liberals on their own field, with their weapons and emerged with all the honors.

[From the Ansonia Sentinel, Jan. 13, 1961]

SENATOR DODD'S STRONG CASE

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, appears to have vindicated the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee from the charges made against it by British Drama Critic Kenneth Tynan in Harper's magazine last October.

A full-page advertisement had appeared in the New York Times, sponsored by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, defending the regime of Fidel Castro. The Senate Committee, in the course of an inquiry to determine if the advertisement violated the Foreign Agents' Registration Act, invited Mr. Tynan to testify before it. It had a right to assume that, as one of the signers of the advertisement, Mr. Tynan might be in a position to enlighten the committee as to its origin and financing. Later Harper's magazine published an article by Mr. Tynan entitled "Command Performance," portraying himself as an injured innocent unjustly haled before a barbarous and ludicrous inquisition. On the strength of this article, the Senate committee was widely pilloried.

In a reply to Harper's, which that magazine limited to a letter to the editor, Senator DODD presented a rebuttal of Mr. Tynan's article protesting his interpolation of questions never asked by the committee. The Senator's original reply was refused as being too long and the one he was finally permitted to make, the following January, had to be screened by a battery of the magazine's lawyers and accompanied by an agreement to hold Harper's free from all harm if Tynan sued for libel, a precaution the Senator doubts was taken with Mr. Tynan's article.

The Senator's reply was followed by a reply by Mr. Tynan and by a comment from Harper's editor, who did not discuss the merits of the Senator's reply but pontificated that congressional investigations have done more harm than good, which as far as we can see had nothing to do with the matter at issue.

This week the Senate Internal Subcommittee heard testimony by Dr. Santos-Buch, one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, that he and Robert Taber, the head of the FPCC, had met with the Cuban ambassador to the United Nations and had received $3,500 to pay for the Times advertisement, which is contrary to earlier testimony by Mr. Taber.

Senator DODD declared on the floor of the Senate that this testimony had demonstrated the need for congressional inquiry and he charged that a widespread effort had been made to turn opinion here and abroad against the Senate subcommittee, of which there can be little doubt.

It is certainly an advantage to the American people if it has been demonstrated that funds of the Castro government were used to brainwash American opinion at a crucial period of our country's relations with a regime which from its inception has shattered the longstanding friendship with the United States, and continues to picture our country and its people as the No. 1 enemy of the Cuban people, which they are not, and, what is more, has reduced Cuba to a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean and a base for the subversion of Latin America with especial animus toward the United States of America.

One wonders if there is not emerging a design to pillory Senator DODD in the same manner that others before him have been pilloried. One suspects that if this develops, American people's sense of fair play will want to know why.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there is a little footnote which I should like to add here to my report on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The subcommittee has been seeking to serve Mr. Taber with a subpena to appear before it and reply to questions in the light of the testimony given by Dr. Santos-Buch on January 10. Mr. Taber, however, has not been available for service. Indeed, he seemed to have disappeared entirely from the New York scene.

He did not make a scheduled appearance on a radio program, and his position as Secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was filled by a substitute, Mr. Richard Gibson.

Within the last several days there has been a press report that Mr. Taber is in Havana and that he has requested asylum from the Cuban Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, long ago I used to hear a song entitled "Muldoon Was a Solid Man." That is a great expression, Mr. President. A solid Member of the Senate is having a birthday anniversary today. He is FRANK CARLSON, one of our most distinguished Members, the Senator from Kansas.

He has the distinction of living in the State in which he was born. In this mobile age that is something of a distinction.

He has served in the House of Representatives, he has served as Governor of his State, and he now serves in the Senate. He exemplifies what I like to refer to as a good definition of progress. It is the constant, intelligent, undramatic application of life on what is the constant loyalty and devotion to duty, and taking life in the stride that will go to improve it. So I salute FRANK CARLSON on his birthday.

I shall not disclose his age, out of shyness and timidity, but I salute him on his birthday.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show my desire to extend happy birthday greetings to our friend FRANK CARLSON. When we served together in the House of Representatives, his district and mine were alongside of each other. I have known FRANK CARLSON for a long time. One could say many very fine things about this kind, Christian, effective statesman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to add a word in expressing birthday greetings to my colleague, FRANK CARLSON. He was a great friend of mine long before I came to the Senate. He has remained a close friend. He has done many kind things for me, and I am delighted today to express my affection for him. I hope that he and his fine family will enjoy happiness and prosperity for many, many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in what they have said about FRANK CARLSON. Like the distinguished minority leader, I served with FRANK CARLSON in the House of Representatives, and it has been my pleasure since then to serve with him in the Senate. There is nothing flashy about FRANK CARLSON. I am glad that there is not, because he is a fine, solid citizen, and a decent man. If I could describe him with one word I would say he is a gentleman. The Senate is better off because of a man like FRANK CARLSON.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the fine encomiums they have put on the record about Senator CARLSON. I agree he is a gentleman. More than that, however, he is a hard worker. More than that, he is a good thinker. More than that, he is a good friend. I believe it is one of the fine things that we do on the Senate floor, especially after the brainstorms we get at times, to take time out to say kind and true things about one of our associates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to express my felicitations to Senator CARLSON on the occasion of his birthday. My own contact with him goes back about 12 years, when he was Governor of his State, and I was Governor of the State of Ohio. I had an opportunity to observe the metal out of which he is made, in my contacts with him as Senator and as Governor. I express commendations to him on his birthday. I thank him for the services which he has rendered to his country. He is a man of extraordinary stability. He has the courage to state his views. My belief is that he has subordinated himself and has elevated his country in the consideration of all the problems that have come before him.

I wish for him many more birthdays and many years of good health.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I wish to join in the remarks which have been made about our good friend, Senator CARLSON, of Kansas. I do not know of any other Senator who has been thrown closer together with him than I have been for the past 10 years. He is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. At one time he was chairman of the committee, during the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, in 1953 and 1954. Prior to that time I was chairman of the committee, and since that time I have been chairman and he has been the ranking Republican member of the committee.

He and I have been thrown close together. I know what he is made of, and what a fine character he has. He and I have worked together in the committee at all times, and I have found him to work for what he thought was in the best interests of the people of the United States.

So it gives me a great deal of pleasure to wish him well as he passes another milestone. My only wish today is that he may have many more birthday anniversaries, that he may live even longer than some of the older Senators who have served in the Senate, and that he may have health and strength in the future. That is my wish to him on his birthday anniversary today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has called our attention to the fact that this is the natal day of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I extend to the Senator from Kansas my congratulations and felicitations.

In my State we have a mountain known as Stone Mountain. We proudly

boast that it is the largest solid block of granite in the world. When we wish to pay ultimate tribute to the stability, honesty, and forthrightness of a man, we say he is as solid as Stone Mountain.

I say with respect to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that he is as solid as Stone Mountain. In the lexicon of my State, no higher tribute can be paid to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I certainly second what the Senator from Georgia has said with respect to the Senator from Kansas. I suppose, and I hope, that I might refer to Mount Rushmore in the same way as the Senator from Georgia has referred to Stone Mountain. The Senator from Kansas could be given a similar tribute in my State by referring to him as being as solid as the granite of Mount Rushmore.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that a short time ago, while I was called out of the Chamber, several Members of the Senate extended felicitations and congratulations on my birthday.

I wish to say that these birthdays are coming too often; they are getting closer together.

But I do appreciate the kind remarks which were made; and I shall read them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MULTIPLE SPONSORSHIP OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the 85th and 86th Congress I carried on a one-man crusade for a modification of the rule which permits dual sponsorship of legislation. I doubt whether Senators are actually aware of the confusion and difficulty with which the Journal clerks and other employees of the Senate must cope simply because of the multiple sponsorship of proposed legislation.

My resolution will be before the Committee on Rules and Administration once more, and I hope other Senators will join me in getting the rule modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on the statement made by the distinguished minority leader with respect to his resolution dealing with multiple sponsorship of bills and resolutions. I have watched this practice grow in the years since I first became a Member of the Senate. When I first came to the Senate there was no such thing as multiple sponsorship by Members of the Senate. When a Senator introduced a bill, those who believed in the purpose of the bill supported it, and those who did not believe in it, opposed it. As it is today, I have watched Senators who have introduced a bill, going around to other Senators urging them to sign their names to it as cosponsors.

It has been one of my toughest tasks since I have come to the Senate to adhere to my decision not to join in multiple sponsorship of legislation. I have been terribly embarrassed at times. In fact, my distinguished colleague from Georgia has introduced bills of which I am strongly in support, but, due to my position on the matter of multiple sponsorship I have refrained from joining him in introducing those bills in the Senate.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that multiple sponsorship adds anything to the bill itself. Nothing is added by a large number of Senators sponsoring a bill. Certainly such a practice detracts from the work of the individual Senator who has prepared the bill and who is the real inspiring force behind it.

I wish we could, not only for the sake of our hard-pressed staff, but for the sake of the Senate itself, get away from the practice of saying, "Well, now, I have 51 names on the bill; I shall introduce it."

There is not a Senator who has not been embarrassed at one time or another by multiple sponsorship, if he has engaged in it very widely, because we find things in bills that we did not know were in them.

I have seen distinguished Senators rise to the floor and say, "I signed the bill as a coauthor; but after hearing it discussed I am convinced that I cannot support it."

With the exception of bills relating to one State, where the two Senators from that State sign it, or in the case of one Senator from each party, at least, I see no occasion for multiple sponsorship of bills. I realize, though, how difficult it will be to do away with the practice.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the observations of the Senator from Georgia with respect to the joint sponsorship of bills and resolutions. I entirely agree that it is a bad practice. For some time, I resisted it. However, I must confess that when I found I was being asked by many constituents and others, "Why do you not join in the sponsorship of such and such a bill? Your colleague has and Senator So-and-So has. Are you not in favor of that proposed legislation?" it led me on occasion to ask that my name be added to their bills; and also I have sought to make it possible for others who might want to do so to join with me in the sponsorship of proposed legislation by asking that bills or resolutions remain at the desk for that purpose.

However, I do not believe it is a good practice. There have been occasions when, as the Senator from Georgia has said, a Senator has had his name placed on a bill because he was in favor of the general purposes of the bill, only to learn that some particular provision of the bill was not in accord with his beliefs, or to have the bill reported by committee amended in such a way that it was hardly recognizable. Then he would be obliged to make a statement on the floor that he could not support the bill on which his own name appeared. It seems to me that that is unfortunate.

It is unfortunate from another aspect, namely, the apparent standing a bill may be given from the statement that there are 30 names on the bill, before it has had any committee hearings.

I believe it would be desirable to abolish this practice by adopting a rule which would prevent joint sponsorship except when a bill or a resolution pertaining to something for one State alone might be sponsored jointly by the two Senators from that State, or by one Senator from each party.

It might be remembered that the distinguished former Vice President, the late Senator Barkley, of Kentusky, was very outspoken in his belief and convictions against this practice, and submitted a resolution to forbid it.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for submitting his resolution and bringing the matter up. It is a matter which deserves the consideration of the Senate in the interest of the integrity of proposed legislation, and I hope the resolution will have widespread support.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not only does this particular subject involve a situation in which a number of Senators sign their names to a bill when many of them have not even read the bill; it involves pressure from out in the country. For years, I have followed the rule laid down by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Only recently it was said to me, "Oh, come on. So and so signed it." I have fallen for these requests several times, but I think the practice is a very bad one.

I can remember distinctly an occasion when the distinguished Senator from Georgia introduced a bill, and on the floor of the Senate we amended the bill. I heard the Senator from Georgia say on the floor, "Now, I shall have to vote against my own bill." That is one instance of situations which occur and which could be multiplied many times, if we are to continue the practice of multiple sponsorship of bills.

I sincerely hope we may adopt an amendment to the rules. The rule might provide, as has been suggested, that one Democrat and one Republican may sponsor a bill; or if it relates to the welfare of a State, then the two Senators from the State concerned might associate themselves in the introduction of such a bill. That would make a majority of three. I think that is more than enough. However, I think the practice of multiple sponsorship of bills is very bad. Persons have come to my office and said to me, "We want you to join in the introduction of a certain bill." I have said in the past, and I say again today, that when I get word from back home to the effect, "We want you to agree to this and agree to that," I say, "My dear sir, bills are referred to committees. I have sent bills to committees; and in committee they have been amputated and amended so that when they are reported, they are not the same bills."

Furthermore, on the floor of the Senate bills can be amended again. They then go to the House and go through the mill there. It does not make sense for us then to stand by and say, "That is my bill"; because it is not the same bill after it has been operated on. But if one's name is on the bill, and it is the same numbered bill, one gets credit for it nevertheless.

Of course, the practice continues of changing the nature of a bill in committee or on the floor of the Senate or in the House; and then the bill goes to conference.

I have had to explain many times to the people back home why I have not been willing to join as a cosponsor of bills.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to subscribe to the views expressed by several Senators who have spoken on this subject. In my opinion, no Senator ought to be subjected by a fellow Senator to the necessity of saying "No."

Whenever there is delivered to me a bill with a request that I join with a fellow Senator in its sponsorship, it requires that I give either an affirmative or a negative answer. To give an affirmative answer, I may have to subscribe to some of the provisions in the bill with which I do not agree. To give a negative answer, I must tell a fellow Senator, "No." In my opinion, I ought not to be subjected to that type of approach, requiring me to do what obviously is unpleasant.

Day after day into each Senator's office come bills. Many of them are sent there through the promotion of pressure groups. I know the bills in which I wish to join as a sponsor. I know what I believe is needed at any particular hour for the welfare of the Nation. I may be mistaken, but I believe I am just as alert to the subject as are my fellow Senators. I do not need the prompting of A, B, or C, suggesting that I join with them in the promotion of a particular bill. My fellow Senators ought to show me the courtesy of allowing me to determine whether I will join in the sponsorship of a bill, and they ought not to join in the common movement of trying to pressure me. For that reason I express the view that it would be a very healthy thing for this proposal of the Senator from Georgia to be given support by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire—if I am within the rules, and I believe I am—to make another brief observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). If no other Senator desires recognition in the morning hour, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to make another brief observation with respect to the question of multiple sponsorship, so that all our discussion of this subject will appear at one place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This whole procedure is in derogation of our legislative process; and if we continue to follow it, it will destroy our ordinary process of dealing with legislation. Here we have a bill signed by 60 or 70 Senators, although no committee hearings have been held on the bill, and there has been no discussion of the bill, and there has been no opportunity for any adversaries of the bill to point out any of its weaknesses.

As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has said, all of us receive letters in which we are asked, "Why haven't you signed this bill," and undertaking to commit a Senator in advance to some very intricate and complicated legislative proposal which he has not had an opportunity to study.

Ordinarily a bill is introduced and is referred to a committee, and in the committee it is subjected to hearings and to amendment, and then it is brought to the floor of the Senate; and it is thought that on the floor of the Senate, Senators will debate the issues involved in the bill, and that here, in the clash of mind with mind, we finally shall make the sparks of truth scintillate, and shall be able to determine the correct course in connection with the enactment of such legislation.

But it is becoming dangerous, and threatens our whole parliamentary system, when, on the basis of letters, 65, 70, or even a greater number of Senators commit themselves in advance of any detailed examination of a bill, as is our usual custom. If this practice is continued, it may finally lead to a situation in which it will be said there is no need for the Senate to meet; we could simply permit the pressure groups to travel about the country and persuade 51 or 52 or 53 Senators to sign a bill; and then it could be said, "Why have the Senate discuss the bill? A majority of the Members of the Senate have already signed it. Why have any committee hearings on the bill, inasmuch as a majority of the Senate have already signed it."

Mr. President, I think multiple sponsorship of proposed legislation is very dangerous; and I hope we recur to the old practice of the Senate, by means of which not more than two Senators could sign proposed legislation. Then let us thresh out the measures here on the floor, where we are supposed to settle such matters, rather than have multiple sponsorship on the basis of letters written to Senators.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I firmly believe there has developed in the Senate a technique by means of which lines of communication, supposedly running back home, are used to tell people to contact and pressure Senators to join in the sponsorship of particular bills.

I repeat my statement of a moment ago; namely, I believe it is a grave affront to the intelligence of a Senator even to request him to join in the sponsorship of a bill, when there is being built up pressure of the type described by the Senator from Georgia. Furthermore, of course, as the number of sponsors increase, if there are Senators who are hesitant about the bill, that hesitancy is likely to turn into a lack of courage, and that situation is likely to result in procuring their subscription to proposed declarations of law in which such Senators do not honestly believe.

I ask my fellow Senators on this floor today not to pressure me by asking that I join in the sponsorship of their bills. I shall join in sponsoring them when I feel there is a need to do so. I repeat that I beg Senators not to ask me to join in such sponsorship of bills. I think I have sufficient alertness to know what is going on; and if I wish to become a sponsor of a bill, I shall do so on my own volition, without being badgered and beaten into submission, following pressure to join in sponsorship.

SUPPORT OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the regions of our country which has suffered from long and persistent unemployment is the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan. In recent weeks there have been additional announcements of layoffs and closings by mining firms operating in the iron ore industry in this region.

Mr. President, the people and the communities of this area are deeply disturbed about the bleak prospects facing them in the months ahead. They look hopefully to the new administration and the Congress for speedy action on the area redevelopment bill. They are appreciative of President Kennedy's first act upon taking office, in ordering a substantial increase in the surplus food distribution program. But, above all, they want an opportunity to participate in programs which will bring new employment opportunities, through industrial and recreational development to the Upper Peninsula.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in my remarks copies of resolutions, letters, and telegrams I have received from the people of northern Michigan, expressing their desire to have an opportunity to help themselves.

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

"RESOLUTION BY GOGEBIC COUNTY

"Whereas Gogebic County is in dire need of economic assistance; and

"Whereas Gogebic County in the upper peninsula of Michigan has been steadily losing population, declining from 33,225 in 1920 to 24,370 in 1960, while the Nation has been growing rapidly in population; and

"Whereas followup studies of local high-school graduates over a period of 25 years reveal that upward of 60 percent of each graduating class leaves Gogebic County; and

"Whereas there has been sharp curtailment in the iron ore mining and lumber industries; and

"Whereas 30 percent of the Gogebic County budget is devoted to welfare costs; and

"Whereas the average unemployment figure in Gogebic County has averaged 14 percent during 1958, 1959, and 1960; and

"Whereas the economic trend of Gogebic County is downward and the list of direct relief recipients and persons unemployed continues to grow; and

"Whereas the basic industry of iron ore mining is importing foreign ore because of cheap labor costs and because of tax benefits given by the Federal Government and because the Federal Government has failed to recognize the need to take care of the local people as well as the foreign nations; and

"Whereas Gogebic County would be able to develop economically by development of the vast natural resources such as iron ore, copper, and timber that are located in Gogebic County; and

"Whereas a program of highway construction to further develop transportation resources into the county would help the economy greatly; and

"Whereas the availability of natural gas would assist the local economy; and

"Whereas a program of expanded vocational training for persons that have been displaced due to job demands would make available our large labor reserve for national employment or employment in service industries; and

"Whereas an expanded program of research and development of mineral resources, in wood products, and in the tourist industries would make available economic opportunities; and

"Whereas the Federal Government should divert and relocate defense industries for the national security of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of Gogebic County have paid substantial amounts in income taxes to the Federal Government without receiving any direct benefits, and further, that this money received from the citizens of Gogebic County has been used to support and develop foreign nations to the detriment of the people of Gogebic County; and

"Whereas there is a direct responsibility on the Congress of the United States to provide employment and work opportunities for the people of Gogebic County rather than the welfare programs and increased unemployment compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Gogebic County Board of Supervisors, That they request the Congress of the United States to give their support to the proposals of the special labor, management, Government program study group headed by PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois, and that congressional action be taken to implement these recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved That the Gogebic County Board of Supervisors request the Congress of the United States to support the Flood-Douglas bill that deals with the problems of areas of economic unemployment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Gogebic County Board high priority in any assistance given under distressed area legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered by William E. Carroll, Jr., to the Honorable U.S. Senators PATRICK MCNAMARA, PHILIP HART, and PAUL DOUGLAS, and that copies of this resolution be also delivered to U.S. Representatives JOHN B. BENNETT and DANIEL J. FLOOD."

I, Rudolph J. Egizi, clerk of the Gogebic County Board of Supervisors do herewith certify that the resolution, of which the above is a true copy, was unanimously adopted by said board at its meeting on the 13th day of January 1961.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said county, at the city of Bessemer, in said county, on this 13th day of January 1961.

RUDOLPH J. EGIZI,
County Clerk.

IRONWOOD, MICH., *December 5, 1960.*

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram sent to President-elect John F. Kennedy:

"DEAR SIR: May I extend my congratulations on your decision in taking immediate action on a program of Federal aid to chronic unemployment and depressed areas. Please permit me to call your personal attention to the desperate economic situation within the deep shafts iron ore producing districts of Upper Michigan. These districts were not directly mentioned in the AP news releases as were the Minnesota ranges. Our people would be gratified by your personal reassurance for full and complete consideration of Federal aid to Upper Michigan's iron producing areas under your proposed program. My best wishes for your personal success.

"Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH S. MACK,
"Michigan Democratic State Representative Elect, Gogebic-Ontonagon Districts, Ironwood, Mich."

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL, WAKEFIELD, MICH.

Whereas due to the critical unemployment situation which faces Gogebic County in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas the increasing unemployment situation has created a very unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition, not only in this area, but in other areas throughout the United States; and

Whereas the percentage of unemployment has risen above the 6½ percent mark which is required to determine a distressed area; and

Whereas the situation today requires the development of a program by the Federal Government which utilizes the talents of our young women graduating from high school wherein they will be prepared to act in any national emergency, such as an atomic war: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Wakefield, Mich., hereby appeal to the Honorable JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District Congressman, and to the Honorable U.S. Senators of Michigan, PATRICK MCNAMARA and PHILIP HART, to take immediate action to encourage the Federal Government to institute a specialized program to train young girls graduating from high school to be able to act in any national emergency requiring abilities including nursing, administration, etc. This type of program would help alleviate not only the unemployment situation in distressed areas, but also could be developed into a program whereby the entire United States would benefit; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given to Mr. William Carroll, Jr., which he may forward to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and to the Honorable Governor of Michigan, John Swainson.

MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL, WAKEFIELD, MICH.

Whereas there are approximately 1,000 unemployed in Gogebic County, and in the city of Wakefield, Mich., there are approximately 55 unemployed and a total of approximately 275 unemployed during the week the mines do not work; and

Whereas the city of Wakefield is not in a financial position to employ the number unemployed; and

Whereas the increasing unemployment situation has created a very unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition, not only in this area but throughout the entire Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas all of the efforts to alleviate this situation have met with meditative and negative results; and

Whereas a goodly number of the unemployed are veterans, and

Whereas the unemployment situation in this area needs immediate remedial action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Wakefield, Mich., hereby appeals to the Honorable JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District Congressman, and to the Honorable U.S. Senators of Michigan, the Honorable PATRICK MCNAMARA, and the Honorable PHILIP HART to take immediate action to secure Federal aid by setting up work programs to alleviate this unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and any of the other States in need of aid.

MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY CITY OF IRONWOOD, GOGEBIC COUNTY, MICH.

Whereas there are approximately 1,000 unemployed in Gogebic County, and approximately 500 unemployed in the city of Ironwood, Mich.; and

Whereas the city of Ironwood is not in a financial position to employ the number unemployed; and

Whereas the increasing unemployment situation has created a very unhealthy, serious, and distressed condition, not only in this area but throughout the entire Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas all of the efforts to alleviate this situation have met with meditative and negative results; and

Whereas a goodly number of the unemployed are veterans; and

Whereas the unemployment situation in this area needs immediate remedial action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Commission of the City of Ironwood hereby appeals to the Honorable JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District Congressman, and to the Honorable U.S. Senators of Michigan, the Honorable PATRICK MCNAMARA, and the Honorable PHILIP HART to take immediate action to secure Federal aid by setting up work programs to alleviate this unhealthy, serious and distressed condition in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and any of the other States in need of aid.

LUTHER C. SWANSON,
Mayor.

ABE N. LADIN,
HERBERT J. WILLIAMS,
EUGENE B. VELIN,
RAYMOND E. MANCHESTER,
LEONARD J. ERICKSON,
JOHN LASOTA, Jr.,
Commissioners.

PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS FOR IRONWOOD, MICH., JANUARY 1961

General: This report contains in general form public works projects which could be initiated to help alleviate the unemployment which presently exists in the Ironwood area.

These projects include storm and sanitary sewers, water mains, buildings, sidewalks, street projects, and flood control. In the winter, we could put many people to work immediately on flood control and in the summer, we could put many people to work on either flood control or on sidewalk jobs without too much delay due to advance planning, etc.

Sewer projects: The city of Ironwood has a pressing need for storm sewers throughout the city. It would be desirable to have a complete storm water collection system paralleling our sanitary collection system. For the present however, we have urgent need for the completion of 16 projects for a total estimated cost of $120,500.

Sanitary sewers:

Approximately 10 isolated sanitary sewer jobs at an average cost of $3,500	$35,000
2 booster pumps at $8,000 each	16,000
1 mine waste sewer with a settling pond	32,900
Total	83,900

Say, $85,000.

Water projects: We have several substandard water mains in Ironwood which should be replaced in addition to some new lines. Fifteen projects for a total of $100,500.

Parks: We have four park projects for a total of $15,000.

Buildings: The city needs a new storage garage, a new bandshell, and two new park buildings for a total cost of $55,000.

Sidewalks: Ironwood has very few adequate sidewalks. We could start crews to work on them immediately when weather permits—say, $75,000. This amount would not repair all the poor sidewalks by any means.

Street projects: We have recently completed a study in conjunction with the Michigan State Highway Department in order to determine our municipal street needs for the next 20 years. Approximately $750,000 worth of work could be incorporated into public works project.

SUMMARY

Storm sewers	$120,500
Sanitary sewers	85,000
Water projects	100,500
Parks	15,000
Buildings	55,000
Sidewalks	75,000
Streets	750,000
Total	1,201,000

In addition to the above figures, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has a flood control project slated for the Montreal River at Ironwood. No cost figures are available at present.

IRONWOOD, MICH., *December 8, 1960.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to use every possible means to include upper Michigan as an area of economic distress to be studied by the newly appointed committee headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS. We need an immediate program to correct current difficulties and a long-range program to develop our resources for the future.

PETER BENSONI,
Representative, United Steelworkers of America, Ironwood, Mich.

IRONWOOD, MICH., *December 9, 1960.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your cooperation and support to declare Gogebic County as a distressed area. Your help will be appreciated.

JOE SOLTIS,
President, United Steel Workers of America, Local 1922.

NOVEMBER 14, 1960.

Mr. JOE SOLTIS,
President, United Steel Workers of America, Local 1922, Ironwood, Mich.:

As you know President-elect Kennedy has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in northern Michigan. PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs. Would appreciate your keeping me informed of any other actions we might take.

PHILIP A. HART.

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, IRON COUNTY, MICH.

Whereas Iron County has suffered the loss of a number of mining operations within the past few years; and

Whereas it is felt that numerous other mining operations in this area will be closed in the near future; and

Whereas the economy of Iron County is primarily and directly associated with said industry; and

Whereas it is the belief of many that the cessation of mining operations is directly attributable in large part from the importation of foreign ores: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the County of Iron be designated as a distress area and Federal funds be appropriated for the purpose of reestablishing the economy of said Iron County; and be it further

Resolved, That Federal action be taken for the purpose of placing quotas on the importation of foreign ores; and be it further

Resolved, That Federal funds be made available for the purpose of establishing research projects for the increase in iron ore production so as to stabilize the economy of the area; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable John B. Bennett, Representative in Congress of the 12th Congressional District of Michigan and Senators PHILIP A. HART and PATRICK V. MCNAMARA.

HELEN JOHNSON,
County Clerk.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 2849,
Crystal Falls, Mich., November 19, 1960.

The Honorable PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: We, the undersigned, being all officers of the United Steelworkers of America, District 33, AFL–CIO, Local 2849, Tobin Mine, located in Crystal Falls Township, Iron County, Mich., at the request of the local membership, wish to point out to you the following facts:

The Tobin mine in Crystal Falls, prior to October 1957, employed 180 men, who were laid off at that time for a period of 18 months. In March of 1959 this operation reopened with a smaller staff and operated until June of 1960, at which time it again ceased operation. Since that time all of these employees were put out of work and there is no evidence of a reopening.

Most of the employees are over 40 years of age and too old to be considered for work elsewhere, according to present-day requirements in the mining industry. Practically all of the employees have necessarily used up their savings during this shutdown. In 1957 the Book and Warner mines, operated by the North Range Mining Co., also closed down in this area, laying off about 200 employees. Neither of these operations have reopened.

Being a small mining community, the loss of these three mines have dealt Crystal Falls a distinct economic blow, inasmuch as there is no other industry available for the hiring of these laborers. On the basis of this, it is our opinion that Crystal Falls is a distinct depressed area, and we are asking that you, as our representative in Congress, take whatever steps are necessary to obtain Federal assistance for a work program in the Crystal Falls area in the near future.

It is also our opinion that the importation of foreign ores, with yearly increased tonnage, is a direct cause for the present economic situation, and we, therefore, feel that there should be a reasonable tonnage limit on the importation of iron ore.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BROZAK,
President.
JOE T. BENDA,
Vice President.
WALTER SULASALMI,
Secretary.
ARVID J. MAKI,
Financial Secretary.
LOUIS KREMPASKY,
Treasurer.

DECEMBER 14, 1960.

Mr. JOHN L. BROZAK,
President,
Mr. JOE T. BENDA,
Vice President,
Mr. WALTER SULAVALMI,
Secretary,
Mr. ARVID J. MAKI,
Financial Secretary,
Mr. LOUIS KREMPASKY,
Treasurer
Local Union No. 2849,
United Steelworkers of America,
Tobin-Columbia Mine,
Crystal Falls, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your letter describing the situation and conditions existing at the present time in Crystal Falls. As you may know, President-elect Kennedy has appointed Professor William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in the Upper Peninsula.

PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs.

Do not hesitate to keep me informed of developments in the local employment situation in Crystal Falls, and I will do all I can to bring this situation to the attention of President-elect Kennedy.

Sincerely.

PHILIP A. HART.

MARQUETTE COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL,
Marquette, Mich., January 3, 1961.

PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Marquette County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, requests that immediate action be taken to relieve the desperate situation that exists in the iron-producing counties of nothern Michigan.

Men between the ages of 40 to 65, with up to 20 years service have been laid off. The recent curtailment in Marquette County alone has affected more than 600 families.

On January 3, 1961, the largest underground mine, Mather (A) in Ishpeming, Mich., will cease operation indefinitely. There has been a reduction in every mine on the Marquette Range.

In addition the Merger of the D.S.S. & A. and Soo Line has affected approximately 130 families. The E. J. Longyear Co. has transferred their operation to Minnesota. And the Munising Woods Products have gone out of business.

Because of the long and severe winters, we urge that immediate action be taken on a public works program. Also on a more adequate surplus food distribution program.

So you can see that our situation is very serious and any effort expended in our behalf would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

MARK FRENCH,
Recording Secretary,

MARQUETTE COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL,
Marquette, Mich., November 30, 1960.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Marquette County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, urges the establishment of a public works program for the Upper Peninsula of Michigan due to the curtailment of mining activities and also of construction during the long winter.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MARK FRENCH,
Recording Secretary.

DECEMBER 8, 1960.

PETER BENSONI,
Representative,
United Steel Workers of America,
Ironwood, Mich.
JOSEPH S. MACK,
Michigan Democratic State Representative-Elect, Gogebic-Ontonagon Districts,
Ironwood, Mich.
Mr. MARK FRENCH,
Recording Secretary,
Marquette County Labor Council,
Marquette, Mich.:

Pleased to inform you that President-elect Kennedy has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on Special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by

Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in northern Michigan. PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs. Would appreciate your keeping me informed of any other actions we might take.

PHILIP A. HART.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 2656,
Ishpeming, Mich., December 7, 1960.

Hon. PHIL HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Due to the fact, of the curtailment of work by the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., on the Marquette Range in the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan, the rank and file of Local 2656, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO of Ishpeming, Mich., at a meeting on December 4, 1960, made a motion that the recording secretary send you a letter urging immediate Federal aid to the Marquette Range.

The unemployment situation on the Marquette Range is serious at the present.

Yours truly,

REINO PELLONPAA,
Recording Secretary.

DECEMBER 14, 1960.

Mr. REINO PELLONPAA,
Recording Secretary, United Steelworkers of America, Local 2656, Ishpeming, Mich.

DEAR MR. PELLONPAA: As you know President-elect Kennedy has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Area Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Professor Haber and Senator DOUGLAS, I am sure, are fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in the Upper Peninsula.

PAT MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. I am also working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs.

Thank you for your letter concerning the local situation on the Marquette Range. Do not hesitate to keep me informed of developments there and I will do all I can to bring this situation to the attention of President-elect Kennedy.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 4793,
Negaunee, Mich., December 20, 1960.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tracy Mine Local 4793 Negaunee, Mich., would like to go on record in asking your support in seeking some type of Federal public work for the distressed areas of the Upper Peninsula.

As of this writing one large mining concern is contemplating some type of curtailment at its operations, which may mean greater unemployment in these areas.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. JOHNSON,
Recording Secretary.

DECEMBER 28, 1960.

Mr. GEORGE B. JOHNSON,
United Steelworkers of America, Local 4793, Negaunee, Mich.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Thank you for your letter of December 20 asking support for help in the distressed areas of the Upper Peninsula. As you may already know, the President-elect has appointed Prof. William Haber to represent all Michigan on the special Depressed Areas Study Committee headed by Senator DOUGLAS. Both Professor Haber and the Senator are, I am sure, fully aware of the critical unemployment situation in the Upper Peninsula.

Senator MCNAMARA and I are preparing additional material to call this problem to their attention. Also, I am working with the Department of Agriculture to get more food commodities added to the present surplus food distribution programs.

Do not hesitate to keep me informed of developments in the local employment situation in Negaunee, and I will do all I can to bring this situation to the attention of President-elect Kennedy.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

MARQUETTE, MICH.

Hon. PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You may wonder why a constituent from a different State is addressing a letter to you as well as to elected officials from my own State, and I hope that this fact does not deter you from reading it before it enters file 13.

The reason that I am writing to all of you is to ask for your wholehearted support for legislation to aid depressed areas, and to include, or even start with, the economically weak areas of northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and western upper Michigan. The aforementioned regions are probably the most unadvertised areas of unemployment, but nevertheless, need help desperately.

I am a former resident of Ironwood, Gogebic County, Mich., a city which lies in the Gogebic iron mining range, and I will use it as an example of the poor economic conditions that exist in these areas.

With the transition of iron mining from underground extraction to the development of low-grade taconite or pelletizing processes, the Gogebic Range has suffered heavily. The latest census pointed out a population decline of almost 3,000 in a county which formerly had about 27,000. The city of Ironwood had a population drop of 11 percent, the highest of all cities in upper Michigan. Of course, similar declines were noted in Iron and Ashland Counties of Wisconsin, and I imagine declines were posted in northern Minnesota, in the Vermilion and Cayuna mining ranges especially. Along with the decrease in population, there has been the accompanying deteriorating effects such as poor retail business, low real estate values, poor wages, reduced State aid to education, but most of all, I believe, disgust and apathy among the residents. In fact, now that legislation is pending that may help these areas, the residents probably will not even express themselves vocally or by means of composition to attain their hopes of economic self-sufficiency. This should not necessarily be construed as a negative attitude toward Federal aid to depressed areas, but rather a feeling of pessimism due to failure of promised legislation in the past. I hope, therefore, that you gentlemen will accept this letter as not only expressing the ideas of an individual, but of thousands of others who are too apathetic to write, or else too old and conservative to strive for economic improvement.

As you are all certainly aware of, an area that is economically depressed and that has lost its younger generation also loses its motivating force, and the road to economic recovery is indeed, a rough one. I, just as thousands of other young people, left my birthplace soon after graduation because of economic necessity. Many of us did not want to leave, but did rather than become members of long unemployment listings. With this condition prevailing for many years, the impetus of the cities declined rapidly, with the result that more energetic cities have received greater benefits from the State and Federal governments. Even now, the automobile manufacturing cities are starting a clamor for Federal aid because of increasing unemployment, and probably will be distress areas as their workless force numbers over 6 percent. (I believe this is the criteria for naming distress areas.) I know that other cities have been named distress areas when their work force increased to this figure, but to my knowledge, no cities in the previously mentioned areas have been cited. Actually, when the population declines as fast as it has in these areas, they probably never met the standards for the present system. I mention this because I believe that such factors as population declines, lower State aid for education, lowered tax valuation should all merit consideration. Also, the type of industry that is located in a town. For example, will not an area which has a high percentage of construction workers and a short construction season always be eligible for aid to depressed areas? I realize that some standards have to be followed, but I hope that these factors will be considered by all of you.

Of course, there is a great difference between a want and a need. There may be instances which arise if this pending legislation becomes a reality which will bear this out, so I would like to suggest several things which I consider a need, whether they would fit into proposed aid to depressed areas or not.

In the first place, I believe that a Federal survey of mining reserves should be carried out, to determine the potential of these areas. Furthermore, I suggest iron ore research in conjunction with the various mining companies to develop the cheapest methods of extracting ore, whether from underground or surface mines. I think additional funds should be provided for research to be carried out by our fine engineering school here in upper Michigan, to keep our mineral industry competitive with foreign ores.

Then, too, with all the hue and cry about the Federal Government acquiring more land under the "save our shorelines" bill, I am wondering if it would not be feasible to set aside areas in our large national forests for tourism and recreation. There are three large forests in these areas: the Ottawa, the Chequamegon, and the Superior which must have scenic attraction possibilities. And speaking of forests, I have before me a copy of a report published by the U.S. Forest Service in 1959, entitled "The Feasibility of Using Lakes States Hardwoods for Newsprint and Other Pulp and Paper Products." This is a very enlightening report of the possibilities of a hardwood newsprint plant located in these northern regions. It emphasizes the fact that mill trials are essential for more exact appraisals of the opportunities for the use of northern hardwoods in newsprint, yet as far as I know, no experimentation has been carried out or even encouraged. Our forests are showing a resurgence, and even are showing a surplus over the allowable cut, so that there would be no shortage of wood if a plant were built.

Another item which I feel that is lacking in this area is adequate aviation facilities. The Ironwood-Ashland (Wis.), area, although serviced by the Nation's leading feeder airline, has no Federal aviation communication or weather reporting agencies. The closest ones are at Duluth (120 miles), Houghton, Mich. (100 miles), and Wausau, Wis. (130 miles). The Wisconsin State Aeronautic Administration is planning a series of beacons to aid pilots flying north from the Milwaukee-Chicago area as far north as the Rhinelander-Land O'Lakes, Wis., vacation area. There will be a large increase in private flying both in winter and summer

into this area, as more emphasis is put on winter sports. When flying into this area, however, drastic changes in flying weather are often noted near the Lake Superior shoreline. To keep pilots informed of these conditions, I believe provision should be made for safeguarding the flight of both private and commercial pilots as they fly near Lake Superior. The Federal Aviation Administration is putting great emphasis on private pilots acquiring their instrument ratings—yet in this area, there are no facilities to aid the instrument pilot. I realize that the Federal Government installs aviation equipment as the demand warrants it, but I also realize from observation that aviation safeguards encourage flying. It's something like asking which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Several years ago, I was fortunate enough to hear Senator DOUGLAS speak in Marquette when he visited Northern Michigan College. I remember he spoke about his trip to the Near East, especially the oil-rich countries of Iraq and Iran. He mentioned the economic impact that the foreign oil investments had on these countries, with improved living standards for the oil workers, and a large share of England's bond market by the Shah of Iran. Yet, the lot of the desert nomad had hardly improved. I mention this because we do have parallels in our own country—not as severe, but nevertheless, many still wanting. Good examples can be found in these areas.

There are other fields which could be broached upon also, but I have probably exhausted your patience already, for I know you are busy. May I again ask for your support of this legislation for the people in these areas, for I know they need it, and will appreciate it greatly. May I also extend my wishes for a happy holiday season to you all.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. WICK.

DECEMBER 28, 1960.

Mr. DONALD E. WICK,
Marquette, Mich.

DEAR MR. WICK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your interesting and constructive letter to Senator DOUGLAS about the situation in the Gogebic Range, and giving some suggestions as to how you think the situation could be bettered. As your junior Senator, I am particularly pleased that you took the time and thought to write such a letter, and I am sure it was helpful to Senator DOUGLAS and his Depressed Areas Committee.

Perhaps you know that the President-elect appointed Prof. William Haber to represent Michigan on the committee?

Please be sure to send me any other constructive suggestions you may have on the issues we face. Certainly they are so huge and so crucial that we need all the help we can get.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

JANUARY 9, 1961.

Mr. EARL T. BESTER,
Representative, Lake Superior Region,
Distressed Area Committee,
Duluth, Minn.

DEAR SIR: A meeting was called by the undersigned with the cooperation of our chamber of commerce, and was eagerly attended by officials, industrialists, businessmen, and citizens of Watersmeet Township. The meeting was in response to the Federal Government launching a recovery program for distressed areas. We, of a seriously distressed area are quick to come to the fore, to seek such help, but not necessarily of a dole nature. In an attempt to assure ourselves, that we shall not miss an opportunity for assistance and help, the following list of a varied number of projects is recommended. Their order will not necessarily indicate their importance with us.

Resolved, That a water and sewage system be built for Watersmeet Township, especially within the village limits. Sewage now, to a great extent, now spills into our local trout streams, and it looms vividly apparent that it is only a matter of time, when the State will force us to install a sewage system, at a time when it is impossible, due to a constantly declining tax situation.

Resolved, healthwise again, That a medical and dental clinic be built to attract doctors and dentists to our village. The nearest Michigan practitioner of this nature is 30 miles away.

Resolved, That an experimental paper mill be built of a size consistent with the available water supply, to find more uses for the unlimited forest products that would and are not now utilized.

Resolved, That a youth conservation program be inaugurated here in the vast forest area, to divert their energy in a gainfully employed manner, toward the improvement of public parks, picnic areas, and other recreational projects that would attract tourists and vacationists.

Resolved, That our area be alerted to any civil defense benefits that could be directed advantageously toward our community or area.

Resolved, That some arrangement be instituted whereby at least a small percentage of the vast lakefrontage holdings owned by the U.S. Forest Service, be made available to prospective summer home purchasers, to the gain of the Forest Service coffers, the gain of the summer home purchaser, and just as important to the gain of the township taxwise, the tax situation of which township is being bled white by the lack of sufficient tax return on a great percentage of lands the Forest Service owns. The tax famine in Watersmeet is most acute.

Resolved, That some arrangement be allowed, whereby a grant, loan, or subsidy be allowed to finance and construct a skihill, either Government operated or privately operated, on what is known as tower hill, West Paulding, Mich.

Resolved, That secondary-township roads be blacktopped to alleviate the maintenance problem that gravel roads constantly present.

Resolved, That the 500 miles of forestry roads now planned in this Forest be built immediately, but to build out of Forest Service funds, and not out of funds that would be at the expense of the townships interests. None of the governmental expenditures of a Forest Service nature should be at the expense of diminishing the funds available to the township.

Resolved, That a research and training center be built and established here, to cope with at least the local forestry problems. The center should be of a nature that would have the private enterpriser in lumbering entirely in mind, and should have a staff that would have the rehabilitation and recovery of a sick and dying lumber industry completely at heart. The Forest Service already had elaborate facilities to protect their interests.

Resolved, That a strong governmental effort be made whereby the 25 percent of national forest receipts that go to local units on a per capita basis, be changed so that the receipts go to the local township units in direct proporation to the acreage that the U.S. Forest Service owns in each township of the particular national forest. Watersmeet Township's large acreage of U.S. timberlands produces the lion's share of the timber, while it collects a very small proportion of the forest funds, a very unfair situation indeed. Equally unfair as it would be for us, to expect funds from natural resources that another township has within its boundaries.

Resolved, That Federal aid be given for housing projects for low income and county aided persons, such as handicapped persons, aged persons, Indians, or any needy persons, to aid in clearing our slum areas.

Needless to say, your studies will reveal we are in a seriously depressed and distressed area, what with a vicious round of decline in population, decline in taxes, decline in employment, departure of our young population to the industry of larger cities, lack of taxes from the vast national forest here, lack of taxes from the vast commercial and tree farm forests, and in the face of all this, a rising cost of welfare due to the high proportion of elderly and retired folks as compared to the productive population.

May we solicit the faintest opportunity to be allowed to re-submit our proposal or appeal for help in which the funds for this recovery plan will be spent.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK J. BASSO,
Committeeman Gogebic Range Area, Distressed Area Committee, Watersmeet, Mich.

CITY OF WAKEFIELD, MICH.,
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
January 16, 1961.

The Honorable PHILIP A. HART,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: We are enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Wakefield City Council concerning unemployment benefits.

Your serious consideration in this matter will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CITY OF WAKEFIELD,
MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL OF WAKEFIELD, MICH.

Whereas the number of unemployed in this area and other areas of the State of Michigan is steadily increasing; and

Whereas the number of unemployed will be increased in this area to an even greater number due to the recent layoff of approximately 500 men by the local mines; and

Whereas if this condition continues beyond the 26 weeks allotted for drawing unemployment benefits, it will overload our welfare and relief departments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Wakefield, Mich., urge and request that the proper officials adopt measures to extend the period of drawing unemployment benefits beyond the present 26 weeks, and also to liberalize the program of unemployment benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our United States and State Senators and Representatives, the Governor, and also the Michigan Unemployment Commission.

MARGARET WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, has morning business been closed?

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

Mr. BIBLE. 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. BIBLE. 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.

NOMINATION OF ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric and ask that the Chair lay the nomination before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

U.S. PHILANTHROPY: 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from today's New York Times entitled "U.S. Philanthropy: 1960."

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

U.S. PHILANTHROPY: 1960

In these days of self-criticism and unkind comments from abroad it will be heartening to see the annual rundown of American philanthropy made by the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel. The association's 1960 "Giving U.S.A." will show that, in spite of the business downturn that developed last year, philanthropy went up—although at a slightly slackened pace.

According to the association's estimates philanthropy went over the $8 billion top for the first time last year—8.2 compared with 7.8 in 1959 and 7.1 in 1958. The large donations of foundations and business concerns and notable charitable bequests leave the impression that these are the most important kinds of giving. As a matter of fact they account for about one-fifth of the total. The great bulk of funds comes from individuals. The last available income tax figures showed that 58 million taxpayers claim deductions for contributions.

Over the years individual gifts have steadily increased, but somewhat behind the growth of the economy as a whole. Last year showed a gain over the year before, but at a slightly lower rate than in 1959. Gifts by corporations and firms, however, actually declined, showing the direct relation between the profits of business and their philanthropic contributions. On the other hand, foundation grants and charitable bequests went up.

The association's figures for 1960 show that, as usual, about half of the total goes into the field of religion. Giving to education is moving ahead in importance faster than the other major fields—in second place last year, with 16 percent of the total—while the relative position of welfare and health declined a little.

Over the years philanthropic giving has been growing faster than personal income and very much faster than the population, while the purchasing power of the dollar has declined. All this shows that the American people are increasingly able and willing to spend their money for the public good.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the people of the United States contribute the great bulk of the funds mentioned in the editorial. Fifty-eight million taxpayers claim deductions for contributions of $8.2 billion to philanthropic causes in this country.

Mr. President, it seems to me a new administration could start no more auspiciously than to bring this to the attention of the world. This represents the American heart, which works so munificently in an infinite multitude of causes. This is what dominates the philosophy of the American way of life.

FINANCIAL SUCCESS OF THE TVA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority has long been noted for its achievements in resource development, engineering and power development. Its financial success has received far less attention.

Recently, the TVA published two documents containing the latest evidence of its financial soundness—its annual report to the President and the Congress, and a report on its sales of electric power to municipal and cooperative systems.

A news article in the New York Times of January 1, 1961, sets out the major points of the TVA's report to the President and the Congress. In an editorial entitled, "TVA: A Going Concern," the Times on December 26, 1960, praised the Authority for its achievements in the power field.

I request unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1961]

PRESIDENT AND LAWMAKERS TOLD OF PROGRESS BY TVA IN 1960

KNOXVILLE, TENN., December 31.—Development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley region this year continued to yield increasing returns, the Tennessee Valley Authority reported today in its annual report to the President and Congress.

The most widely noted development in TVA activities during 1960 fiscal year was the new bond financing program to obtain private capital for power facilities.

The report, however, pointed to steady progress, in resource development activities as well, including increased savings in shipping costs from use of the Tennessee River waterway, further industrial expansion, along the waterway, greater use of electric power, large-scale reforestation and more forest product industries, and increased assets in the recreational value of the TVA lakes.

The core of the resource development program is its multipurpose system of 31 dams on the Tennessee and tributary rivers, making possible flood control, navigation on a 650-mile-long waterway, and hydroelectric power. The operation also provides bonus benefits to recreation and municipal-industrial water supplies.

Congressional action authorized TVA for the first time to obtain private capital through the sale of up to $750 million of power bonds. The financing program is designed to provide a new source of non-Government funds for expansion of power facilities needed to meet rapid increases in electric power use in the seven-State TVA region.

The first bond issue, totaling $50 million was sold in New York on November 15.

The power system's net income of $51 million for the year, and total net power proceeds—funds available for TVA's debt service and repayment of Federal appropriations—were $100 million, the report said.

"As a result of this issue of retained earnings, the stockholders of the system—the citizens represented by the Federal Government—owned power assets of nearly $1,800 million, compared with an investment of only $1,200 million of Treasury funds," the authority added.

TVA also is gradually repaying $1 billion of the net appropriation invested in the power system and will pay an estimated $1 billion more in dividends to the Treasury during this repayment period.

"The power system generated more than 63,400 million kilowatt-hours in 1960, an increase of 2,400 million kilowatt-hours from the year before. Improved hydro conditions made it possible to obtain this increased generation from the hydroelectric plants. They produced nearly 17,500 million kilowatt-hours compared with less than 15 billion the year before. Generation at the steam-electric plants remained about the same as the year before, just under 46 billion kilowatt-hours, the report said."

Steamplants consumed about 18,600,000 tons of coal, which cost $82,600,000.

TVA entered into a number of long-term coal contracts to assure steady fuel supplies. The largest was for 65 million tons of coal to be delivered to the new Paradise steamplant in Kentucky over 17 years. The base price for the coal is only $2.95 a ton delivered to the plant. Because of the long term of the contract, the contractor, Peabody Coal Co., will use strip-mining equipment of unprecedented size. "Since the coal will be mined within a 5-mile radius of the plant, the novel arrangements between TVA and Peabody will practically eliminate coal transportation as an element of cost at the Paradise plant," TVA said.

TVA and municipal cooperative distributors paid about $16,300,000 in State and local taxes and tax equivalents in 1960. This was an increase of $1,600,000 above 1959.

Major construction during the year included completion of 425,000 kilowatts of generating capacity for the power system and initial operation of the new main lock at Wilson Dam in Alabama. At the end of the year about 3 million kilowatts of capacity, including several large new starts, was under construction and scheduled for completion in the fall of 1963.

Installed capacity of the generating system, including Aluminum Co. of America dams in the Tennessee Valley and Army Engineer projects in the Cumberland Basin, was 11,373,460 kilowatts at the end of the year. TVA is planning a new plant in the eastern part of its system, the first generating unit of which will have a record breaking capacity of 800,000 kilowatts.

[From the New York Times]

TVA: A GOING CONCERN

Tennessee Valley Authority's power business in the Tennessee Valley continues to prosper. Its October report showed that it was paying off its indebtedness to the Federal Government, as required by law; was preparing to issue bonds in the open market, as now permitted by law, for new construction; was selling nearly half its power to Federal agencies; was getting about two-thirds of its energy from fuel and only about one-third from running water, and in an engineering sense as well as a financial sense was a going concern.

The Authority has now issued a follow-up report on its sales to about 150 municipal

and cooperative electric systems. Sales for the fiscal year 1960 were 13 percent, measured in kilowatt-hours, above the previous year; for the first time the rates charged for residential consumers dropped below 1 cent a kilowatt-hour; homeowners were using about two and a half times the national average, and all in all the outlook was cheerful.

TVA and its wholesale customers pay taxes or sums in lieu of taxes. Admittedly these may not always precisely equal the taxes a private corporation might pay on similar properties. Admittedly, also, it took Federal credit to get TVA's power program started. But it simply isn't true, as is sometimes alleged or implied, that the TVA power system is a parasite on the American taxpayer. It has been, and is, a good investment for the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. SIDNEY GORDON GILBREATH

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, few men of my acquaintance have left such an indelible influence on the advance of education in Tennessee as Dr. Sidney Gordon Gilbreath. When he passed away at his home near Johnson City, Tenn., on January 6, my State lost a true patriarch and I lost an excellent counselor.

Dr. Gilbreath's life spanned 91 years and was in every sense a full one. Born in my native Madisonville, Tenn., where he was a classmate of my late father, he began his service to education at the age of 19, when he became a public school teacher. At 21, he was superintendent of Monroe County Schools. At 26, he became Tennessee State Superintendent of Schools—the youngest man ever to hold that office.

Thereafter, Dr. Gilbreath served successively as president of Hiwassee College at Madisonville, which his grandfather had founded; as a professor of education at Peabody College in Nashville; as superintendent of schools at Chattanooga; and then, for 15 years, as the first president of East Tennessee State College at Johnson City. He also served as president of the Public School Officers Association and of the Tennessee State Teachers Association.

As is characteristic of men of great intellect, he had a broad range of interests, deeply held. On his 21st birthday, he had been admitted to the Tennessee bar and was recognized as an authority on school law. He helped to write the law creating Tennessee's State normal school system. In later years, he wrote a newspaper column signed simply, "SGG."

Dr. Gilbreath retired from his last full-time position, as Southern manager for a textbook firm, in 1942. But despite advancing age, his mind retained its brilliance, his interest in current events remained unflagging; so that those who sought his counsel and guidance were ever rewarded.

This was truly a remarkable man, and Tennesseans will long mourn his passing.

THE PRESTIGE OF NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in recent months the prestige of nations, particularly our own, has been a matter of unusual concern. We wonder whether our prestige in the world is as high today as it has been in the past, and what direction it will take in the future.

Before we can know how true prestige may be achieved, we must know in what it consists. Drawing upon her broad historical perspective and keen insight into current events, the noted British economist and author, Barbara Ward, has written a provocative article which undertakes to identify the elements of national prestige and, in the process, presents a number of challenges for the entire free world.

This article appeared in the New York Times magazine of January 1, 1961. I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times Magazine, Jan. 1, 1961]

THE HIGHEST RESOLVE—TRUE PRESTIGE

(By Barbara Ward)

As the new year opens, one issue, made clear by last year's storms and dissensions, is paramount. Nations are obsessed as never before with "prestige." They are not only concerned about what they do; they are immensely preoccupied with the impact on other states of what they do.

France is anxiously pursuing policies aimed at recapturing the sense of power and la gloire. Britain, with equal anxiety, debates whether closer association with Europe would undermine its Commonwealth ties and, with them, any claim to separate great power status. And the leading neutral states try to make good their claim to independent influence and standing in the world's councils.

This concern for status is not confined to nations on the precarious verges of power. The two most powerful states in the world seem at times positively obsessed with the impact they are making on other governments. Why else should Mr. Khrushchev spend a month in New York clowning, roaring, beating the rostrum, waving actual shoes and symbolic rockets, belaboring his opponents, embracing his friends, if he did not think other nations worth impressing? Stalin did not given a brass kopeck for the views of others. Khrushchev cannot leave them alone.

Nor is the United States immune. In the presidential elections, America's standing in the world was one of the major campaign issues. Certainly there seemed to be no other question over which the candidates were more utterly at variance—one contending that American prestige had never stood so high, the other that it had never fallen so low.

What are we to make of this obsessive issue of prestige? Is it, should it be, a genuine matter for national concern? Should it be a serious aim of national policy? These are far-reaching and insistent questions.

The word "prestige" itself gives us a hint of the importance of these questions and indicates that the answers may not be so straightforward as they seem. In old French, the word simply meant a conjuring trick, and from there moved on to convey first illusion, then glamour, and at last ascendancy over other men's minds. In old English practice, a prestidigitator was a conjurer, and the adjective "prestigious" conveyed the meaning of juggling or deceitfulness. And both go back to the old Latin root, praestigium, which, without any equivocation, simply meant delusion.

Thus, if we are to be guided by the ancient wisdom of our language, we may well conclude that the contemporary rage for prestige, for ascendancy, for good standing in other eyes, is rooted in some of the least reputable attributes of our age—the tricks of propaganda, the modern hucksters' make-believe world of supposed values and suggested virtues, all the restless uncertainty and hypersensitiveness of a fiercely competitive world.

Nor is the meaning now given to the word always more reassuring. Most of the current meanings, examined closely, have an element of ambiguity about them; and perhaps the most ambiguous of all is the one on which most states would nevertheless agree—that prestige depends almost solely on power.

Until our world carries through its most needed political revolution and achieves a properly policed and institutionalized rule of law, political relationships clearly remain power relationships. However, the brutal weight of atomic weapons, the scale of economic and technical progress needed in their production—and the overwhelming fear of ever having to use them at all—have made sheer military power a most uncertain element in the prestige of all save the giant states.

Even for countries of the size and stature of Britain and France, the straining and stretching to produce atomic weapons largely at the expense of other aspects of defense have added not one jot either to their security or to their status. They depend, after as before, upon the strength and vigilance of the United States and the integrity of the NATO alliance.

Further down the scale, similar pretensions to power become merely ludicrous. A small nation ordering itself a jet air force and bankrupting itself in the process gains neither power nor prestige. Even a conventional military establishment which empties the state's coffers only gives the illusion of grandeur. On all such "prestigious" efforts, the last word was said by Aesop in his fable of the bullfrog blowing itself out to the size of an ox and exploding in the process.

With the atomic titans, power and prestige are clearly inseparable. There can be no retreat from power for them save toward agreed, controlled disarmament. Meanwhile, nothing short of a genuine and obvious parity of power in all aspects of defense can give America and hence the West any real security, let alone prestige.

It is not simply that Russia, unchecked by America's counterstrength, might fall into that state of "dizziness through success" to which Stalin thought his people all too prone. It is that any marked American inferiority would stir up other governments to question their own survival and set in motion that process of doubts and wobbling politics that produced the Quislings and the Lavals of prewar Europe.

If the more ruthless powers also appear more formidable, many states will find it convenient to be "neutral on their side." There have been traces of this mood in recent years, during which America has appeared all too often to be more concerned with balanced budgets than with balanced strength; and the warning cries of "national bankruptcy," coming from the capital of a nation commanding at least Russia's gross national product, have been interpreted as a failure of nerve.

Since the means of strength—skilled manpower, industrial potential, vast resources—are so clearly and obviously available in America, it is an easy conclusion to argue that what is missing is the will—a conclusion even more damaging to prestige than any supposed lack of power.

But if power alone exhausted the content of prestige, there would be some strange redrafting to be done in the human record. Few nations have held such undisputed military mastery as the Assyrians or the Mongols, yet few have left so prestigeless a reputation behind. More recently, the Nazis were

engaged, during the widest extension of their military might, in exterminating 6 million Jews. There is no doubt which of these activities will determine their standing in history.

And today, in spite of the terror of atomic destruction, physical force is probably not the main determinant of prestige. Horrific power exists, but it is held in check by the very nature of its horror. It follows that the battle for influence over the interests and loyalties of other states is only partly played out in terms of force. The fight is also a struggle for understanding and conviction waged on the ultimate battlefield of men's minds—and here physical power is only one influence among many.

Even the usual definitions of prestige recognize this fact. The idea of prestige is closely bound up with that of leadership, of being respected and followed by other states because of achievement. Clearly, this route is open to great states and small alike. Pitt the Younger spoke for all of them when he proclaimed, during the Napoleonic wars, that Britain would save itself by its exertions and Europe by its example. And history is witness again and again that size and prestige have no fixed correlation. Indeed, its first lesson is that true prestige has always been the product not so much of genuine power as of genuine excellence.

In its golden age, Athens was a city a good deal smaller than Columbus, Ohio. But what other city in the human record has produced in a few decades philosophers to equal Socrates and Plato, dramatists of the powers of Sophocles and Euripides, sculptors to equal Praxiteles, statesmen of Pericles' stature?

This community of scholars and artists, this little world of scientists exploring for the first time the great symmetries of geometry and music, this society of citizens experimenting and innovating in all the arts of free government was in its own day the education of Hellas, and has remained ever since the education of the West.

Wherever a comparable outburst of native genius has occurred—in Renaissance Italy, in France's Grand Siècle, and, for the civic and industrialists' arts, in Victorian England—there has been no need to ponder about prestige or seek out its sources. The communities were quite simply preeminent and mankind beat a path to their door.

To excellence one should add innovation. There are times in history when the gramophone needle of human effort seems stuck fast in the record. Round and round the nations go, sticking in the same dilemma, breaking off in defeat at the same irremediable crack. The stuck needle of autocracy, the stuck needle of subsistence agriculture, the closed doors of science and technology, the barriers to communication have bound man for millennia to the cycle of birth and death and sowing and harvest and victory and defeat.

Given the long dominance of this melancholy wheel, it is not surprising that the great moments of prestige in history have been, again and again, moments of innovation. The Greeks broke through one barrier when for the first time they practiced citizenship under a government of laws—not men. The England Voltaire admired had evolved the practice of limited and constitutional government on a national scale. The American Revolution undermined the fundamental assumptions of empire and established free federation on a continental scale.

Britain's 19th-century prestige was securely rooted in pioneering every aspect of industry and science; and, as the London Times sadly concluded, when pondering the condition of England, at Queen Victoria's death in 1901: "Others have learnt our lessons and bettered our instructions while we have been too easily content to rely on methods which were effective a generation or two ago."

In short, innovation had passed to others and with it went prestige.

While excellence and innovation are the bases of true leadership and influence, they are open to quite as much misinterpretation as the link between prestige and power. Small states misunderstand the nature of creative innovation and innovate themselves into steel mills for which they have no materials and heavy industry for which they lack all the skills.

New states believe that their excellence will be judged by the size and luxury of their embassies abroad. Modernizing states see that science is the high road to modernity, and build scientific institutes for which they lack scientists and funds.

In short, the element of keeping up with the Joneses in the international world creates false judgments of value, mistaken estimates of influence, posturing, and playing for effect.

Even the greatest powers are not immune to similar errors. In the postwar world Russia has had at least two solid grounds for true prestige.

One is the speed of its postwar economic reconstruction and the distance it has traversed in 40 years, bringing a community of peasants from the wooden plow to the atomic pile in little more than one generation. Wherever nations are poor and backward and long for the prestige of modernity, Russia's forced-draft methods of growth make their impact, especially where backed by sizable offers of economic aid.

The other achievement has impressed all nations, developed and underdeveloped alike. Nothing has given Russia so powerful a boost in world prestige as its performance in outer space—its pioneering rockets, the intricate mastery of its moon probes. Not only were they portents of power and remarkable in themselves; they were external evidence of a real if one-sided pursuit of excellence in Russia which has made education the prime interest and activity of the state.

It was this revelation of a whole community dedicated to the tough disciplines of study that stirred—rightly—an awed awareness among Americans that in some crucial fields they might have dropped behind.

And it is not altogether a comfort to reflect that in promising his people American living standards within a decade, Khrushchev has made his bow to an opposite achievement in the United States.

It is true that an almost unconscious acceptance of American standards of informality and liveliness and dress has spread all through the youthful world, so that the young Marxist in Warsaw may still want above everything to buy a T-shirt and students in Asia sit down to talk politics and break off for jazz.

But the true hierarchy of excellence cannot be inverted. A nation dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge will gain a prestige that the pursuit of pleasure cannot give. As the Report to the President on National Goals expressed it: "In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music, and the sciences * * *"—and none of these springs from uneducated, uncultured, and indifferent minds.

Yet, in spite of Russia's undeniable achievements in education and economic growth, these do not seem to be the Communists' chosen determinants of prestige. The present profoundly bitter and envenomed dispute between Moscow and Peiping for leadership in interpreting Communist ideology suggests that Russia sets far more store by its claim to lead the Communist bloc.

To plot the laws of the future, to lay down the objective fatalities of history, to outstrip America, to see capitalism wither, to lead a whole universe into the Communist camp—these are Moscow's most prized claims that give least ground for true influence and respect.

The Communist system, in genuinely objective fact, is of such uncertain popular strength that not one Communist government dares test its backing freely at the polls. This is the practical, contemporary failure. But the historical failure goes deeper still. Precisely at the point—in politics and interstate relations—where the Communists claim to innnovate most bravely, they have plunged back to mankind's oldest, rawest, most discredited governmental forms: to imperialism abroad, to crude autocracy at home.

But before the Western Powers congratulate themselves on avoiding comparable confusions, it is well to remember that they, too, are likely to make their mistakes chiefly over the points which seem to them self-evident.

One of the main prestige themes of Western life in recent years has been the abundance and wealth produced by the free-market economy. Elections have been fought on the theme: "You never had it so good." The German "miracle" is recounted and extolled. Nations are lectured on the merits of free enterprise with an ideological zeal that almost recalls Moscow's.

But what is the reality? Certainly the Western Powers can take pride in a system that works so much more effectively than it did, say, in the twenties and thirties. But they need to recognize the fundamental difference between now and then. It is that so many more people now enjoy the benefits of the economy, there is a new kind of affluence in which all, or nearly all, have a real share.

In other words, prosperity becomes a matter of prestige when it is widely diffused and can claim to have its roots not only in enterprise but in justice as well. There is, after all, no excellence in selfishness, no innovation in unshared wealth. Both are as old as history—or as autocratic government itself.

These conditions set the limits to the system's attraction and prestige. American private enterprise has little appeal to the Latin-American masses, for they have no sense of sharing in its gains. The German miracle is no longer so attractive since West Germany's overvalued currency and unshared reserves are beginning to stem the affluence of everyone else. And all the Atlantic nations are seeing their influence in the world increasingly shadowed by the fact that they are growing richer while others tend to grow poorer.

In these conditions, to expect prosperity alone to confer prestige is as gross an error as for Russia to think that dictatorship, however camouflaged, can attract people who have known what it is to be free.

The very weaknesses in Western prestige suggest how it may be genuinely achieved in the future. The basic elements are sure—power, excellence, creative innovation, the trinity of genuine leadership in the world. But they must be embodied in strong convictions and working policies.

Balanced power until controlled, policed disarmament is achieved; a new value set on excellence of every sort—above all, on this fundamental excellence of education; bold innovation where it is most clearly called for—in international association between states and continents, in economic cooperation to close the widening gap between rich and poor; these are the broad determinants of true prestige in our days.

If the Western Powers go forward boldly enough in pursuit of such policies, they will soon discover the great paradox of prestige—that those who think most about it enjoy it least, and those who put the obsession aside,

and concentrate on vision and action instead, find it most plentiful. Once, during the Marshall plan, America and its allies were thus engaged on a great enterprise that transcended national interest and self-absorption. At no time, before or since, has their prestige stood so high.

After all, the wisdom of our language does not entirely mislead us. Too great a preoccupation with prestige can lead to the pursuit of illusion and the cult of deceit. The healthy man does not worry about his health, the confident state about its reputation. And the Western Powers will be less concerned about their standing among the nations when, once again, they are actively engaged upon great projects and farsighted policies that, with achievement, will earn their own prestige.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on January 22 the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the independence of the Ukrainian Republic was celebrated.

Today several Senators have spoken of the Ukraine and have spoken about the significance of the observance. I contemplate talking on this subject in a measure on account of the Ukrainian people, but primarily because I believe the plight in which the Ukrainians find themselves is symbolic of the plight occupied by many people now under the yoke and the imperialistic domination of Red Russia.

Very little may be understood about the significance of Ukrainians generally; however, they have a history which ought to be known and when it is known, in my opinion, will be respected.

The Ukraine is larger than France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy or Spain. It has an area of about 215,000 square miles, approximately five times the area of the State of Ohio.

The Ukraine has a population of over 40 million people. From that standpoint it ranks respectively with France, Italy, and England. It is the most densely populated state within the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics.

Tragically, over 5 million of its approximately 40 million people are in the Soviet Far East and central Asia, many of them being in the concentration and labor camps proliferated by Red Russia for occupancy by those human beings who have the courage to speak up and who wish to occupy the position of dignified entities upon this earth.

The Ukraine is known as the breadbasket of Communist Russia. Its fields are fertile. Its people are versed in agriculture, within the limits of the opportunities that have been provided for them. They are capable of sustaining themselves. The Ukrainians have a culture that goes back 1,500 years. They are a religious people, hard working, respecting their families and womanhood. They yearn for learning, and have taken great advantage of their limited opportunities. They are a fighting people, especially when the cause is the liberty of human beings. These Ukrainian people—40 million in number, 5 million in concentration camps, the slaves of tyrannical communism—are waiting the day of liberation. They know it is to come. When it will arrive they do not know.

Let us take a look at the highlights of these people.

First, they have a separate and distinct Slavic language. Its base is Slavic, but it is distinctive. It had its first independent and free state known as the Ukrainian Kievan beginning in the 9th and going to the 14th century. It embraced Christianity more than a thousand years ago. It lost its independence in the 15th century, but reestablished it in the year 1648, and enjoyed it as a distinct, honorable people until 1783 when it was again lost.

In 1918 these Slavic people, known as the Ukraines, not subscribing to the Marxist and Engel doctrine, but wanting to be liberated from the domination of the czarist Russia, joined in the revolution of that year, and they contributed in great measure to the overthrow of the czarist regime. That was January 22, 1918. For a period of 2 years 40 million Ukraines believed that they had regained the independence and freedom which had been theirs for several centuries. But instead of that independence abiding with them, in 1920 the Communist armies overran the soil of the Ukrainians and began their communization, which has continued until this day and happily, I say, without success. Between 1920 and 1922 the Ukrainian people were controlled and dominated by imperialist Moscow in the guise of an independent Ukrainia, and in my opinion that label of them as an independent Ukrainia is significant, but shockingly false.

In 1923 Red Russia forced independent Ukraine into the fictitious federation of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and since that time the Ukraine has remained in bondage under the exploitation of Red Russia. If one should speak with Khrushchev today or with his Ambassador at the United Nations, he would be told that the Ukraine is an independent nation, living within the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics. That, however, is not the truth.

Ukranians are a servient people, worthy of being independent, but suffering the burden of the tyranny of Red Russia, and being exploited by the Communists not only with respect to their farms and factories and homes, but also their blood and lives.

What are some of the facts belying the claim that Khrushchev, Stalin, and Red Russia contemplated independence for the Ukraine? In 1930 there were the famous Kharkov trials. The intelligentsia of the Ukrainian people, their philosophers, their poets, and their political leaders—and they are humble but decent people—were speaking of an independent Ukraine. In the Kharkov trials the judges were witnesses and prosecutors, and the patriotic leaders were liquidated. In the 1930's there was again a resurgence of leaders hoping for the achievement of a free Ukraine, but the persecution again began. After numerous executions there followed a series of suicides.

Rather than bear the heel of the Communist tyrant, many of the leaders preferred death, and found comfort and solace in death through their own hands.

We then come to the Moscow-made famine in 1932 and 1933. Genocide has been mentioned. The greatest expert in genocide is Khrushchev. By design and plan, about 5 million patriotic Ukrainian people were put to death by keeping them from obtaining food.

Then we come to 1937. In the town of Vinnitsia, where there was a desire for freedom, leaders were speaking not to the satisfaction of the Communists, bringing to the Ukrainian people what is known as the massacre of the Ukrainians at Vinnitsia.

We then come to the yearly purges and deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, beginning in the early 1930's and continuing into the 1940's, and even until today. It is not known, but it is believed that the Ukrainians constitute the largest population of any of the subjugated people now slaves in the labor and concentration camps of Moscow.

We now come to 1945. I have previously said that the Ukrainians are a God-fearing people. Their Ukrainian Catholic Church in 1945 practically suffered destruction at the hands of Red Russia.

Ukrainian political prisoners in 1953 and thereafter led uprisings in Vorkuta and Karaganda concentration camps.

I should pause for a moment on that point. This is a Ukrainian speaking:

> I live in a concentration and slave labor camp. I am a human being. I want to think and I want to speak. I want to be free. I have never done a wrong, except to think and to seek for freedom. Yet here I am within these bleak walls in the snow and windblasted plains of Siberia. I have suffered pain. The prospects are that I will not be liberated out of this camp, but I shall rise and I shall fight.

That is what they did in the face of guns and might, to go to their death.

Ukrainians have demonstrated through the last 43 years their desire to be free. However, that opportunity has not been provided for them.

In September of last year Khrushchev came to the United States and attended the United Nations Assembly. He spoke there at great length. He demeaned himself in a manner which made many of our people wonder what stability there was in his thinking. But in one of his talks he began to speak about the freedom and independence of people. He spoke about the exploitation the imperial powers are practicing upon allegedly enslaved people, and he condemned the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other countries, alleging that we are imperialistic nations.

I wish to put into the RECORD today a narration of the conduct of Red Russia. It begins back in 1920, at the time Red Russia first took control of the Ukraine. The Ukraine became independent on January 22, 1918. It was officially recognized as an independent nation by many governments. By the end of 1920 independent Ukraine no longer existed. It was conquered, overrun by Red Russia.

Byelorussia, also within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, proclaimed its independence on March 25, 1918. It was conquered by Communist Russia in 1920. It no longer lives as an independent nation, but has become a servient people, the slaves of tyrannical communism.

Georgia established its independence on May 26, 1918. It was subjugated by Moscow in 1920. It no longer is an independent nation.

Armenia established its independence on May 30, 1918. It was overcome in 1920. It has now as the headstone, as I call it, Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Azerbaijan, which proclaimed its independence on May 29, 1918, lost its independence to Moscow in 1920.

Cossackia, which proclaimed its independence on May 5, 1918, was conquered and subjugated in 1920.

Estonia, which proclaimed its independence on February 24, 1918, was occupied by Communist Russia in June of 1940.

Latvia, born on November 18, 1918, was slain by Communist Russia in June 1940.

Lithuania, born to freedom and independence on February 16, 1918, was molded and subjugated by Communist Russia in June 1940.

All of these countries were independent republics. They wanted to live as free republics, but the Red greed, and desire to rule the world, brought those ambitions to an end. Each one of these nations today is a colony of Communist Russia, ruled with an iron hand, subjected to slavery, russification, and colonial exploitation.

Communist Russia has another brand of colonies. They are the so-called satellites of middle and eastern Europe. They are so enmeshed in Communist Russia's military, political, and economic machinations that they cannot act with any semblance of freedom and independence.

I would put into this category the whole list of captive nations. I do not know whether I can identify all of them, but I would begin with Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. I would include Yugoslavia and Poland. The great masses of people in those nations want to be free, but they are not given that privilege by this imperial Red dragon.

Mr. President, I desire to quote what was said by a number of leading statesmen in the United Nations Assembly after Khrushchev had labeled France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, and the United States as imperial powers, exploiting the people. Before doing so, I point out that the United States has provided $75 billion of aid to help the people in underdeveloped economies and to aid in the resurrection of nations which were destroyed in the war.

After Khrushchev got through beating the desk with his shoes, and after not one of our representatives at the United Nations spoke up, the representatives of several small nations rose to their feet for violent protest. I wish to quote what was said by Australian Prime Minister Robert Gordon Menzies:

> I venture to say that it is an act of complete hypocrisy for a Communist leader to denounce colonialism as if it were an evil characteristic of the Western Powers, when the facts are that the greatest colonial power now existing in the world is the Soviet Union itself.

Later, Francisco A. Delgado, chief of the Philippine mission, rose to his feet to give expression to his thoughts. It was while Delgado was speaking that Khrushchev, with his shoe, pounded the desk, causing a disturbance, to the end that Delgado would not be heard.

Delgado, speaking of the United States, said:

> They helped us to establish a public school system so that, by the end of the American regime, the Philippines had one of the highest literacy rates of any country in Asia. * * * They constructed hospitals and stamped out epidemic diseases. They built roads and bridges and developed agriculture and industry. They permitted our people the full enjoyment of civil liberties. They developed and strengthened our democratic institutions.

That was a quite significant statement made by the representative of the Philippines, especially when we recognize the type of justice which is administered in the Communist nation of Soviet Russia and its colonial servants around the world.

Further, in rebutting the attacks of the representatives of the so-called people's democracies to the United Nations, Ambassador Tingfu F. Tsiang, representative of the Republic of China, emphasized the traditional sympathy of the Chinese people for the Eastern European peoples, and asserted that none of the representatives of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Ukraine, and Byelorussia is free to speak his mind; all are captive prisoners and mouthpieces of the Kremlin.

These satellite nations are supposed to be independent, but they cannot speak their minds. They are the puppets of Soviet Russia. Not a single one of them is in a position to act as an independent nation.

Finally, I come to the words of the Prime Minister of Canada, John J. Diefenbaker. I think there is material within his statement which we ought to remember, as we proceed in the Senate in our debates and actions this year. Mr. Diefenbaker stated:

> Since the last war, 17 colonial areas and territories, comprising more than 40 million people, have been brought to complete freedom by France.

I emphasize that: 17 colonial areas and territories of France have been given freedom since the last war. I continue to quote Mr. Diefenbaker:

> In the same period, some 14 colonies and territories, comprising half a billion people, have achieved complete freedom within the Commonwealth.

Seventeen colonies have been given their freedom by France; 14 by Great Britain; making 31 in all.

> Taken together, some 600 million people in more than 30 countries, most of them now represented in this Assembly, have attained their freedom with the approval, encouragement, and guidance of the United Kingdom and France.

And, I may add, with the encouragement of the United States. Mr. Diefenbaker continued:

> These facts of history invite comparison with the record of the Soviet domination over peoples and territories, sometimes gained in the name of liberation, but always accompanied by the loss of personal and political freedom.

I have identified those countries. The enslavement began in 1918 and is continuing down to this very day. Mr. Diefenbaker continued:

> The General Assembly is still concerned with the aftermath of the Hungarian uprising of 1956. How are we to reconcile that tragedy with Mr. Khrushchev's confident assertion of a few days ago in the Assembly?

Mr. Diefenbaker then quoted Mr. Khrushchev as saying:

> It will always be the Soviet * * * stand that countries should establish systems * * * of their own free will and choosing.

Mr. Diefenbaker then asked:

> What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples * * *?

I venture to say that on the floor of the Senate there will be Senators who will be condemning the United Kingdom, France, and Belgium as wanting to continue their colonial policies.

I ask Senators to remember that since 1945, 31 nations have been set free after they made their choice as to whether they wished to live within the Commonwealth of the United Kingdom or wished to be completely free. There has been a purpose on the part of our country and our allies to allow peoples to determine for themselves what type of government they want. But that cannot be said about the Soviet. It has enslaved millions of people. It has deprived them of their liberties, has drunk of their blood, has stolen their property, and has made abject slaves of them. Yet the leader of that great power has the audacity constantly to label these Western freedom-loving nations as "imperialistic, colonial powers." The truth, Mr. President, is quite to the contrary. The exploitation and the use of these peoples to their own disadvantage have been practiced by Khrushchev, not by anyone else.

Mr. President, I would say to the Ukrainian people that the day is unrelentingly advancing when the Ukrainian poets and writers will have a chance to speak out and write in the Ukrainian language; the Ukrainian scientists will be able to act; Ukrainians interested in political life will be able to speak as free people; the Ukrainian clergy will be able to lead the Ukrainian people in the worship of God in accordance with their consciences. And the many million people of the Ukraine will, one day, bring their charges and accusations before the final Tribunal. Those charges will be about the shedding of innocent blood, the tortures and the suffering imposed upon the Ukrainian people, and the carrying of those enslaved people into concentration camps.

The Communists' wave of terror has created new mass graves; it has created endless trains winding toward Siberia, carrying thousands of the Ukrainian people and thousands of the people of other of the subjugated nations. By every rule of justice and every law of nature, these conditions cry out for redress; the Ukrainian people will have their day.

I call upon my fellow citizens in Ohio to ponder on the creation of the independent Ukrainian Republic 43 years ago yesterday, its brutal extinction by the Communists; and to envision the resurrection of the Ukrainians as a free people. They are our friends, and believe in freedom; they are worthy of our sympathy and our help.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR COTTON

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial appearing in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, congratulating my able colleague, Senator COTTON, for his sponsorship of Senate bill 293.

I am much pleased to note this public recognition of Senator COTTON'S efforts to provide a reasonable program of aid to education.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial, entitled "Congratulations to Senator COTTON," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Jan. 13, 1961]

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR COTTON

Senator NORRIS COTTON has certainly proposed a mighty sensible idea when he suggests that the Federal Government remit to the States 2 cents out of the 8 cents they collect on each package of cigarettes sold in the United States. Under COTTON'S plan the many millions of dollars that this represents would be used by the States for aid to education.

What makes Senator COTTON'S plan so sound and desirable is that this would give the States not only increased money for education, but the complete control of the spending of this money. Under this plan, the Federal Government could not start telling the States or local communities what they should teach in their schools, or how they should run their schools.

It is quite obvious that one of the reasons why local communities and States have such a hard time covering their expenses is that the Federal Government taxes the individuals so heavily that they take out of the States a great deal of money that could ordinarily go to support the cost of State government and local education.

Instead of taking more money out of our pockets, Senator COTTON'S proposal would prevent all this money from going down to Washington, where so much of it is wasted, and would send it directly to the States where the States could have immediate control over it.

We hope that the bill Senator COTTON has introduced into Congress will pass. His plan could go a long way toward keeping local control of education and at the same time lightening the financial burden that now rests on many localities in connection with their school budget.

Congratulations to Senator COTTON.

TRANSPORT REVOLUTION—ADDRESS BY MORRIS FORGASH

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, too few individuals in America recognize the necessity for vision and foresight with respect to matters which affect the lives of every one of us daily. Too few men are exercising the necessary daring and courage to think in a revolutionary manner within their own fields and, having successfully reached bold and consequential thoughts, to apply their reasoning in a practical and efficient way. Such men enrich our lives through their intellect and their contributions to our future well-being. The "works of art" of these men of vision and accomplishment too seldom attain proper recognition or appreciation by the beneficiaries of their words and deeds.

In my opinion, the entire transportation industry has benefited, and the public has benefited as a consequence, because of the thought and the accomplishments of one of its leaders. I refer specifically to my good friend, Morris Forgash, president of the U.S. Freight Co., who has devoted countless hours and days, from a busy schedule for many years, in devising new techniques for utilization by the transportation industry. His interests range the entire field, in all its components; and his voice has been raised, on numerous occasions, all over the country, urging his colleagues to dare to think, and, having thought, to dare to act.

In a recent speech, he has summarized in one place the results of many years of advanced thinking about how to move the necessary goods and commodities essential to our living anywhere on the globe in the fastest and most expeditious manner possible. Because his address intrigued me with the breadth and importance of the techniques he proposes—particularly those regarding "piggyback" and compartmentalization—I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

TRANSPORT REVOLUTION—PROGRESS REPORT

(Address by Morris Forgash, president, United States Freight Co., before the Motor City Traffic Club, Detroit, Mich., October 10, 1960)

It is a notable experience to meet with so many traffic and transportation people in a city so closely identified with transportation.

Detroit has played the role of the giant in the industrial revolution that has taken place in this century. The genius and industry concentrated in this area have changed the habits of a nation and had a potent influence on the entire world. In war and in peace, the economy and the safety of the Nation owe a great deal to the industry of Detroit.

Standing unchallenged as the automobile capital of the world, Detroit literally put America on rubber tired wheels, and it is your purpose, I am sure, to keep America rolling. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say "keep America mobile," for change has characterized the entire history of transportation and we are in a period where change is being accelerated.

Just take one example, we know that the wheel—the oldest symbol of transport, an invention lost in the gray mists of unrecorded time—is in some danger of meeting its first challenge to survival. A new vehicle of sea, land, and air transport, that functions without wheels or wings, and without water displacements, is getting into production. An examiner of the ICC recently tried to define what it is and the best he could come up with is that "We have here a new commodity."

You are not worried about this new development, I am sure, because it presents only a challenge to versatility and not to your productive capacity, and Detroit has met such challenges before.

Lined up behind the air car are the monorail, the conveyor, the rocket, the submarine freighter, and other curious things that only a few years ago were given serious thought only by the writers of science fiction. The anatomy of transportation is changing.

But we cannot stand still while we retool the transportation plant. We must be prepared to meet the demands of an expanding economy and an exploding population with the physical transportation plant that we have in operation. In terms of present consumption of transport service that means we must turn out anywhere from 1,200 to 1,400 billion ton-miles of service before this time a year from now.

That should not prove a staggering task for the most massive and efficient transportation plant ever devised by man. Surely the United States has the physical transportation capacity to move anything she can produce, anywhere it needs to be moved, under peacetime conditions or wartime emergency.

The salient fact is, however, that we have devoted more time to building up capacity in the transportation system than we have devoted to improving efficiency, evolving new techniques, and eliminating waste and duplication. In struggling to build up a system that would give the shipper a choice of modes of common carriage we have permitted conditions to develop under which the shipper has created for himself another choice—private carriage. And thus has come into being a new dimension in transportation.

The verdict of the long-range future will show that as of right now—today—the choice of private versus public carriage is at the core of the very real problem of maintaining a common carrier system under private management and control. This choice has literally forced upon an enlightened shipping public entirely new concepts of transportation, the essential ingredients of which are time and price. Service still has the same value of the shipper that it always had but he has found a new yardstick by which to measure value. What would it cost him to do it himself.

It is no answer to explain to the shipper that the common carrier has to consider his capital investment and maintenance costs, has to assume responsibility for safe carriage, has to perform expensive terminal and accessorial services, has to take into calculation empty-return miles. The shipper knows about these things when he buys his own truck and he reduces them to a simple formula—money and time.

When do-it-yourself transportation poses a serious threat to the mass-producing professional carriers something is wrong. It suggests that we have completed a cycle in defiance of the practical working of economics. Our forefathers on this continent, of necessity, were almost completely self-sufficient. They grew their own food, milled their own grain, spun their own cloth, tanned their own leather, made their own clothes, and hauled their own products. Industrialization and specialization did away with all that.

The proposition, that the great mass of shippers in this country can produce their own transportation more efficiently and economically than they can obtain it from the

common carriers, is as repugnant to basic economics as that we should find it profitable for everyone to buy knitting needles and, like the Pilgrims, produce their own clothes.

Nevertheless, the trend is in that direction. In terms of total output, common carriers are not maintaining their place in the distribution system. Something like two-thirds of highway transportation is produced by private or exempt carriers. The railroads, admittedly the most efficient mass and distance haulers in our system, are losing their place in the economy at an alarming pace.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has just released a study showing the actual versus the potential railroad tonnage trend over the 10-year period, 1947 to 1957. It shows that in 1957 the railroad slice of the total production pie was 26 percent less than it was in 1947. And to those who say "Why shed a tear for the railroads?" I say "Send not to learn for whom the bell tolls." If we cannot maintain our railroads in the realm of private industry we will not long so maintain the other carriers.

We cannot afford to permit the "decline and fall" of the common carrier because common carriage is the only means of transport that can adequately serve the whole economy—the only medium that offers any hope of security and survival in a world of mounting danger. The question is not whether but how we will support and maintain a strong and fully adequate system of common carriage. And if we reach the point of diminishing returns we will discover that the alternatives are increasingly higher freight rates or tax dollars. We have an opportunity to do something now, on our own initiative, in the area of freight rates as equated to transport output in terms of speed and service. If we follow the rest of the world down the road to Government ownership of public transport we will lose that initiative.

You are more concerned with solutions than with problems and I want to suggest for your consideration some solutions that seem quite obvious to me. First, I think we have tended to lose sight of some fundamentals and first principles in our thinking about our transportation system, such as its ultimate mission—the role of Government in transportation—and the means for achieving the goals of transportation policy.

Regulation was designed, initially, to protect and promote the public interest, and that should be its cardinal purpose and effect today. It is true that as the transportation system expanded, and new modes of carriage came into being, transportation policy was directed to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States and the national defense. Transportation policy also seeks to preserve the inherent advantages of each mode of carriage. But if there were no need to protect the public interest there still would be no need for regulation of common carriers, any more than there is need for Federal regulation of the steel industry or other businesses.

If we subjugate the needs of the public to the needs of particular segments of the transportation industry we will achieve neither a coordinated nor an adequate transportation system. If we consider the effect of change and innovation designed to obtain the maximum benefits from the natural advantages of each mode of carriage, not in the light of the public benefits flowing therefrom, but of the effect of such change on another mode of carriage, we will stifle progress. The Transportation Act of 1958 was designed to prevent just that.

Technological advances mean nothing unless they are translated into advantages to the shipping public. And if improved technology demands new technique and method, new standards of service and price, we should not throttle progress in the straitjacket of old concepts and old ways of doing things.

The history of transportation in this country is a history of revolution succeeding revolution. The wagon train, the canal and barge, the steam packet, the steel rail, largely succeeded each other because of their ability to serve the needs of a growing Nation. Then came the airplane and the revival of highway and domestic water transportation due to invention, technology, and improved facilities on which to operate. But we reached a point in time where a viewpoint took hold that we should not disturb the status quo. This viewpoint seems to stem from a philosophy that science should be permitted to improve technique, but technique should be geared to what everybody else in transportation is doing.

We ought to reread history so that we may clearly understand that the status quo will never be possible in transportation. Transportation is the dynamics of mobility. It has paced civilization since the invention of the wheel and we cannot freeze transportation in the posture it achieved in the fifth decade of the 20th century.

The revolution I came here to talk about tonight is unique in the history of the evolution of transportation, and, may well rank in importance with the development of the diesel locomotive. It is not based on a new means of locomotion or propulsion, or upon new physical pathways to resolve the elements of time, terrain, and distance, but upon new concepts for the adaptation of old services to current demands. If we permit it to succeed it will apply to every subsequent development in transportation because, like Newton's law, it rests on a basic theorem and is not subject to obsolescence. The theorem is that the shipper should have available to his use the best, the safest, the fastest, and the cheapest avenue of transportation that the physical transportation system is capable of producing at any given time. We cannot get away from the fact that this is the basic mission of transportation as a regulated public utility, and it ought to be the basic objective and purpose of regulation.

It is surprising, with all our knowledge, that this revolution was not triggered long ago. We have realized for many years that to make our transportation system fully effective it must be coordinated, and coordination has been one of the major objectives of our national transportation policy since it was adopted in 1940. It also has long been recognized that the common denominator of our system of transportation is the unit of haulage or freight container. Twenty-five years ago Joe Eastman recommended use of the container as a coordinating factor and urged standardization before the lack of standardization spread to such proportions as to neutralize all economic benefits of containerization. For more than a hundred years "piggybacking," in one form or another, has been employed sporadically as a means of unifying one mode of carriage with another.

But notwithstanding policy, knowledge, and experience, coordination through containerization gained little headway until the early part of the decade of the fifties. It was only along toward the latter part of the decade that the idea developed into the proportions of a full-scale revolution. The Interstate Commerce Commission clarified some legal questions concerning piggybacking in 1954 and this old, old innovation in transportation was hailed by electrifying reports in the press—but we were still thinking about transportation in compartments. We had not yet oriented thinking about piggybacking and containerization to the shippers' viewpoint.

Perhaps the real stumbling block was that while everyone was talking about coordination there was no agreed-upon definition of what coordination means, so that we were talking about different things. Everyone was agreed that coordination is a good thing but there was no real agreement because the term meant different things to different people. The confusion has not yet been fully dispelled, and until it is we will continue to work on a Tower of Babel.

If we stop to think for a minute we will realize that coordination of transportation is not meaningful in and of itself. What purpose would be served in coordinating a rail haul from here to Chicago with a truck haul from Chicago to the coast? Why would anyone send a shipment from here to San Francisco by air and put it on a slow freighter for Tokyo?

The only kind of coordination that serves any useful purpose is a combination of services of different modes of transportation on a conjunctive basis that will give the shipper the maximum benefits of each mode—in terms of economy, speed and convenience. If we can agree on that definition we will readily see that a good deal of the talk and thinking about coordination is fuzzy.

Substitution of one form of carriage for another is not coordination because it is not conjunctive. It is an arrangement of convenience—not the convenience of the shipper but of carrier management. An example is the substituted service arrangement for piggybacking called plan I. Under this plan the motor carrier contracts with a railroad to haul the freight of the motor carrier in the motor carrier's trailers for a part or all of the journey within the truckman's authorized territory. To put it another way, the motor carrier simply subcontracts to the railroad a part of his obligation to haul, and the shipper gets just what he bargained for in the first place—truck service at truck rates.

Another form of coordination much talked about—coordination of the services of differing modes of transportation on the basis of joint rates—has theoretically been possible from the very beginning, but it has made little headway. We may as well face the economic fact that for terminal-to-terminal hauls by land for any appreciable distance the most efficient and economic means of carriage on the scene today is the railroad. Conversely, the flexibility and maneuverability of the truck makes motor carriage superior, and indeed indispensable, for the ancillary or shorter distance hauls.

In addition, the short-haul motor carrier is a vital link in a comprehensive system of nationwide coordination. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why this important segment has been and still remains so silent about a development which holds forth so much promise for its economic well-being. On the other hand, the most vocal exponents of coordination are the long-haul motor carriers and here, unfortunately, is where the confusion sets in—when they speak of coordination between rail and motor carrier, they are actually advocating "substituted service" which is an entirely different doctrine.

In addition to his important role of furnishing the transportation service for which it is best fitted from every economic standpoint, the short-haul motor carrier can be a real factor by coordinating its operations with that of the railroad for the longer distances to and from the railhead, thereby providing a much improved overall service to the shipping public. This also provides the only means the railroad has to supplant expensive freight and short-haul operations by means of the motor vehicle. In short, the short-haul motor carrier holds a principal key to proper coordination, and, I submit, this is the area in which exploratory work and research has been sadly neglected.

Future developments may realine some of the economic factors to some extent. We may see the advent of the truck-train on

the superhighway. New means of propulsion, and I do not exclude the possibilities of atomic power, may bring changes in present concepts of water and rail carriage. But whatever the situation, the basic movement must yield to the medium best qualified to perform that movement.

True coordination, in my opinion, must be founded upon two essential ingredients. The development and use of a standardized container that is completely interchangeable among all modes of transportation; and the adoption of a simplified rate or charge that will reflect—for the shipper—the inherent advantages of the basic line-haul carrier or carriers. Within the past few years tremendous strides have been made in the two areas I have mentioned. That, of course, is the revolution about which I am talking and as to which I wish to give you a brief progress report.

Perhaps the greatest single stride yet taken toward containerization was the publication in September 1959 of the report of the special subcommittee on containerization and standardization of the National Defense Transportation Association. This subcommittee, which was formed in 1958, and of which I have been privileged to serve as chairman, is made up of eminent representatives of the various transportation media industry. After thorough study and research, and the sifting of our own views and ideas in work sessions and meetings, we unanimously recommended a standard container with a basic unit length of 20 feet, for use singly or in multiples, up to a maximum length of 40 feet, and with a standard width and height of 8 feet by 8 feet. Containers of these dimensions can be used on the rails aboard the latest 85-foot flatcars; on the highways aboard 40-foot trailers for long-distance hauling and 20-foot demountable trailers for city street and short-haul delivery routes; and aboard ships and in cargo planes now in use or on the drawing boards.

We are fully aware that our recommended standard is merely a goal; that trailers and containers of many different sizes are already in use; and that not everyone agrees that we have come up with the best possible specification. Nevertheless, it is significant that we have agreed on a goal, for, without such a goal, containerization will defeat its own purposes and succumb, through obsolescence, to the forces of change.

May I at this juncture say a few words about the important part ocean carriage can play in this coordinating development. Steamship companies must realize that the economies achieved by the reduction of labor at the pier will not of themselves insure the success of marine containerization, because water carriage is neither the beginning nor the end of the distribution cycle. Such economies are certainly desirable—in fact, they must be achieved if the operations of the steamship companies are to continue being profitable. Because every container originates and terminates on land, however, the hauling of the container must be commercially feasible and attractive to surface carriers.

A steamship company will not help itself, except to a minor degree, by instituting a container program that is not integrated with highway and rail movements. Marine containers must be so designed that their cube and handling features do not penalize other carriers.

The next step is the all-purpose, or universal container, that can double in "brass" and be adapted to haul almost anything that moves. This is something of particular importance to you here in Detroit, and I will have more to say on the subject a little later.

Neither standardization nor the ultimate, all-purpose container, will bring about coordination unless we can bridge the gap between the physical modes of carriage, and the essential "bridge," in my opinion, is the freight rate of charge that will permit and encourage the shipper himself to effect the coordination. The first long step in that direction was taken when the railroads, a little more than a year ago, began to publish simplified charges for the hauling of freight in the shippers' own containers, from ramp to ramp. Under one plan, known as plan III, the charge contemplates the furnishing, by the railroads, of the flatcar to haul the shipper-owned trailers. Under the other, known as plan IV, the shipper is required to furnish both trailers and flatcar, and the railroad provides only the motive power.

This new and revolutionary basis for containerized transportation met with instantaneous success because it made sense to the shipper. The shipper always has packaged his own freight shipments in cartons, crates, or what-have-you, but when he went to ship it he had to pay for weight of packing, countless manual handlings, and absorb the cost of needless and expensive services wholly incidental to the line-haul movement of his shipments. Why not "package" the freight to ride in the first instance, and avoid all these handlings, all the exposure to loss, damage, and pilferage, all the wasted hours in terminals and yards?

But the shipper could not afford to invest in the necessary equipment, "package" the freight with his own labor, and arrange for its movement to and from the railheads, unless he could obtain a price for the line-haul movement of the total "package" that would reflect the advantages of hauling a prepackaged lot of freight over steel rails.

The old standards of ratemaking provided no yardstick for pricing this new type of service. Under the new concept the railroads had to disregard, in whole or in part, the factors which normally constituted the composition of a freight rate; namely, capital investment in and maintenance of equipment (except motive equipment); common carrier liability; cost of terminal switching and other accessorial services; and empty car movements. And to that last, elusive, traditional ratemaking stand of "value of service" they had to apply a new meaning—"How much would it cost the shipper to provide the same haul with his own equipment?"

Striking out boldly, the railroads changed the "atomic structure" of the freight rate to meet these known facts and obvious shipper demands. They simply published a charge of so many dollars for hauling shipper-packaged freight on flatcars between given points. For the complicated formulas of the past they substituted a formula with the known per-mile cost of hauling the shipper-owned equipment over the road at the bottom and, at the top, what the shipper would pay, which increasingly is determined by what it costs him to do the complete job himself. In between they fixed a charge that provides a profit to the carriers and a savings to the shipper.

Thus the freight rate proved the catalyst that finally broke containerized, coordinated transportation out of its chrysalis. Technology developed the hardware—the freight rate was the fusing element.

But the path of progress has never been easy, and because this new service represented change it brought forth cries of anguish from vested modal interests. Far and wide the lament was heard: "This will break down the traditional freight-rate structure—it will throw the sacred classification out of the window." Traditional methods and concepts always must give way to the onslaughts of economic change.

Surprisingly enough, these charges are echoes out of the past, for while this concept of containerized piggybacking is new in the sense that it uses modern tools and is tailored to the needs of modern distribution, it is old in theory and practice. Once, in the early thirties, an administrative interpretation that containerized freight had to be sold, if at all, on the old freight classification basis instead of the unit-price or mileage basis, set the movement back about 25 years. But here and there piggybacking of the same kind, represented by the current plans, was conducted successfully, if sporadically, and with the Commission's blessing. For example, the Chicago Great Western Railroad began a service between Chicago and the Twin Cities in 1936, based on a published tariff, naming charges in flat amounts per movement of shipper-owned trailers, in precisely the same manner as the current plan III rates. The rate was challenged and the Commission approved it as lawful.

The flat piggyback charges do not ignore rate classification. One of the most important characteristics of freight in today's competitive transportation system is its density. The space limitations of the trailers used in piggyback service—their cubic capacity—provide a near perfect classification of the lading, based solely upon density and the ability to load. Thus the rates do reflect classification principles which are the most significant under modern conditions.

But neither precedent nor economic fact have stilled the outcry against this new adaptation of an old theory. Litigation involving the plan III and plan IV rates is still in progress. Dire predictions about the assumed competitive effect of these plans have been spread before a committee of Congress. I recall that once when some freight forwarder legislation was reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, over the objections of competing interests, the committee expressed itself in its report as follows:

"The function of Congress is to legislate in the public interest. It has not been demonstrated that allocation of traffic as between competing carriers, by legislation, is in the public interest" (S. Rept. 1285, 81st Cong.).

That statement of congressional policy was made in 1950, but it is timeless and it is all that need be said on the subject today.

We stand at a crossroads in the history of transportation, and we will take the wrong turn if we permit narrow or selfish, or simply timeworn and outmoded, concepts to deprive the public and the Nation of the tremendous and limitless potentials of this new kind of service.

So vast are the potentials, and so rapidly are they being realized, that it would require a series of lectures to do the subject justice. In my limited time let me use some broad brush strokes on the canvas of some old prophecies of mine. It is not that I want to establish myself as a prophet, but I need a convenient yardstick.

About 2 years ago, when piggybacking was in its embryonic stages, I stood before a gathering of traffic and transportation people in Los Angeles and read some of the things I saw in the future of this development. I made a number of predictions, which, in the interest of time, I will only epitomize here. They were as follows:

The larger portion of the rail boxcar and refrigerator fleets will be supplanted—within 10 years—by trailer and demountable truck bodies on flatcars; this will bring about revolutionary changes in the production, merchandising, and transportation of the essential element of goods—perishable, frozen, and otherwise; and the eroding empty-car movement, which consumes 40 percent of the productive capacity of the rail system, will be reduced by 50 percent or more through the use of refrigerated trailers and containers.

We have made history faster than we have recorded in all of these areas. Just what the census of the piggyback fleet would show as of this moment I do not know, but

the carloading reports show that for the first 34 weeks of this year piggyback loadings were running 35 percent ahead of last year.

But figures do not tell the whole story. We can read the future of piggybacking by the enthusiasm with which it is being accepted not only by the shipping public but by men in the transportation industry who are doing something about it. For example, in an interview printed in the New York Times last September 26, President Harry W. Von Willer, board chairman of the newly merged Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, was very optimistic about the benefits the two roads could achieve in extending their "piggyback" or trailer on flatcar operations. He predicted that the future of the railroads lay in that direction and that eventually 60 percent of all freight will move in containers or trailers on flatcars. Stating that, "while piggybacking, at the present time, accounted for only 3½ percent of the railroad's total traffic, it was, nevertheless, doubling regularly each year."

When I predicted transport revolution in the area of food production and distribution I was simply using one example of many. The all-purpose container will revolutionize the transportation of new automobiles, of liquids, grains and almost everything else that today requires the use of special-purpose, one-way equipment. A prototype of such a container was unveiled at the NDTA convention in Seattle last fall. It could haul new automobiles on retractable ramps, liquids in collapsible rubber containers, or dry cargo—separately or in any combination.

Since that time such a container is being engineered to its ultimate capability—the hauling of refrigerated products. As another innovation, a collapsible tank has been introduced which, by use of disposable plastic liners, can be used to haul liquids in one direction and grains in the other, without danger of contamination.

The all-purpose container is not only in production, by several companies, but in actual use. Right now, new automobiles are being hauled in one direction and the same trailers are bringing back a payload of other commodities. I do not need to tell you, here in Detroit, what that means in terms of economy. Your freight rates have necessarily been geared to a 50-percent-empty movement—you have been buying a round-trip ticket to take a one-way ride. When the use of this new equipment makes it possible to sell all the return tickets to somebody else, it cannot help but reduce your cost of distribution. Who can say to what extent a final development of all-purpose trailer or container may influence the policy of the automotive industry in the operation of decentralized assembly plants? It is my belief that this built-in double freight cost may have had its effect on decisions of the automobile industry in establishing assembly plants closer to the source of sales.

The national ratio of empty to loaded movement is not quite as high as yours in the automobile business, but it is a whopping 40 percent, and that is the greatest waste in the entire economy. If we can cut that in half—and I predict we can do much better than that with all-purpose containerization—we will have made the greatest improvement in the transportation system that has occurred in our lifetime—perhaps in this century.

The elimination of this colossal waste, and the increased productivity which it will introduce into the transportation system without any increase in the physical plant, is of vital significance not only to the economy of the Nation but to national defense. The Department of Defense not only is pioneering containerization on its own, but has intervened in the legal proceedings and testified in support of the plan III and plan IV rates that are under attack.

The military potential of a standby fleet of all-purpose equipment, ready to haul anything, anywhere, from the end of the production line or the depot platform to a foreign beachhead and beyond cannot be overestimated. We cannot afford to stockpile such a pool of equipment from public funds, nor can we hope to build one on the eve of emergency or after the enemy strikes. But we are building one now—very largely with private capital—and it can be diverted to emergency use if the time comes when survival depends on the capacity and flexibility of the transportation plan.

Just to give one specific example of the military potential of containerization, I refer to an article by Rear Adm. Thomas A. Long, Deputy Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy, which appeared in the September-October 1960 issue of the National Defense Transportation Journal. Admiral Long said that terminal handling absorbs 69 percent of the Navy's ocean transportation costs. He said if that factor cannot be licked American-flag commerce will disappear from the world sealanes. He pointed to containerization as the answer and added: "All that is needed is leadership and coordinated effort within government" to realize its full potential.

Again reverting to my earlier prophecy, I said that the passenger deficit to which we have become resigned as a necessary concomitant of the obligation of the railroads to carry everything anywhere, can be solved by merging this fringe area of rail service with a payload. Passengers don't object to riding with a kitchen—why should they object to riding with a commissary? With roller bearing flatcars and harmoniously designed containers there is no reason why piggybacked freight should not lend elegance to the finest passenger trains in the country—and give them the respectability of paying their way.

The fact is that freight already is being piggybacked on passenger trains in some sections of the country.

Transportation is not a complicated thing in the shipper's perspective. He views transportation in terms of speed and cost—how much, how far, how fast. I said in 1958, and I repeat it now, that roller bearing piggyback equipment will shrink freight transit time between the east and west coasts to 48 hours. As one consequence of that kind of speed I said the railroads would be able to prevent further erosion of their higher rated commodities to air transportation.

A great many people thought there was a typographical error in my manuscript when I predicted that kind of speed, even though I looked ahead 10 years. But look at the record. Ten years ago the coast-to-coast rail time was eighth night arrival, ninth morning delivery. Today it is fourth night, fifth morning delivery—and we are on the verge of shaving off another day. I doubt if the airlines even in a jet age, will take very much freight off of the rails on the basis of a 1- or 2-day differential in transit time on a transcontinental haul.

Events along this line are moving faster than anticipated. Only the other day the Santa Fe Railroad docketed for consideration a proposal for the establishment of an extra charge in piggyback service for containerized shipments from Chicago to Los Angeles. The basic charge, in regular third morning arrival service, is $924 per car but this proposed service carries a price tab of $1,600 per car. At the outset this service will be established experimentally for a period of 6 months and will begin with movement in the rail carriers mail and express train. Cars will leave Chicago 11:30 p.m. and arrive in Los Angeles 7:30 p.m. the second night. Some time within the next 2 years we can look forward to the establishment of solid piggyback trailer and containerized trains between principal trading centers in the United States.

My final prediction—that ultimately we would be able to ship a container load of freight from any point in the United States to any point in the world without physically rehandling the contents—is already being proved out.

United States Freight Co. and its affiliates operate internationally, and it will not be long before intercontinental piggyback service, from New York, Chicago, and other points in the Middle West to the Orient, will be in regular operation. This highway-to-rail-to-ship-to-rail-to-truck globe-circling service will be conducted with our own standardized equipment. The freight will be picked up at the shippers' docks in the interior of the United States with 20-foot trailers, two of which can be locked together for over-the-road movement as a 40-foot unit. It will be delivered to the consignees in the Orient from the same trailers, without physical rehandling. It will move all the way on one bill of lading, by one carrier, on one charge.

This kind of freight pipeline can be established between any two points in the world—national barriers permitting—and it will be established because the shippers will demand it and they are entitled to no less.

In 2 short years we have made more progress toward coordinated transportation, through standardized containerization, than we made in all the years since it dawned upon a young America that we could not have coordinated rail transportation without standard widths of track and interchangeable equipment. But we have only seen the beginning. We are still in the early morning of enterprise.

The United States is growing, physically, economically, and in population. Industry is shifting away from the railheads. The world is getting smaller—the peoples of the free world are growing more interdependent upon each other. There is urgent need for a system of transportation that will extend the benefits of fast, low-cost rail transportation away from the railheads, and provide the most economical combination of rail and highway service. There is need for a worldwide transportation pipeline that will facilitate the flow of commerce, give new life to our lagging merchant marine, and strengthen our posture for defense.

This new concept of piggyback containerized service, at realistic charges which permit the shipper to acquire and use his own equipment, is the only development that offers any hope of filling these needs. It is the only development that offers the faintest hope of halting the increasing spiral of freight rates and stemming the growing trend to private carriage. It is coordination in action and not in theory.

If we have the vision and wisdom to give this new development an opportunity to survive and grow, and the patience to help it through the experimental stage, we will achieve a new dimension in transportation. Engineering and technology have done their part. All we have to do now is make up our minds that it is time to break with the past and we will inherit a better future.

THE HIGH COST OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the question of which side benefits most from so-called cultural exchanges between this country and Soviet Russia is still being debated.

The American Legion magazine for December 1960, carries a well-written and thought-provoking article on this question, entitled "The High Cost of

Russian Culture," written by Esther Julie Pels. Most Members of this body who are also Legionnaires have probably seen the article. I therefore commend it to the attention of others, who may have missed it.

In addition to reviewing the long, 40-year record of Communist effort to achieve social and cultural equality with the United States, through the medium of exchanges, this article also points out the importance that Khrushchev himself places on such cultural and other exchanges. Last June, while delivering one of the most insulting and coarse personal attacks ever made against a President of the United States, Khrushchev was careful to add:

Russians will continue to get visas for the United States and Americans for Russia, and all delegations which had planned to make trips to the United States—scientific, educational, technical, and artistic—will still make them.

Personally, I have a suspicion that the technical, educational, and scientific exchanges are far more important to the big Red boss of the Kremlin than any cultural or artistic exchanges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The High Cost of Russian Culture" be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

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

THE HIGH COST OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

(By Esther Julia Pels)

This is why the Russians are in favor of the cultural exchange program. As usual, they manage to get a lot more out of the arrangement than they give.

In Moscow last June while delivering the most insulting diatribe ever directed against the Government of the United States, Premier Khrushchev paused long enough to say: "Russians will continue to get visas for the United States and Americans for Russia, and all delegations which had planned to make trips to the United States—scientific, educational, technical, and artistic—will still make them."

This was in reference to the so-called cultural exchange agreement between the United States and Russia which has now been extended to the end of 1961.

In light of recent events we could reasonably hope that this would mean finis to this particular Soviet booby trap. But don't bet on it. We have some pretty myopic gentlemen in our State Department who are prepared to argue that cultural exchange is a sure-fire way to reduce international tensions. However, they overlook a lot of history, especially in the case of Germany and Japan, with whom we had some very nice cultural relations—up until the outbreak of hostilities.

The "cultural" theme has been too profitable for the Russians for them to want to drop it. Hence the remarkable alacrity shown by them when it comes to signing cultural treaties. Conferences on disarmament, nuclear weapons control, and American POW's lost in Korea may be dragged out for months and years, but cultural bargains with Uncle Sam are snapped up by the Reds in a matter of days.

Considering the success they have had in softening up Americans to accept Ukrainian choruses, orchestras, and the ballet as representative of Communist culture, who can blame them?

Actually the agreement signed between the United States and the U.S.S.R. calls for exchanges in "cultural, technical and educational fields." Somehow or other the technical and educational aspects of the exchange have been played down and the program is widely known as the "cultural exchange" program. This gives it an air of untouchability, since no one, not even a lout, dares to attack or question culture. Accent on culture by the Communists therefore is, first, designed to attract and appeal to intellectuals and, secondly, to establish a "bridge to the non-Communist masses," as they phrase it.

It also serves to give protection to the exchanges in the program which might otherwise alarm Americans if they were fully aware of their implications. The proposed exchange of visits of the delegations of Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and Members of the U.S. Congress is one. The obvious folly of giving away our industrial know-how to a backward nation in the exchange of delegations in the fields of iron and steel, mining, and plastics industry is another. Fortunately, the proposed visit of the "Red Banner song and dance ensemble of the Soviet Army" proved too strong for some American stomachs. The widespread protests forced the cancellation of the project, so for the time being at least, Americans are spared the sight of the Red troops who mowed down the helpless people of Hungary.

A careful reading of Communist documents would prove invaluable to anyone planning a cultural deal with the Russians. However, few people ever bother with that. Communists seem to know this because they are amazingly frank and candid in drawing up their directives for cultural exchanges and other Trojan horse activities.

Khrushchev has expressed his views on the role which culture must play in Communist life in the following statement taken from the New Times, February 1956: "In the battle which our party is waging against the moribund ideas and conceptions of the Old World, for the dissemination and affirmation of Communist ideology, a major role belongs to the press, literature, and art."

The whole infiltration of this country by Communists through various fronts, began with, and was successfully carried out under, the guise of this same cultural activity.

By 1928, Stalin, having liquidated all opposition in his own country, was ready to proceed with the infiltration of communism into other countries.

The depression in the United States in 1929 gave him a golden opportunity. Many people were willing to try new, radical solutions to the problems of unemployment and want. Whittaker Chambers and others have written extensively on the widespread disillusionment which swept through normally conservative segments of our population. The storm of the depression unhinged and bewildered many American intellectuals. Communist supersalesmen were on hand to assure them that they and they alone held the key to a rational and well-ordered society of the future.

This trend was noted in the New Masses, a magazine known in Communist circles as "the leading organ of the proletarian cultural movement of the U.S.A.," with the following statement: "The first organizational expression of this radicalization occurred at the very beginning of the economic crisis with the formation in October 1929 of the first association of revolutionary writers and artists of the United States, the John Reed Club."

This discontent was quickly seized upon by the Communists. Up to this time most Americans, regardless of social or economic position, had rejected communism for the alien revolutionary movement it was. The Communist movement had been organized and largely controlled by foreign-born elements.

In 1930, according to the New Masses, a conference was held: "At Kharkov, the capital of the Socialist Soviet Republic of the Ukraine, there was held from November 6 to 15, 1930, the second world plenum (conference) of the International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature. Revolutionary writers and artists from 22 countries and 5 continents, as well as numerous representatives from the Soviet Union gathered to discuss their problems and tasks—creative, organizational, and political—and adopted a common international platform and specific programs for each country."

Translated from Communist gobbledygook, this means that the Communists had set up for the first time a worldwide network for cultural penetration into the countries they planned to subvert and overthrow.

The American delegates were from the New Masses and the John Reed Club. They were Fred Ellis, Michael Gold, William Gropper, Joshua Kunitz, A. B. Magil and Harry Alan Potamkin. These names figure prominently through the pro-Communist cultural groups established in the 1930's.

Since not all the delegates to the conference were Communists but were in sympathy with the aims of the Communists and willing to travel down the same road to achieve those aims, they were addressed not as comrades, but as fellow travelers. This was probably the origin of this now well-known expression used and understood so widely.

In addition to the political program which they brought back with them, in which they pledged themselves "to fight in defense of the fatherland of all the workers and revolutionary intellectuals of the world, the Soviet Union," the delegates had a planned 10-point program for cultural infiltration. The New Masses was to be used to win over intellectuals to the Communist cause. The John Reed Club was to be expanded, and closer contacts with revolutionary cultural organizations and publications in other countries were to be maintained. All of these were to be controlled by Moscow, and in the hands of disciplined Communist organizers. It was also organized to give technical assistance to the revolution. The delegates signed an appeal in the New Masses "to the young intellectuals of America, break with the dying culture of a dying class. Join us in the fight for a new world."

All Communist propaganda is based on the dictum that capitalist culture is rotten, decadent and dying, and that Communist culture represents the new, the virile, and the dynamic culture of the future. Cartoons, which are always a highly effective means of political indoctrination, hammered on this theme in the New Masses year after year.

The standard defense alibi used by those apologizing for sending abroad so-called art by Communist artists is "We are not interested in the artist's politics, only in his art." Many of these defenders of Communist artists are undoubtedly conservative, patriotic Americans and some probably even fancy themselves anti-Communists. Those using this argument obviously have no knowledge or familiarity whatever with Communist directives on this question. Note the following open political orders to a group of people previously infiltrated and seduced on the cultural level, taken from the New Masses of 1934: "If, for example, an artist is interested in Negro problems and portrays scenes from Negro life, he would become a member of the group that would cooperate with the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. The group of artists would then join the latter organization, become active members of it, participate in its struggles, acquaint themselves with the problems confronting the Negro masses, and come to know the masses themselves.

"There are many advantages in such a plan. The artist gains in knowledge of his

material and in understanding of the situations that he deals with. The revolutionary movement on the other hand benefits from the propaganda value of such works."

With the artists well organized to serve the Soviet Union, the Communists next turned their attention to writers. Writers had been organized in the John Reed Clubs and the Kharkov conference had been formed around the International Union of Revolutionary Writers. Still there was need, the Communists said, "for a further organization of revolutionary writers to convince the people of the necessity of the struggles against capitalism and for the institution of Marxism, as well as to fight Fascist tendencies in the United States."

This new organization was founded by the leaders of the John Reed Club and the call to set up this new front came from Earl Browder, then national secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. The name of this outfit was the League of American Writers. Membership in this new group was open "to all writers whose work has been published or used with reasonable frequency in channels of communication of more than local scope including magazines, newspapers, the radio, the stage, and the screen." Among the aims of the organization were: "To enlist writers in all parts of the United States in a national cultural organization for peace and democracy and against fascism and reaction," and "to effect an alliance in the interest of culture between American writers and all progressive forces."

As you can see, this new "cultural" front gave the Communists the opportunity to influence all the great media of propaganda in the United States for the advancement of Soviet aims.

Only by reading these manifestos of what the Communists have achieved under the banner of culture can one appreciate the point of an anecdote told about the Nazi gauleiter who sneered: "When I hear the word 'culture,' I reach for my gun." This anecdote illustrates the cleverness of the Communists and their superiority over the Nazis. The Hitlerites openly boasted of their detestation of bourgeois culture. The Communists, infinitely smarter, realized that only through culture could they establish contact with important intellectuals and subvert them to party aims.

These revolutionary cultural fronts—of film workers, dancers, musicians, folk singers, youth groups, athletes, etc.—grew so rapidly that the active Communists in each unit decided to unite in one big cultural front. This was called the Workers Cultural Federation and by 1931 it comprised over 179 organizations. Each of these fronts was set up to ensnare various groups. For instance, the Workers Anti-Religious League was affiliated as part of "cultural" activity. This outfit had as some of its aims "the launching of a campaign against Bible teaching in the New York schools and the establishment of antireligious Sunday schools for children."

Eugene Lyons has written the whole story of this cultural infiltration and its tragic results for America in his book called, so aptly, "The Red Decade."

The highlight of Communist cultural activity in America was the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City in 1949.

More than 1,800 people paid $10 a plate (a lot of money in 1949) to attend. The New York World-Telegram headlined it this way: "Reds To Stuff $10-a-Plate Culture Down Their Throats." The cultural part of their program was a coverup for the real purpose of the meeting: To downgrade America and advance the current line of the Soviets—"peace."

The climate of such tolerance toward communism changed in the United States when thousands of American boys lay dead in Korea. Americans had been shocked and sickened by the revelations of wholesale spying by Communists revealed by congressional investigating committees. The true nature and horror of the Soviet system came to light with the massacre of Hungarians, including children, by Soviet troops in 1956. Yet it seems incredible that a short 2 years later the United States should be signing a "cultural" agreement in 1958 with these same Soviets.

It is hard to see just what our State Department hoped to gain from a "cultural" exchange with the butchers of Budapest. Why should our great American heritage of human freedom and the dignity of man be adjudged equal and exchangeable (since obviously one does not exchange unequals) with that of an admittedly backward country whose government is based on total terror through a secret police system for the suppression of all basic human values?

One must assume that our officials entered into this cultural exchange program in a sincere, albeit misguided, effort to penetrate the Iron Curtain and create good will for America. But what of Khrushchev? Stalin had always been wary of opening up Russia to the eyes of foreigners, having set up the greatest mass spy network in all history. Stalin naturally suspected that the United States would attempt to match every spy he sent into, or had recruited in, America. Stalin permitted some tourists to visit Moscow and a few other Russian cities partly because of the foreign exchange they left behind and partly because a small number of gullibles could always be counted on to return to America singing the praises of the Soviet system.

Khrushchev proved much smarter. He knew that it would be relatively simple to restrict tourists to certain "safe" areas. With the largest secret police force in the world, reinforced by a massive army of voluntary informers among those having contact with visitors, keeping an eye on suspected tourists presented no real problem. On the other hand Khrushchev knew that Americans were an openhearted and trustful folk who would recoil from the idea of shadowing "cultural" visitors, even if they had the manpower to do so.

Unfortunately, recent press dispatches bear this out. A New York Times article on December 25, 1959, reported "U.S. Students Get Rebuffs in Soviet." The article stated: "The 24 young Americans who went to Moscow and Leningrad last September complain that they cannot gain access to laboratories, archives, and other scientic facilities essential to their work. In an annex to the recent agreement, the Soviet Union undertook to guarantee American students access to its archives. So far this Soviet commitment has largely remained on paper only, it is reported. In contrast, the report continued, the Soviet exchange students in the United States are unrestricted in their use of scientific facilities."

Despite such occurrences, gullible Americans still flock to the Soviet Union. Last year 12,000 made the pilgrimage; this year it is estimated that 15,000 will go to a land where our own President was rudely refused entrance.

The loss of prestige suffered by the United States in the art and literature exhibition which we sent in 1959 to the Moscow exhibition aroused much unfavorable comment. On Soviet insistence we quickly and abjectly removed more than 100 books from the exhibition shelves. The Communists insisted that "only books relating to American culture should be shown." We left up to them which books represented American culture. The chairman of the State Committee for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, Georgi Zhukov, informed the U.S. Ambassador at Moscow "that unless the books were removed the Soviet Union would have to take unspecified measures." We immediately gave in without argument.

It was a different story when the State Department objected to a few books in the Soviet exhibition in New York. They remained.

The art exhibition we sent to the Moscow Fair aroused criticism from every conceivable quarter. Chairman FRANCIS WALTER of the House Committee on Un-American Activities declared in a speech that "more than 50 percent" of the artists whose works were in the exhibit had Communist or Communist-tinged backgrounds.

President Eisenhower remarked of a painting by Jack Levine included in the exhibit that "it looks more like a lampoon than art." The picture was a caricature of a gross, swilling U.S. Army general and is indeed typical of the cartoons and drawings found in the old New Masses in the thirties.

Overlooked in the general hullabaloo over the paintings in the exhibition, was a statement made in a report of the affair appearing in the New York Times stating that the State Department had added some early American paintings to the controversial exhibition. The article stated that the art sent over in the first exhibition had "followed an informal agreement with the Soviet officials that the Soviet fair here and the American show in Moscow reflect art created since 1918." From this it would appear that our officials allow Communists to dictate to us that no art or culture previous to the Communist revolution of 1917 should be recognized, not even in our own country.

This is part and parcel of the subtle pressures generated by Communists as milestones in their march to world power. It is the culmination of what the despised Communists started at Kharkov so long ago.

The whole question of the value of these cultural relations is causing deep concern among thinking Americans. The concern is justified particularly after a recent report from Japan that the Communist-inspired riots which caused the cancellation of President Eisenhower's good-will tour were probably financed with the earnings of Soviet cultural troupes—dancers, musicians, and others.

The whole concept of our cultural exchange agreement with the U.S.S.R. is based on an obvious fallacy. The agreement states: "This agreement is regarded as a significant first step in the improvement of mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." It goes on to say that it is hoped that this will contribute "to a lessening of international tensions." Almost any bright eighth-grader should be able to figure out that the tensions between the two Governments are due entirely to Soviet Government pressures against us all over the world. The Soviet people have nothing to do with these pressures. The Communists in power thoroughly know and understand us. They have also made it pretty plain that they despise us and indeed intend to "bury" us. They have no genuine desire to know us any better—only to destroy us.

INTEREST RATES AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during the recent political campaign much was said in criticism of what was described as the high interest policy of the past administration as well as in criticism of the number of unemployed.

Actually there are many instances where our Government has paid higher rates of interest than those prevailing during the past administration. Furthermore, one point which is ignored by the critics is the fact that interest on Government bonds today is taxable,

whereas in earlier periods such interest was tax-exempt. This feature alone would account for a great difference in the prevailing rates.

Also, when speaking of the number of unemployed, the critics ignored one very important factor; namely, that during the 8 years of the past administration our country has been at peace. When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953 we were in the midst of the Korean war, and when that war ended it necessitated the absorbing into the civilian labor force the veterans as they returned home. On December 31, 1952, there were 3,507,205 men in uniform; on December 31, 1960, there were 2,492,700 in uniform.

However, rather than argue these points further, I thought it best merely to incorporate in the RECORD a statistical report of what was actually achieved or not achieved by the past administration in each of these two categories.

With this thought in mind I first requested the Treasury Department to compile a report showing the average rate of interest that was being paid on all outstanding Government obligations during each of the 8 years, 1953 through 1960.

This report is not a statement of the interest actually being paid at any given time, but, rather, it represents the average rates paid on all issues outstanding during each fiscal year.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Treasury Department's letter, signed by Mr. Julian B. Baird as Under Secretary, along with the accompanying table showing the computed average interest rates on all interest-bearing Federal securities.

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

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1960.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of December 6 to Secretary Anderson requesting average interest rates on Government obligations from 1953 through 1960.

The attached table shows the computed average rates on all interest-bearing Federal securities as of the end of each of the calendar years you requested. These averages are not a reflection of interest actually paid but are rather the average rates on issues outstanding at a given point of time.

The averages are obtained by multiplying the interest rate on individual issues (each issue year in the case of savings bonds) by the amount of the issue outstanding and dividing the sum of the products for each type of security by the total of that type outstanding.

This information is readily available on the basis of the classifications shown and will, I believe, suit your purposes. As you probably know, among the marketable obligations of the Treasury, bills and certificates are by statute, originally 1 year or less to maturity and notes, 1 to 5 years to maturity. Bonds are all originally 5 years and over to first call date or maturity. Thus, the computed average rate on bonds reflects the rate on issues which were originally of longer term. Among nonmarketable securities, savings bonds are redeemable on demand; special issues are redeemable on demand or after 1 year; and the bulk of investment bonds are subject to exchange for 5-year marketable notes.

The information for December 31, 1960, is, of course, estimated but should correspond closely to the actual figures when they are available.

Please call on us again if you require any further information.

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN B. BAIRD,
Under Secretary.

Computed average interest rates on all interest-bearing Federal securities

[In percent]

Dec. 31	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 [1]
Direct obligations								
Marketable:								
Bills [2]	1.51	1.06	2.43	3.05	3.51	2.93	4.50	2.93
Certificates	2.48	1.26	2.39	2.93	3.70	2.21	4.13	4.03
Notes	1.76	1.80	1.94	2.34	2.87	2.95	3.92	3.77
Bonds	2.39	2.48	2.49	2.48	2.51	2.59	2.62	2.75
Total marketable	2.17	1.96	2.32	2.59	2.96	2.62	3.47	3.19
Nonmarketable:								
Savings bonds	[3] 2.73	[3] 2.78	[3] 2.83	2.86	2.91	2.94	3.26	3.32
Special issues to trust funds	2.75	2.66	2.59	2.70	2.64	2.65	2.70	2.79
All other [4]	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.72	2.71	2.72	2.72
Total nonmarketable	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.78	2.78	2.80	2.98	3.04
Guaranteed obligations	2.55	2.61	2.58	2.59	2.62	2.62	2.65	2.92
Total interest-bearing securities	2.41	2.29	2.49	2.67	2.89	2.69	3.30	3.14

[1] Estimated.
[2] Rates of simple interest based on amounts borrowed.
[3] Includes Treasury savings notes.
[4] Mostly investment bonds.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Debt Analysis Staff. Dec. 15, 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, to get a true picture of the past administration in dealing with the problem of employment, I asked the Labor Department to prepare certain statistics.

These statistics cover a 14-year period beginning with the year 1947 and extending through 1960. The first report will show the annual average of the total civilian labor force.

The second report shows the annual average of the total civilian employment for each of the years 1947 and 1960.

The third table shows the annual average of the number of unemployed, while the fourth chart will show the annual average unemployment rates broken down percentagewise.

These charts cover the past 14-year period, and are broken down giving the statistics for each month, as well as the annual averages. For example, the annual averages for the calendar year 1960 are as follows:

1960 civilian labor force (annual average)	70,612,000
1960 total employment (annual average)	66,681,000
1960 unemployment (annual average)	3,931,000
1960 percentage of civilian labor force unemployed (annual average) percent	5.6

I fully recognize that there are those who will criticize these figures by pointing out that, while the average number of unemployed in 1960 was 3,931,000, the December 1960 figure shows 4,540,000 unemployed, or 6.4 percent of the labor force.

However, to those who wish to pick out particular months for emphasis, I call their attention to the fact that in the month of July 1949, during the Truman administration, the percentage of the civilian labor force unemployed reached a high of 7 percent, and the annual average of unemployed for the calendar year 1949 was 5.9 percent, while it was 5.6 percent for calendar year 1960.

These charts dealing with the employment and unemployment percentages have been compiled on a monthly basis as well as to show the annual averages for each of the past 14 years.

I let the charts speak for themselves with just this final comment—the past 8 years were years of peacetime employment.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from the Department of Labor, dated January 19, 1961, and signed by Mr. Walter C. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of Labor, followed by chart No. 1, showing the civilian labor force of the past 14-year period.

Chart No. 2, showing the total number employed during each of the months as well as the annual average of employment for the past 14 years.

Chart No. 3, showing the unemployment record of the past 14 years broken down both by months and annual averages.

Chart No. 4, showing the percentage of the number of unemployed as compared to the total labor force for the same period.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In accordance with your request, I am enclosing information on labor force employment and unemployment in the United States from 1947 to date.

I hope this information will be helpful to you. Should you need more, please call Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, here at the Department.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. WALLACE,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

CHART 1.—*Civilian labor force*

[In thousands]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual averages
1947	57,790	58,010	58,390	59,120	60,290	62,609	62,664	61,665	60,784	60,892	60,216	59,590	60,168
1948	59,214	59,778	59,769	60,524	60,422	63,479	63,842	63,186	62,212	61,775	61,724	61,375	61,442
1949	60,078	60,388	60,814	60,835	61,983	63,398	63,815	63,637	62,763	62,576	62,927	62,045	62,105
1950	61,427	61,637	61,675	62,183	62,788	64,866	64,427	64,867	63,567	63,704	63,512	62,538	63,099
1951	61,514	61,313	62,325	61,789	62,803	63,783	64,382	64,208	63,186	63,452	63,164	62,688	62,884
1952	61,780	61,838	61,518	61,744	62,778	64,390	64,176	63,958	63,698	63,146	63,646	62,921	62,966
1953	62,896	62,885	63,339	63,155	63,285	65,147	65,214	64,931	63,905	64,059	63,975	62,993	63,815
1954	62,840	63,725	63,825	64,063	64,425	65,445	65,494	65,522	65,244	64,882	64,624	63,526	64,468
1955	63,497	63,321	63,654	66,647	65,192	66,696	67,465	67,726	66,882	67,292	67,206	66,592	65,847
1956	65,775	65,491	65,913	66,555	67,846	69,430	69,489	68,947	68,069	68,082	67,732	67,029	67,530
1957	65,821	66,311	66,746	66,951	67,893	69,842	70,228	68,994	68,225	68,513	68,061	67,770	67,946
1958	66,732	67,160	67,510	68,027	68,965	70,418	70,473	70,067	68,740	69,111	68,485	68,081	68,647
1959	67,430	67,471	68,189	68,639	69,405	71,324	71,338	70,667	69,577	70,103	69,310	69,276	69,394
1960	68,168	68,449	68,473	69,819	70,667	73,002	72,706	72,070	71,155	71,069	71,213	70,549	70,612

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii, raising the level by about 280,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

CHART 2.—*Total employment*

[In thousands]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual average
1947	55,268	55,406	55,852	56,439	58,094	59,741	59,779	59,256	58,635	59,079	58,437	57,761	57,812
1948	56,843	56,927	57,093	58,079	58,393	60,906	61,296	60,908	60,128	60,008	59,659	59,162	59,117
1949	57,045	56,809	57,417	57,550	58,418	59,308	59,335	59,611	59,110	58,754	59,305	58,326	58,423
1950	56,728	56,809	57,332	58,476	59,482	61,129	60,946	62,196	61,028	61,627	61,129	60,099	59,748
1951	58,830	58,740	59,974	59,829	60,990	61,507	62,226	62,372	61,280	61,668	61,140	60,858	60,784
1952	59,502	59,480	59,480	59,874	60,938	62,232	61,972	61,984	61,924	61,642	62,030	61,357	61,035
1953	60,729	60,901	61,489	61,368	61,714	63,313	63,444	63,389	62,271	62,476	61,930	60,317	61,945
1954	59,246	59,731	59,772	60,194	60,734	61,642	61,712	61,983	61,781	61,919	61,478	60,487	60,890
1955	59,800	59,738	60,327	61,460	62,481	63,676	64,684	65,115	64,521	64,975	64,612	63,935	62,944
1956	62,684	62,354	62,787	63,799	64,950	66,027	66,354	66,421	65,774	65,955	65,084	64,306	64,708
1957	62,578	63,190	63,865	64,261	65,178	66,504	67,221	66,385	65,674	66,005	64,873	64,396	65,007
1958	62,238	61,988	62,311	62,907	64,061	64,981	65,179	65,367	64,629	65,306	64,653	63,973	63,966
1959	62,706	62,722	63,828	65,012	66,016	67,342	67,594	67,241	66,347	66,831	65,640	65,699	65,581
1960	64,020	64,520	64,267	66,159	67,208	68,579	68,689	68,282	67,767	67,490	67,182	66,009	66,681

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii, raising the level by about 265,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

CHART 3.—*Unemployment*

[In thousands]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual averages
1947	2,522	2,604	2,538	2,681	2,196	2,869	2,884	2,409	2,149	1,812	1,779	1,829	2,356
1948	2,371	2,851	2,676	2,444	2,028	2,574	2,546	2,278	2,083	1,768	2,065	2,213	2,325
1949	3,033	3,490	3,397	3,285	3,565	4,089	4,480	4,025	3,652	[1] 3,823	3,622	3,719	3,682
1950	4,699	4,828	4,342	3,707	3,306	3,737	3,481	2,671	2,539	2,077	2,382	2,438	3,351
1951	2,683	2,572	2,352	1,959	1,812	2,276	2,156	1,836	1,906	1,784	2,024	1,830	2,099
1952	2,278	2,358	2,038	1,870	1,840	2,158	2,204	1,974	1,774	1,504	1,616	1,564	1,931
1953	2,167	1,984	1,850	1,787	1,571	1,834	1,770	1,542	1,634	1,583	2,045	2,676	1,870
1954	3,594	3,994	4,052	3,869	3,690	3,803	3,783	3,539	3,464	2,963	3,146	3,039	3,578
1955	3,697	3,583	3,326	3,187	2,711	3,019	2,781	2,610	2,361	2,317	2,593	2,657	2,903
1956	3,092	3,136	3,125	2,755	2,896	3,403	3,134	2,527	2,295	2,127	2,648	2,723	2,822
1957	3,244	3,121	2,882	2,690	2,715	3,337	3,007	2,609	2,552	2,508	3,188	3,374	2,936
1958	4,494	5,173	5,198	5,120	4,904	5,437	5,294	4,699	4,111	3,805	3,833	4,108	4,681
1959	4,724	4,749	4,362	3,627	3,389	3,982	3,744	3,426	3,230	3,272	3,670	3,577	3,813
1960	4,149	3,931	4,206	3,660	3,459	4,423	4,017	3,788	3,388	3,579	4,031	4,540	3,931

[1] Unemployment exaggerated by coal strike.

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

CHART 4.—*Unemployment rates*

[Percent of civilian labor force who were unemployed]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual average
1947	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	3.6	4.6	4.6	3.9	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.9
1948	4.0	4.8	4.5	4.0	3.4	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.6	3.8
1949	5.1	5.8	5.6	5.4	5.8	6.5	7.0	6.3	5.8	[1] 6.1	5.8	6.0	5.9
1950	7.7	7.8	7.0	6.0	5.3	5.8	5.4	4.1	4.0	3.3	3.8	3.9	5.3
1951	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.2	2.9	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.2	2.9	3.3
1952	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.5	3.1
1953	3.5	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.5	3.2	4.3	2.9
1954	5.7	6.3	6.4	6.0	5.7	5.8	5.8	5.4	5.3	4.6	4.9	4.8	5.6
1955	5.8	5.7	5.2	4.9	4.2	4.5	4.1	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.9	4.0	4.4
1956	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.1	4.3	4.9	4.5	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.9	4.1	4.2
1957	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.8	4.3	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.7	5.0	4.3
1958	6.7	7.7	7.7	7.5	7.1	7.7	7.5	6.7	6.0	5.5	5.6	6.0	6.8
1959	7.0	7.0	6.4	5.3	4.9	5.6	5.2	4.8	4.6	4.7	5.3	5.2	5.5
1960	6.1	5.7	6.1	5.2	4.9	6.1	5.5	5.3	4.8	5.0	5.7	6.4	5.6

[1] Unemployment rate exaggerated by coal strike.

NOTE.—Adjusted for comparability with definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. Figures for 1960 include Alaska and Hawaii.

Prepared by: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics, July 1960.

TRACY S. McCRAKEN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great citizen of my State of Wyoming, as well as a great American. On December 26, 1960, my dear friend, Tracy S. McCraken, our Democratic national committeeman, and a very distinguished newspaper publisher, passed away very unexpectedly.

Mr. McCraken was distinguished on many fronts, active on more, but always insisted on remaining behind the scenes. He asked for no public plaudits. He asked for no popular recognition. And as it stands today, there were ever so many selfless and unselfish things Tracy McCraken did the outside world knows little or nothing about.

It was this kind of selflessness that endeared him to all who knew him well. My personal acquaintance with him began with my employment at the University of Wyoming as a professor. I can say with all honesty that he was one of the very few men I have known around the country who truly understood what a university was all about, what a liberal education really means, and what the maintenance of an academic atmosphere strictly requires. Thus, in the academic world, he carved a place for himself in the history of higher education in this country.

As vice president of our board of trustees for many years—again turning down the presidency because it would be too conspicuous a role—in one of the most exciting moments in the university's history, he presided over its expansion and helped to guide its useful growth.

On another level, that of his chosen profession, journalism, the professionals in that pursuit have long since paid their undying tribute to Tracy McCraken. He was one of the giants in the land in the newspaper field. We in Wyoming were proud of him on that score alone.

Finally, in his third pursuit, which was almost an avocation of his, but which took so much of his time and personal endeavor that it became at moments his vocation, namely, his service to the Democratic Party as national committeeman, he distinguished himself repeatedly in raising his voice not only in the interest of the party but in the interest of the less populous segments of the Democratic Party. While I refer to him as a Democratic national committeeman and a member of my own party, I hasten to add that his keenest interest of all was that all Americans be more interested in politics, whatever the party of their choice, and his personal efforts were devoted to stimulating public interest in all levels of politics. He became widely interested in that matter on a nationwide scale rather than in Wyoming alone.

In conclusion, this man, who served so significantly the public interest in a private way, deserves the plaudits of all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief background statement I have prepared of his own rise to success on so many fronts be printed in the RECORD immediately following my own remarks in regard to Mr. McCraken.

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

TRIBUTE TO TRACY S. McCRAKEN

Mr. President, on December 26, 1960, this Nation lost a great public servant and an outstanding American. I refer to the untimely death of Tracy S. McCraken, a noted newspaper publisher in the State of Wyoming who was also our Democratic national committeeman.

Tracy—as he was affectionately known throughout our State—was born in the State of Illinois, but came to Wyoming during the First World War to attend the University of Wyoming, and he was graduated from that university in 1917. He returned to Illinois after his graduation and became a reporter for the Belvidere Republican.

He rose from reporter to city editor and to editor-manager of the Laramie Boomerang in Wyoming shortly after returning to Wyoming in 1919. He then served as secretary to Gov. William B. Ross, and for 3 years was secretary to a great U.S. Senator from my State, John B. Kendrick.

Mr. President, in 1926, Tracy purchased the Wyoming Eagle, which was at that time a weekly newspaper at Cheyenne. He built it to the largest weekly in the State and converted it into a daily morning tabloid in 1933.

In 1936, he assumed ownership of the Wyoming State Tribune and Leader, Cheyenne's other daily newspaper, and he then gradually added other newspapers and radio and television stations to his chain. At the time of his passing, Tracy's chain included the Wyoming Eagle and Wyoming State Tribune at Cheyenne, the Laramie Boomerang, which is an outstanding newspaper in my hometown, the Rawlins Daily Times, the Rock Springs Rocket and Miner, the Northern Wyoming Daily News at Worland, stations KFBC and KFBC–TV at Cheyenne and KVRS at Rock Springs. He stepped down as president and publisher of the Cheyenne newspapers in 1957 in favor of his son, Robert. He remained as chairman of the board until his death last month.

Mr. President, Tracy McCraken was a distinguished politician as well as a distinguished newspaperman. Formerly a member of the Democratic national executive committee, he was Wyoming's national committeeman from 1942.

Tracy, at the time of his death, was also vice president and a member of the University of Wyoming board of trustees. A successful businessman, he was a director of the American National Bank of Cheyenne, vice president and treasurer of the Wyoming Realty Co., and owner of the Plains and Frontier Hotels in Cheyenne and the Connor Hotel in Laramie.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, as well as the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], who now occupies the chair, in his capacity as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, in expressing my personal sense of loss on the passing of Tracy McCraken. In many respects, he has been one of the outstanding citizens of Wyoming; a man who, as has been indicated, has had a very sympathetic interest in the welfare of the State of Montana, as well as the Rocky Mountain region as a whole.

Many people outside of Wyoming will miss Tracy. The good things which Tracy has done will live after him and, I think, will serve to commemorate a life which was full and which certainly accomplished much in the way of real results, and which personified the man whom the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming has so graciously described at this time.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Montana for his stimulating comments in regard to our mutual friend, Tracy McCraken.

AWARD TO SENATOR MAGNUSON BY INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on November 21, 1960, my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was honored by the Inland Empire Waterways Association of Walla Walla, Wash., for his untiring efforts in behalf of the comprehensive water resource program in the Pacific Northwest and to the entire Nation. As an indication of the association's appreciation for this service, the association's board of directors presented him a certificate of appreciation at their annual convention held in Portland, Oreg.

I ask unanimous consent to have the certificate printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION FOR HONORED SERVICE IS AWARDED TO WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. SENATOR

For distinguished service to the United States of America and the Pacific Northwest from 1937 to 1960. His outstanding accomplishments in the field of comprehensive water resource development have resulted in expediting the development of power, reclamation, flood control, and navigation in the Columbia River Basin. His interest in maritime matters and coastal harbor improvements has won him the plaudits of the Nation. His continued efforts in this regard have led to the enhancement of the economy of the Northwest States. His exemplary leadership as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has resulted in coordinating all transportation interests to work for a more comprehensive and competitive transportation network in the Nation. His continued efforts in the field of transportation have resulted in legislation which has been constructive and more recently was responsible for the establishment of the transportation study group to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which is analyzing the position of transportation during the next decade. All of his efforts have helped to gain for the Pacific Northwest and the comprehensive water resource development program great prominence and public support.

CHARLES BAKER,
President.

NOVEMBER 21, 1960.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

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

of the Senator from Nevada to consider the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Roswell L. Gilpatric, a distinguished citizen of New York and an able and outstanding member of the bar of the city and State of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. As a fellow lawyer, Mr. Gilpatric has for almost 20 years been a member of the highly respected firm, Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

Mr. Gilpatric has demonstrated a progressive, forward-looking attitude in his professional and public life. He has had a deep interest for years in the problems of our Defense Establishment. He has carefully studied our defense posture, and has been a leader in suggesting needed changes. While I by no means intend today to endorse all the changes which he has proposed, I recognize that he has given long and intensive study to problems in this area. His views on the subject are deserving of our respectful and thorough consideration.

In my opinion, Roswell Gilpatric's knowledge, experience, and independence of judgment fit him admirably for the position of Deputy Secretary of Defense. I urge the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the nomination.

Mr. MORTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am sorry that I could not be in the Chamber when the nomination of Elvis J. Stahr to be Secretary of the Army was confirmed. My colleague, Senator COOPER, today is in Somerset, Ky., where a well-deserved Cooper appreciation day is being held. I ask unanimous consent that Senator COOPER'S statement, made before the Armed Services Committee, be printed in the RECORD just prior to the action of the Senate in confirming the nomination of Mr. Stahr; and I wish to say that I associate myself with that statement.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER IN SUPPORT OF THE NOMINATION OF ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
January 17, 1961.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have known the Honorable Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army-designate, personally for over 10 years, and before that time was acquainted with his outstanding record as an educator and in various posts in the service of the United States. His brilliant record is before this committee and speaks for itself.

I do want to say that he is held in the highest respect in his native State of Kentucky, for his fine qualities of mind, his administrative ability, and for his integrity.

I am very glad that he has been named to be Secretary of the Army and I am happy that I shall have the chance to vote for his confirmation in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOHN B. CONNALLY, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the nomination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, am I correct in stating that the present business before the Senate is the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to make a few observations with respect to the pending business.

First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate for being excused for my absence last week due to a very tragic accident which resulted in the death of the foreman at my ranch. He left a widow and six small children. I was advised of the serious turn of the accident a week ago yesterday, Sunday, and immediately left Washington. The man unfortunately passed away during the week. His funeral was held Saturday afternoon. The various problems that arose incident to the unraveling of the facts surrounding the accident—the insurance, arrangements for the bereaved family and for a ranch operation in midwinter, and so forth—made it impossible for me to be present in Washington during the week when hearings were conducted on the nominations for the various defense posts.

In connection with the nomination of Mr. Robert S. McNamara for the office of Secretary of Defense, the chairman of the committee had circulated to members of the committee a copy of the proposed trust agreement, which had reached me before I left Washington.

I was able in that instance to dictate a letter to the chairman of the committee raising some questions. I understand that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the ranking minority member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators took note of my questions and saw that the questions were asked and answers developed.

There was no similar opportunity, however, for me to make a study of any questions or allegations relating to Mr. Connally.

In view of a speech which was made on the floor of the Senate last Saturday by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in which he considered some of the questions which had been mentioned in the press, involving my name, and because the Senator from Oregon in his discussion referred to me by name on two or three occasions during his remarks, I thought I should make some observations at this time.

In addition to regretting that I was not able to be here for the hearings last week, may I say that I regretted that I was unable to be present for the inauguration.

I noticed the interesting speech of the President as reported in the press. I was impressed by it, and particularly wish to commend President Kennedy saying that we should not negotiate out of fear, but that we should not fear to negotiate. I was also impressed with his statement on the responsibility of citizens to try to do something for their country instead of asking what the country could do for them.

Having served with both President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, I want it clearly understood that anything I might ever say with respect to the present administration will be in the belief that President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON will pursue their duties with high dedication and with eminent qualifications for the posts to which they have been elected.

With respect to several aspects of the pending nomination which were discussed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and in various press statements or columns, I personally have no great knowledge. I have no personal knowledge that Mr. Connally was in any way connected with the incidents of the spring of 1956, when certain individuals attempted to put some funds into a campaign fund for my benefit on the eve of the vote on the natural gas bill.

I had no information at that time that Mr. Connally had any interest, in any way, shape, or form, in the matter. I suppose I might have met him at some time, but if he were to walk into the Chamber or were present in the gallery, I would not be able to recognize him today. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no knowledge that he had any connection with that incident in any way, shape, or form. If he had such, through his interest in the proposed nat-

ural gas legislation, that is not a matter of knowledge by me.

Under the circumstances, I have not had an opportunity to investigate or to make any check, or to submit any questions to him in connection with the allegations of these articles which have appeared in the press and in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

I have, since noon today, read the hearings as they were developed in the Committee on Armed Services on the nomination of Mr. Connally. I would have to say that, on reading the statements made by him in response to interrogations by members of the committee, I thought he made a very good response, and that his answers were satisfactory so far as the questions propounded to him were concerned.

Had I been present at the hearing, undoubtedly I would have had some additional questions to ask him. However, under the circumstances related, it was not possible for me to be here the past week.

If it were proved that Mr. Connally had any personal connection with the operations attempted by Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, I would have to vote against his confirmation. Were I to do so, it might be alleged that I was an interested party and prejudiced. Without an opportunity to explore this matter in committee, I do not feel that, as a party of possible interest, I should participate in this judgment. The rules of the House provide that Members should not vote in a matter where they have a direct personal interest.

Therefore, Madam President, in view of the fact that the intimation—if not the allegation, at least the intimation—was that Mr. Connally had some connection with or some interest in the incident of 1956, I recognize that to a certain degree I am a party of interest, and therefore, under the rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from voting on the Connally nomination.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, there is one other comment I should like to make in connection with this matter. In one of the columns written by Mr. Pearson, appearing in the newspapers of Monday, January 16, 1961, appears this paragraph:

NOTE.—In the end, Elmer Patman and John Neff, lobbyists for Superior Oil of California, were fined only $2,500 each and given only 1 year suspended sentences for offering money to a U.S. Senator. The U.S. judge who let the two off so lightly was Joseph C. McGarraghy, appointed by Mr. Eisenhower after he had served as an Ike delegate to the 1952 GOP convention, and chairman of the Eisenhower-Nixon Inaugural Parade Committee. Neither Howard Keck, head of Superior Oil, nor any of the Keck family were made defendants, though the corporation, which cannot be put in jail, pleaded guilty and was fined $10,000.

Madam President, I should like to offer a bit of comment on that statement, in fairness to Judge McGarraghy. I have never personally discussed the matter or the case with Judge McGarraghy, either before the matter came before him or since. I know Judge McGarraghy, and I have always had a high regard for him. I first came in contact with him when I served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. However, this particular matter has never been the subject of discussion by me with him. I think it is incumbent upon me, perhaps, to make a comment in justice to Judge McGarraghy. I feel I should do so because Judge McGarraghy cannot speak here and being a member of the bench, he is unlikely to make any statement about it.

Actually, Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, as I understand, pleaded guilty to a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act. The judge could not have imposed any sentence for bribery as such if there were neither a conviction nor a plea of guilty on a bribery indictment. The only sentence the judge could have imposed was one provided within the provisions of the Lobbying Registration Act. That law permitted the imposition of a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment for 1 year.

I do not know, but I have always had the hunch, that probably when they pleaded guilty to these particular counts to which they did plead guilty, they did not anticipate anything more than a monetary fine. The fact that they were fined $2,500, rather than the $5,000 fine which might have been imposed, I have always surmised was for the purpose of reminding them of the $2,500 figure involved in each of their intended operations. As Mr. Neff said when asked about his attempted activities in another State "that figure seems to come up everywhere." But whatever considerations led the judge to fix the individual fines at $2,500, it was one-half of the maximum fine that could have been imposed on each of them.

The 1-year sentence was the maximum that could have been imposed for violation of the particular act to which they pleaded guilty. The judge did suspend the sentence. However, practicing attorneys do not welcome the imposition of any prison sentence of 1 year, whether it is suspended or not. I am sure that the imposition of the 1 year sentence was not only a punishment to them during the year in which the sentence lasted but would forever carry with it a professional stigma for any practicing attorney.

The fact that the corporation pleaded guilty and was fined $10,000 speaks for itself. A corporation, as such, could not have been put in jail.

Under the circumstances, in view of the fact that the Lobbying Registration Act was the act under which the conviction was had by the plea of guilty, I have thought that the judge acted appropriately. Judges customarily take into consideration that the costs and uncertainties of trial are avoided when parties charged admit guilt and enter guilty pleas.

There is one other penalty which a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act carries by terms of the statute itself. The act provides that anyone who is convicted of a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act may not appear before a congressional committee for a period of 3 years following that time. So that the two individuals involved, Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, in addition to the $2,500 fines and the year's suspended sentence, were prohibited from appearing before congressional committees in connection with any legislation for a period of 3 years following that time.

I have added these remarks with regard to this subject merely because I thought that Judge McGarraghy, being a member of the bench, was not in position to say anything about the matter himself and because there may have been some misunderstanding as to what statute was involved. It was not a conviction for a violation of the bribery statute; it was a conviction for a violation of the Lobbying Registration Act. If the other counts of the indictment voted by the Federal grand jury had been pressed and if there had been a conviction under those counts, it might have been a different matter. The judge could only pronounce a sentence within the statute under which convictions were obtained.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of John B. Connally. I do so with very great reluctance and a heavy heart. I do so even though I recognize that Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle who have been reluctant to approve nominations have been very anxious to give the President the benefit of the doubt. I know that Republican Senators have shown very great and very proper reluctance to oppose any nomination. I am a Democrat, a northern Democrat, and a Kennedy Democrat. I was for Senator Kennedy enthusiastically before the nomination at Los Angeles and am for him now enthusiastically. I believe that his nominations for appointments to the Cabinet have been excellent. I have said so, and I have said so publicly.

However, I feel that in good conscience I am bound to speak out and oppose the nomination of John B. Connally to be Secretary of the Navy.

I should like to explain to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that what I intend to do is ask of him certain questions and, if he would be patient with me, I should like to establish in each case the background for the question, so that it would be a little clearer.

At page 13 of the hearings on the nomination the Senator from Georgia is quoted as having said:

Chairman RUSSELL. Personally, I think we are fortunate to have a man who knows something about the oil business to handle these oil reserves. No contract relating to them can be entered into until it is submitted in detail to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. Both of those committees have subcommittees who go over these contracts, and examine them in great detail. I think it would be a distinct advantage to the United States to have someone who does know something about the oil industry.

Madam President, I have very carefully examined the biography of the nominee, printed in the hearings. Frankly, it appears to me that the nominee's only qualification is that he has been in the oil industry. It is true that

he has been an active and efficient administrator, but strictly in the oil industry. He has a law degree and has practiced law, but that practice was confined to 2 or 3 years when he was a young man. He also served in the armed services, like 16 million others of us during World War II and, like several million, served in the Navy.

He was administrative assistant for a few months to a very distinguished former Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

For several months, he ran a small radio station.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if the nominee's only real, important qualification, his principal experience, has been his employment as an executive of one of the world's biggest private oil empires?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not checked the time of Mr. Connally's service in each capacity. I have forgotten the number of years he worked for the late Sid Richardson, who was a very large, independent oil operator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that he joined the firm in 1952 and worked there from then until the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. If he was graduated in 1940, he had not spent more than half his time in Mr. Richardson's employ. He stated he practiced law for several years. I know of my own knowledge that he was in Washington for a time and was associated with the present Vice President when he was a Senator. I have not actually checked the time, but Mr. Connally apparently has worked for some 9 years for the Richardson oil interests.

He said he came to Washington in 1939 as secretary to then Congressman JOHNSON.

Apparently he had not spent half his time in the oil industry. He spent some in the private practice of law with the firm of Powell, Wirtz & Rahout, in Austin, Tex. I knew Mr. Wirtz quite well. He was Under Secretary of the Interior during a part of the time of Harold L. Ickes, if not for the entire time.

He spent some of his time in the operation of a radio station.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that, important as the experience is that this man has had, and recognizing, of course, that service as an administrative assistant to a Senator is important, too, the main reason why this man can be looked upon as an administrator, the main reason why he can be looked upon as qualified for the high position of Secretary of the Navy, is that he has had substantial executive experience in the oil industry, having been connected with a very large private oil empire?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should say that that was his largest administrative experience.

The evaluation of experience is a relative matter.

The Senate on Saturday confirmed the nomination of Robert F. Kennedy to be Attorney General of the United States. The junior Senator from Wisconsin supported the nomination. If Mr. Kennedy had had any administrative experience in private life equivalent to that which he had in government, it certainly did not come out in the hearings. The only previous experience he had had was as counsel for a committee of Congress, which is even much more limited experience than that of administrative assistant to a Senator. Mr. Kennedy's experience was limited to only one area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I respond by saying that the distinguished Attorney General has had a very impressive administrative record. The work of that committee comprised an enormous project with many lawyers and investigators. The committee had an extremely complex and difficult job to perform. Its staff was brought together under very trying circumstances. They were new men. They had, in a matter of a couple of years, to do one of the biggest, most impressive jobs in government. The whole group was administered, led, and directed by Mr. Kennedy, the new Attorney General. It seems to me that Robert Kennedy made a very fine, a remarkable, showing of administrative ability.

Also, Mr. Robert Kennedy managed the campaign of the successful presidential candidate. That was a difficult, trying job. He showed great administrative ability in that capacity, ability which I believe qualifies him for his new position.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire and, I think, most of the members of his political party, have tried to take a very fair and reasonable view of the nominations submitted by President Kennedy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin has just said so.

Mr. BRIDGES. However, if we had been looking for things to criticize, we certainly could have picked out many in the nominations which have been made and which are to be taken up.

Measured by the test which the Senator from New Hampshire expressed in the Senate on Saturday as applying, and considering some of the glaring inadequacies of some of the nominees for various positions in the whole field, it is necessary to be fair and very broad-minded. I believe, certainly by the standards which we are trying to follow here, to be fair to the new President at the beginning of his term, Mr. Connally measured up very well in proportion. And I listened to his testimony very carefully, and I have known him for many years. He is an able, outstanding man, and will make an excellent Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New Hampshire did set forth a series of criteria. I agree with those criteria. I subscribe to them. One of the criteria was conflict of interest, and that is the area I expect to establish.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe the RECORD should be left quite as it is, to the effect that Mr. Connally's major administrative experience was in the oil industry. I have known John Connally for quite some time, and, I recall, he managed not only a gasoline refinery and a carbon plant, but also several housing corporations, three radio stations and television stations, a number of ranches, and a large amount of real estate, both city and country. So he has had a really diversified administration experience.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that the Richardson holdings are very vast and diversified; but they are comprised primarily of oil holdings, and the oil is by far the most valuable property and the property of greatest importance.

At the same time, there were the other interests, and Mr. Connally acquired additional experience from them. My argument does not go to the point of competence; it goes to his identification with particular economic interests.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought the record showed there were three coexecutors of the estate, and that Mr. Connally devoted himself mainly to the items I have just cited in the RECORD. I thought that was the burden of his testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall come to that subject a little later.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Do I understand the burden of the Senator's argument to be that the nominee is not qualified by reason of the experience which he has had in the oil industry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; the burden of my argument has not been developed yet. I simply asked my first question, which was to determine whether it could be agreed that the nominee's principal experience has been in the oil industry. I have said that in the oil industry he may well have acquired competence and experience which will be valuable to him. I have not pursued other implications, but I intend to do so. I have nothing against his experience or his acquiring competence in any field.

Mr. SMATHERS. I know that nominees to the Federal Trade Commission, for example, have come before the committee and said they were qualified to be members of the FTC because of their experience in the field of monopoly.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of the Secretary of Labor because he had experience in the labor field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He was a lawyer.

Mr. SMATHERS. He was a lawyer and represented certain labor unions.

Those are factors which are important in determining whether a nominee is qualified or disqualified for the position to which he is appointed. I was wondering whether Mr. Connally was to be disqualified because he was engaged in an area in which the Navy was interested. Mr. Connally said he would not let any past experience or action he may have had in any way influence the conduct of this office to the detriment of the Government. I think we have to take his word for that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I certainly do not disqualify Mr. Connally because of his experience. It is an important qualification. I am simply attempting to establish his experience, where it came from, and what his attitude is likely to be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator remember that I asked Mr. Connally:

And you are satisfied, are you, that you can proceed completely clear of the oil industry with respect to any of your functioning as Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. Connally replied:

Senator, beyond any question of a doubt.

Referring to what the distinguished Senator from Florida just brought up, I then asked Mr. Connally:

As I understand, what you are saying is that because of your broad experience in this industry in the past, you believe that you can get maximum return for the taxpayers' dollar in the interest that the Navy has in the purchase and use of oil?

Mr. Connally's answer was:

That is correct, sir.

Then I asked:

But, nevertheless, from your own personal standpoint, if you did have any interest that might be in conflict with your present position, you have taken all the steps that, as a lawyer, and as a former Government employee, you believe are necessary and right to be sure there was no conflict of interest of any kind whatsoever, is that correct?

Mr. Connally replied:

Yes, sir; that is correct.

I present to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin the fact that in the committee this matter was gone into in great detail.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am certain it was. I read the hearings carefully. It is to that exact point that I shall speak in quite some detail.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall look forward to listening to the Senator. I have known John Connally for many years. I believe he is a man of high character. If there was any conflict of interest, and he says he has handled it properly, I am certain he has done just that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin will do his best to avoid any discussion of character and personality, and will try his best to give the facts and indicate why, on the basis of those facts, this Senator cannot vote to confirm the nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his typically gracious courtesy in yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

I wish to point out that although the comparisons are not exact, Mr. Connally's background and business experience are very much like those which Mr. Robert Anderson had when, 8 years ago, he came before our committee. He came before the same committee, and he came from the same State, and he had been nominated to the same post; namely, Secretary of the Navy. His business experience and background were similar to those of Mr. Connally; and Mr. Anderson's prospects were bright, as are Mr. Connally's. As Senators know, Mr. Anderson later became Deputy Secretary of Defense, and later became Secretary of the Treasury. He served for 8 years; and the other day he left office with a record as outstanding, in my opinion—and, indeed, in the opinion of all others—as any made during those 8 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly experience in the oil industry can be of great benefit. That is one point among those I shall submit. But I shall establish that point first.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator knew Mr. Connally as well as I do, after attending the hearings, and after reading what the columnists have written, he would realize that the only objection which has been raised has been made by some newspaper columnists who have attempted to spew out some "oil" on Mr. Connally.

I believe it is well that the Secretary of the Navy does know something about oil and oil interests. Oil is one of the principal commodities used by the Navy. Certainly the nominee knows something about that subject, and, in my opinion, anyone who deals with the nominee on that subject will have to do so at arm's length—which will be another asset which Mr. Connally will have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The very point the Senator from Mississippi has made is, if followed through fully, in my opinion, one of the nominee's major disqualifications.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, in reading from page 9 of the hearings, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] quoted only part of Mr. Connally's reply. I think the reply in full is very helpful, particularly to the Senator from Wisconsin, as he is presenting his views to the Senate. Therefore, I wish to have the entire paragraph included in the RECORD. The preceding statements are as follows:

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to ask several questions with respect to the testimony that you have given this morning, which I think is to your interest as well as that of the committee.

As I understand it, you made a full disclosure of all oil interests that you have or that your family have to the committee this morning. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And, as you know, the Navy is a large buyer of oil.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. You also know that your former employer was known as one of the world's greatest oil men.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And I admired him, respected him, proud to have him as a friend.

Undoubtedly, therefore, you have read some of the comments that Senator STENNIS referred to in the columns about the fact that your former work has been in the oil industry at least to some extent.

And you are satisfied, are you, that you can proceed completely clear of the oil industry with respect to any of your functioning as Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. CONNALLY. Senator, beyond any question of a doubt.

It was up to that point that the Senator from Missouri quoted.

In addition, Mr. Connally said:

There is no—absolutely no question in my mind whatsoever. And may I add, sir, that I have revealed what oil and gas holdings I have. Again, let me reiterate that I was an employee, I was a salaried employee. I think my experience in the oil and gas business—and it has been considerable, the last 9 years, along with the other enterprises that I mentioned—will stand me in great stead in the position as Secretary of the Navy. I am not a geologist, a geophysicist, or a petroleum engineer, but I understand something of the jargon that they use, and I think my background and experience that I have had will be invaluable to me in administering the naval petroleum reserves, and the oil problems of the Navy.

We also brought out in the hearings that none of the oil holdings with which the Richardson firm had been concerned has anything to do with the naval reserves or is anywhere near them. I think it is very important to bring out that fact.

I shall have other things to say on this subject, although I shall not say them at this time.

But I believe it important to note that Mr. Connally was a salaried employee, and had no interests—except those he stated, which were very small—in the oil industry or the gas industry, and that he has had this experience.

I wished to make this statement at this time, in connection with the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I may say that later in my remarks I expect to dispute some of the points the Senator has made.

Madam President, this nominee has been associated with the General Gas Committee, which was formed by the petroleum industry at the time of the natural gas bill fight, to coordinate the efforts of the petroleum industry to push the natural gas bill through Congress. That fight resulted in use by the proponents of the bill of such improper and unethical tactics that President Eisenhower, who favored the substance of the bill, vetoed it because of the excessive and wrongful lobbying practices.

I want to make it very clear that there is no evidence that would involve the nominee in those practices.

But the fact is that that very aggressive, militant, special-interest group did select the nominee as one of the members of the 24-man steering committee. He was one of the 780 members of the group, and he was selected to be one of the 24 members of its steering committee. The duties of the steering committee were to lead and to coordinate the fight to exempt natural gas producers from regulation. That fight became a national scandal of such great proportions that it caused President Eisenhower to veto the bill. The nominee was recognized by that vigorous group of proponents of the special-interest oil viewpoint as worthy of selection as a member of their governing committee.

I am concerned because the petroleum industry, which has shown its concurrence in the views of the nominee, has the following record:

First, in 1920, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, wrote:

I have been compelled to fight almost every day of my incumbency in office to prevent the dummy entrymen and illegal operators from taking the naval reserves.

Second, this conflict of interest between the oil industry and the public interest—regarding the naval reserves has continued ever since. Recently the Oil and Gas Journal asserted:

The whole concept of naval petroleum reserves is a lot of bilge water. The Navy does not need petroleum reserves any more than it needs iron ore reserves to build ships, or wool ranch reserves to make uniforms or pulpwood reserves to sustain its paper work.

The National Petroleum Council recently insisted that—

Continuous peacetime development, by private industry, rather than public standby facilities is the way to safeguard the Nation's resources.

The United States Code gives the Secretary of the Navy the following discretionary authority—and I may say that I make this statement in response to the statement made by the senior Senator from Georgia at the hearings, where he very properly pointed out that the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services have to review the contracts that are made:

7421. (b) The Secretary has exclusive jurisdiction and control over those lands inside the naval petroleum reserves (of various numbers) * * * and shall administer those leases.

Madam President, my staff and I checked very carefully into the law. We could find no checks on the exercise of discretion by the Secretary of the Navy.

In the second place, under the code, 7422, it is provided that—

(a) The Secretary of the Navy, directly or by contract, lease or otherwise, shall explore, prospect, conserve, develop, use, and operate the naval petroleum reserves in his discretion, subject to approval by the President; (b) that such lands shall be used and operated for—first, the protection, conservation, maintenance, and testing of those reserves; (d) production of petroleum * * * but only with approval of President and by joint resolution of the Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, at this point will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the distinguished Senator's sincerity when he takes the position that perhaps a Secretary of the Navy who may have had experience in the oil industry might be dangerous. I happen to come from an oil-producing State. I know the situation which exists in Oklahoma, and also that which exists in Texas. If Mr. Connally has—as I am told—a very small amount of oil company stock, held in his own name or in his own right, and if he also administers some oil-company stock as trustee for an estate, if he is like all oil men in Oklahoma and, I believe, in Texas, where, because of imports of foreign oil, the production—at least in Texas—from those properties was reduced to less than 5 days a month, the last thing in the world that a man of that nature would want to do would be to have a vast amount of new production come in—which would further reduce the allowables for the production of oil from the properties those companies now own.

These are the plain facts of life. Certainly, these men who deal in oil, who explore for oil, are not looking with any great amount or degree of lust on any Naval oil reserve being brought into production, which would further cut down their allowables and which would reduce the production which they now have. One further point——

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I reply to that particular point before the Senator continues?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that the Senator from Oklahoma has made a point with which I agree 100 percent. It is exactly why we should not have an oil man in charge of the Navy Department. I was about to read the next clause, which states that—

If he finds that the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense.

That gives the Secretary the authority to reduce production to benefit the oil industry.

The oil men of Texas and Oklahoma will follow a predictable course, a course designed to benefit the oil industry, and resulting in disservice to the public.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator will find that the naval oil reserves are there to be used in the event of a prolonged drain on our present oil production and resources. In my memory, I do not know of a situation where there has been any widespread drilling or opening up or increasing of naval oil reserves, because the purpose of the reserves is to have them against the day when we may not have sufficient oil reserves. Those reserves are to be held inviolate against the day when oil production is not adequate to meet our needs. We could probably run the whole Navy by opening up the fields, but certainly the wisdom of the past will not dictate our doing so.

My point is that the last thing an oil man would do would be to exploit the situation and put into production large amounts of oil, in view of the imports from foreign countries and from the Williston basin, and elsewhere, and thus bring about a further reduction in the existing facilities which today are very marginal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that, whereas there has been a policy to preserve the oil reserves, as the Senator has stated, as a safeguard against the time when the Nation will have reduced oil supplies, there have been negotiations to benefit private organizations. This may be good policy. I am simply saying this man would go into the Navy as its Secretary with a background and attitude which would prevent him from exercising the kind of objective judgment which it seems to me a Secretary without those associations would take into that office.

Mr. MONRONEY. Because one happened to be engaged in business in a State where the production of oil was the principal business, where the economic opportunities were good for a man of ability to go into that field, I fail to see that, ipso facto, he must be disqualified from entering the field of public service.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I would have no objection whatsoever to his having any other office, Secretary of the Army, or Secretary of any other department that would occur to me offhand, or Attorney General. I simply object to his being confirmed to this particular office because he is in a position where his whole background, and I think I can say his whole pecuniary interest, would lead him to take a certain course which might be against the public interest.

Mr. MONRONEY. We both have expressed our positions on that matter. I appreciate the kindness of the distinguished Senator in yielding to me. In the course of the discussion, I think there are some points which can be amplified with respect to our feeling in regard to the gas bill, and the Senator said there were improper and unethical tactics used by the Superior Oil Co., by a Mr. Frank Keck, whom I have never known. I know none of those in this field who have been guilty of improper and unethical practices. The Superior Oil Co. was a member of the committee of 24 which the distinguished Senator outlined as having been associated in or working in a common objective to benefit their interests.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The entire purpose of the gas committee, of which this man was a principal director, he being one of the 24 on the steering committee, was to direct and organize the whole fight. This was not the only instance of such efforts. Former Senator Thye received over 1,000 telegrams which were proven by the McClellan committee investigation to be frauds. They were sent by people who did not exist. There was also the well known bribe attempt of a distinguished Republican Senator, which has been discussed. Those are two intances. The then President of the United States, who favored the bill, who asked for the bill, who wanted to sign the bill, felt that the whole series of instances was so grave that he vetoed the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand the Superior Oil Co. made a contribution to the campaign fund of a Senator, who, quite properly and ethically, revealed it. I do not know about the telegrams. I know it is rather common, when I receive a number of telegrams on certain matters, that when I acknowledge the telegrams I receive many replies stating, "I never authorized anyone to sign the telegram." I am sure the Senator is no stranger to the showering of Congress with telegrams when certain legislation is under consideration, whether it be labor legislation, or tax legislation, or interest

rate legislation, in which we are often associated in the fight. He knows we receive telegrams which quite often are signed by the names of persons who did not authorize the use of their names.

The point I am trying to make is, Are we going to assume that one is guilty by association? The Senator and I abhor that principle. The nominee is a fine young man, who has served us well, and who has done fine staff work, having been intelligent enough to be employed by a wealthy man who has been engaged in oil production. Is he to be associated with the unethical, improper advances made to one Senator? Is he to be termed unfit for rendering public service because he has been in a particular field, even though he is willing to serve and is fully capable of doing so?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin was very careful to dissociate himself from any charges that Mr. Connally was guilty of improper lobbying.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator said there was no evidence of it whatsoever, but the statement was made of improper tactics. All I am saying is, Was he associated with the group or the lobby with which the Superior Oil Co. was connected?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not think Superior Oil was represented directly among the steering committee members. It is my understanding they may have been associated with the gas committee. The fact is that the industry is a hard, determined, militant bunch. The 1956 incident is only one incident. It is well known that the oil and gas business is as aggressive and vigorous, a special interest group as there is. They know what they want out of government, and they go after it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Well, certainly the dairy farmers know what they want out of government, and go after it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Their organization has never been cited by anyone, certainly not the President, as unscrupulous.

Mr. MONRONEY. They wanted us to repeal the oleomargarine law.

The point is that it is going to happen again and again where economic interests are involved. Are they going to be guilty because they are in the business of producing oil?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oklahoma knows I have not called anybody a public enemy.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have said that this man is a man of character. I have said that he would be well qualified for another public office. I have said that this particular office may involve a conflict of interest, and in my judgment it definitely does. This does not demean anybody's character.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to hear the remainder of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I admit that I have not yet made my full case.

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot concede that simply because a man has some past knowledge of the oil industry this, ipso facto, makes him unqualified to take a high position, particularly when he is well known to be a man of great ability and character, a man who is honest to the *n*th degree. Those of us who know him better as a servant of the Senate than as an oil man know that.

I have had very few relationships with the Texas oil industry. We are the "poor relations." We have the smaller oil fields, those which are more fatigued and which do not produce as much oil. Still, oil is as important economically, in a way, to the Senator from Oklahoma, as is dairying to the Senator from Wisconsin, or as corn and wheat are to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. These are the economic facts of life.

We do not like to hear people who are engaged in these industries, so important to the economies of our States being called, let us not say public enemies, but let us say second-class citizens. I do not think they should be.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me, and I apologize to the Senator for taking so long a period of time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma, who is characteristically gracious and courteous.

I should like to invite attention to page 13 of the oil and gas lobby investigation, which lists the members of the oil and gas committee which selected the nominee.

W. M. Keck, Superior Oil Co., 610 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, is listed as a member of that committee. His name is listed at that point in the hearings.

Madam President, I am going to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the many other instances in which the Secretary of the Navy has very great discretion and power over the oil reserves. I have already indicated the most important area in which he has unchecked and complete and total discretion, without any review whatsoever and without any consideration of the way in which this, it seems to me, could affect income for the oil industry generally and for the Richardson interests specifically.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these items may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

7423. The Secretary of the Navy shall from time to time reexamine the need for the production of petroleum for national defense when that production is authorized under section 7422 of this title. If he finds the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense. (No check indicated.)

7425. (a) Whenever the Secretary of the Navy is unable to make arrangements he considers satisfactory for—

(1) exchanges of land or agreements for conservation * * *; or

(2) contracts for joint, unit, or other cooperative plans * * * he may acquire, with the approval of the President, such privately owned lands and leases—

(1) by purchase, inside the naval petroleum reserves, or outside these reserves on the same geologic structure; and

(2) by condemnation, inside naval petroleum reserve numbered 1, or, if there is substantial drainage, outside that reserve on the same geologic structure.

(b) The Secretary shall report annually to Congress all proceedings for purchase and condemnation under this section.

7427. The Secretary of the Navy, with the consent of the President, may make agreements, with respect to lands inside the naval petroleum reserves, of the same type as (provided in sec. 226e of title 30, to wit)—

"For the purpose of more properly conserving the natural resources of any oil or gas pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof * * * lessees thereof * * * may unite * * * in collectively adopting and operating under a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of such pool or field or like area, or any part thereof, whenever determined and certified by the Secretary of the Interior * * * to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. The Secretary is thereunto authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the holders of the leases involved, to establish, alter, change, or revoke drilling, producing, rental, minimum royalty, and royalty requirements of such leases and to make such regulations with reference to such leases * * * in connection with the institution and operation of any such cooperative or unit plan as he may deem necessary or proper to secure the proper protection of the public interest.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. It is not clear in my mind whether the name of Keck is related to the small committee or to the large committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The name of Keck is related to the large committee of 780 members. He was one of the very large number.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, in the light of the record, and in view of the history of the days since Secretary Daniels was Secretary of the Navy, considering the expressed viewpoint of the special interests with which this nominee has been principally identified, is not the administration of the oil reserves likely to be prejudiced in the interests of the petroleum industry, which may not be the public interest?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a matter of opinion. I do not think so.

I have tried to point out that in the administration of the reserves the Secretary of the Navy can do hardly anything and cannot enter into any contract that is binding unless the proposal has first been submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

I should like to read section 7431 of the Civil Code:

The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives must be consulted and the President's approval must be obtained before any condemnation proceedings may be started under this chapter and before any of the following transactions authorized by this chapter may be effective:

(1) A lease of any part of the naval petroleum reserves.

(2) A contract to alienate from the United States the use, control, or possession of any part of the naval petroleum reserves.

(3) A contract to sell the oil and gas products, other than royalty products, from any part of the naval petroleum reserves.

(4) A contract for conservation or for compensation for estimated drainage.

(5) An agreement to exchange land, the right to royalty production, or the right to any money due the United States.

That is the law.

There is a further provision, in section 7426:

No contract may be made under this section until the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been consulted as to all its details.

The conclusion that if a man is engaged in the oil industry he is therefore suspect of anything that has ever gone wrong is not a proper one.

The chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee that handles those matters is not an oilman. He does not represent an oil State. I designated the distinguished Senator from Missouri Mr. [SYMINGTON] as the chairman of the subcommittee, which must review and go into the details of each of the contracts which must be submitted to Congress. There is no question in my mind that the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri will go into all of those contracts.

I do not think the mere fact that Mr. Connally has been connected with the oil industry makes him subject to suspicion, any more than we could say that if one banker were to rob a bank in which he served as a trustee for the depositors it would mean, ipso facto, that every banker is a scoundrel and we ought to turn against every one of them.

I have heard what the Senator has said about not making any implications of guilt by association, and so forth. He may not be making such an implication, but otherwise what is all of this about the man named Keck? I do not know who he is. Apparently he must have been subject to some criticism, because the Senator has mentioned him a few times.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the Senator from Wisconsin did not bring up the name of Keck. That was brought out by various Senators who engaged in colloquy with me. I did not mention Mr. Keck first.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator mentioned that Mr. Keck was in the oil business, and that Mr. Connally's main experience has been with Mr. Richardson in the oil business, and that all of this ought to bar the nominee from being the Secretary of the Navy. I do not share that view. I know Mr. Connally personally, so perhaps I have some advantage over the Senator from Wisconsin, who I assume does not know him.

I have great faith in Mr. Connally's character and integrity, as well as in his ability. In my opinion, he will make an outstanding Secretary of the Navy. I do not think the mere fact that he has been a success in the oil industry means he is going to steal the naval reserves, or any part of them, or that he will otherwise stoop to any violation of the law. Let us not forget that he is a man who spent 5 years in the service of his country, in the uniform of the Navy.

He knows something about the Navy from both sides. He knows about the Navy from the fighting side. He has received decorations and citations for heroism under fire. He served in the procurement division of the Navy before he left the service in 1946. He is as well equipped to serve as Secretary of the Navy as any man whose name has been submitted for that office during my service in the Senate, and I have served on committees dealing with naval affairs for nearly 30 years.

When asking a question of that kind, the Senator will not get an affirmative reply from me, because I do not believe the mere fact that the man has been identified with the oil industry should permanently debar him from serving as Secretary of the Navy.

I have known some very fine men in the oil industry. It may be popular to attack all of them and to say that every one of them has made a lot of money, but if one looks further than the obviously prosperous oil men, one will find that a great many of these men have gone broke.

It so happens that I knew Mr. Sid Richardson in his lifetime. In my opinion Mr. Richardson, who has now gone to his last reward, was a very fine and patriotic citizen who loved his country and who would make as much sacrifice for it as almost any other American.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should prefer to reply to the Senator from Georgia first, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Madam President, I know there are fine men in the oil industry. I do not question the fact that there are very fine men in that industry. There are able and patriotic men with excellent character. I am not talking about that.

What I am talking about is the fact that these men have a special interest. If the conflict of interest statutes means anything, if the conflict of interest principle means anything, it means that very fine men in some circumstances should be found to be not qualified for the offices to which they are appointed.

I do not raise any question as to this nominee's character, and I have not done so. I certainly do not think he is going to steal the Navy blind. I think everything he will do he will do in good conscience, but it is going to be done upon the basis of long experience in the oil industry, operating from their viewpoint.

This man has had a good record in the Navy as a fighting man. That is certainly to his great credit. But, after all, no one would seriously argue the fact that simply because a man served in the Navy with distinction as a fighting man he thereby would be qualified to be the Secretary of the Navy.

To reply to the distinguished Senator from Georgia specifically, the Senator has quoted several sections which state, as I conceded, that it is necessary under some circumstances for the Secretary of the Navy to have contracts approved by the committees of the Congress.

Section 7423 is the principal section, as I said in my remarks, which gives the Secretary of the Navy discretion. I quote:

The Secretary of the Navy shall from time to time reexamine the need for the production of petroleum for national defense when that production is authorized under section 7422 of this title. If he finds the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense.

There was no check whatsoever indicated, which is what I was speaking about.

In the second place, I believe we would all agree that Senators will give very great weight to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy. After all, the fact that appointees must check with a Senate committee does not mean that we can ignore the kind of attitude such appointees will have. My brief experience in the Senate, which has been reinforced repeatedly almost every month I have been in the Senate, demonstrates that we give great weight to the attitude of representatives of the various departments of the Government. They are the experts. They are the people who have the facts and the enormous staffs that are able to furnish recommendations.

I venture to suggest that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy will be followed in most cases, and perhaps in virtually all cases.

Some people may be surprised to know that the great majority of the recommendations of Ezra Taft Benson, who was not in high favor with most Democrats and many Republicans, were followed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I serve.

The fact that we appoint a man of the caliber of Mr. Connally as Secretary of the Navy, although he is a fine man, but one with his background, means that we can expect Navy policy, so far as oil reserves are concerned, to be a policy which would certainly not be unfriendly, and might be very useful to the petroleum industry.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, although the Senator from Wisconsin may already know it, I wish to point out to him that the law which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] read was originally adopted in 1920, amended in 1938, and I believe it was amended a third time in 1944. That law was the result of the Teapot Dome scandals, if my memory serves me correctly. Those scandals involved a question of drawing oil from the naval reserves through wells placed close by, which could drain oil out of the naval reserves.

I was chairman of the Armed Services Committee for 2 years, following the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is now again chairman. He has held that position for many years. The whole principle upon which we acted in that committee was to preserve the naval reserve areas for accessible oil in the event there was not sufficient oil elsewhere.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has pointed out, the oil in-

dustry is not working full time now. Therefore, certainly any contracts made with relation to the naval reserve should be very limited, and those reserves should be maintained for use in future years.

I was one of those who, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], went through the so-called Ed Pauley case. The Ed Pauley case was completely different from the case of John B. Connally, Jr., because Ed Pauley, to whom we gave a clean bill of health morally and ethically, just as the Senator from Wisconsin is doing with respect to John B. Connally, Jr., today, was a producer of oil. He was a speculator in oil wells. That situation was completely different from the situation involving Mr. Connally. Mr. Connally was a salaried employee with no oil interests himself, except a very small interest that gave him $325 a month.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator be persuaded if it could be shown that the nominee could conceivably benefit very greatly from policies of the Navy and that he has a prospective opportunity for a very large income as a result of oil production? Does the Senator know that what happens to the petroleum industry in the future will very definitely affect the pecuniary interests and advantage of the Secretary of the Navy-designate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thought we went into that question very carefully in our committee. I refer the Senator to page 8 of the committee report. I asked the question myself, because I thought it was pertinent in view of the Pauley case:

> Senator SALTONSTALL. Is there any arrangement for back salaries or pensions or anything of that character with that firm, when you now come over to Government employ?
>
> Mr. CONNALLY. No, sir. The partnership has no pension or retirement system in effect at all, Senator. I have, up until this point, during the almost 16 months since the death of Mr. Richardson—I would be entitled, under normal circumstances, to receive, if and when the estate was in a position to pay it, and the executors determined that they would—I would be entitled to receive some fees for the work that has been performed during the past 16 months. But I have had a clear understanding with the executors that in the light of my failure or inability to perform functions, that I would earn no fees whatsoever during the time I was in Government service, and that during my Government service I would not collect any moneys due and owing me, even for past services.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] section 240 of the Texas Probate Code, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes of Texas, volume 17A:

> SECTION 240—Joint executors or administrators
>
> Should there be more than one executor or administrator of the same estate at the same time, the acts of one of them as such executor or administrator shall be as valid as if all had acted jointly; and, in case of the death, resignation, or removal of an executor or administrator, if there be a co-executor or coadministrator of such estate, he shall proceed with such administration as if no such death, resignation or removal had occurred. Provided, however, that this section shall not be construed to authorize one of several executors or administrators to convey real estate, but in such case all the executors and administrators who have qualified as such and are acting as such shall join in the conveyance, unless the court, after due hearing, authorizes less than all to act.
>
> Acts 1955 54th Legislature, page 88, chapter 55; and other legislative history dating back to 1876.

That statute is interesting because under that statute, while Mr. Connally remains as executor of this estate, he has agreed to take no compensation as an executor while he is in Government service. He has agreed that only with respect to the 16 months he has served will he take any compensation.

So in answer to the question of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]—a question which was very much in my mind when the hearings were held—there is no way that I see in which Mr. Connally, unless he violates his word, unless he violates his statements to the committee, can benefit from oil during the time that he is Secretary of the Navy, because during the previous period he was only a salaried employee and had no oil interests of his own beyond the $325 a month referred to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I believe I can answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts quite fully, but I would prefer, if he would permit me to do so, to proceed with my speech and cover that question as I come to it. I believe I can answer it convincingly, at least from my standpoint.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, but with the request that he ask me only a brief question, if that is possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota rose merely to say that he hopes the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed to develop his thoughts in this regard.

I have always thought that this subject was a very difficult area in which to legislate. The basic consideration of the conflict-of-interest statute is that a Government official should not do business with himself. Technically, the Government official should meet that requirement by divesting himself of his stocks or financial interests in an enterprise which, by reason of background or by reason of his philosophy, might operate in such a way that there could be a definite conflict between the best interests of the Government and the interests the official might pursue.

I have always thought that it was a difficult field in which to legislate. We might say to an individual, "You divest yourself of your stocks. You divest yourself of your holdings." However, I know of no way in which we can legislate to have a man divest himself of his basic philosophy of life or his basic interest. The problem is, in the final analysis, to determine whether a man has that kind of character and those convictions and ability which will let him operate on the basis of the interest of the Government, whether or not he holds certain business interests.

I believe that a statute states the Government shall not receive uncompensated services. The purpose of that statute certainly is that when a man works for the Government he is supposed to work for the Government, and place that employment in the primary and not secondary position.

So I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed with his statement. I recognize that he has assigned to himself an unpleasant duty, to go into this subject. I think it is in the interest of good government that when these matters arise they be explored to the extent that Members of the Senate have the ability, interest, and time to do so. I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin is making the speech. I am sure the exploration of this subject will be beneficial to the Federal Government as a whole.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota very much. I very much appreciate his comment.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I rise to commend the able Senator from Wisconsin for making this inquiry. It was only this morning that I read in the newspapers that President Kennedy was creating a three-man panel to examine into the conflict-of-interest situation. Congress will have to meet this issue head on. The New York Bar Association has given us a voluminous report. We may have to change some of our basic statutes. I believe it will be helpful, as the committees go into this subject, to have all these matters before us. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I will have to go into this issue.

I wonder if I could have the attention of the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. As I understand, this subject has to do with a law. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may ask questions of the Senator from Georgia without my losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I have not made up my mind as to how I will vote on this nomination. I am putting my questions for the purpose of obtaining information for myself. As I understand, certain congressional committees have the right to post-audit the action of the Secretary of the Navy with respect to contracts and with respect to leases having to do with the individual oil reserves themselves. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Not only do they have the right, but the contract is not a valid contract until that has been done, and it is not binding until that has been done. This requirement is provided by statute, and I have read that statute into the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that under another section of that statute there is the provision that the production can be reduced by the Secretary of

the Navy. He has the discretion, without any supervision or restraint by congressional committees.

Mr. CARROLL. I wanted to come to that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot say that I agree with that construction the Senator has placed on the statute. So far as I am advised, in practice there is no action that is taken with respect to the oil reserves of the Navy looking to a reduction or an increase in the production in any way without consultation with the committees of Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. Would it not also be the fact that no action could be taken by the Secretary of the Navy in this regard—and I am not familiar with the statute—without the approval of the President?

Mr. RUSSELL. That statute specifically so provides.

Mr. CARROLL. With respect to production?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Section 7423 of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Act provides:

SEC. 7423. Periodic reexamination of production requirements

The Secretary of the Navy shall from time to time reexamine the need for the production of petroleum for national defense when that production is authorized under section 7422 of this title. If he finds that the authorized quantity is no longer needed, he shall reduce production to the amount currently needed for national defense.

I would appreciate it if the Senator from Georgia or any other Senator could find any provision in the statute which indicates that a reduction depends upon approval by a congressional committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. In any event, in my opinion, no Secretary of the Navy would alter the terms of these contracts without consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. I was going to say that that would be my viewpoint, because this question has been gone into in the Antimonopoly Subcommittee. We went into it at great length. The question came up at the time of the breakdown in the Middle East. I am confident that the Secretary of the Navy would not take any such action without consulting the President of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The whole purpose of the law is to prevent a depletion of the oil reserves. It is not intended to encourage production. The purpose is to try to conserve the resources that are in the ground, so that we will have them available for our use by the Navy in a great emergency. I do not know anything about the oil industry, but I do know that when the oil is in the ground and it belongs to the U.S. Government, we will have the oil available in case a great national emergency arises.

I am not familiar with the oil industry, but I have not had much sympathy with the oil people complaining about the importation of oil. So long as the oil is in the ground in this country, it is available to us. The oil in Arabia and in other parts of the Middle East may be denied to us almost at any time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point I have been making repeatedly is clear, that in these cases, where a Senate committee or a House committee has to act on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, those recommendations are very impressive and very important, and those recommendations have to be given enormous weight. Senators are busy people. Few of us are experts. Even the members of the Committee on Armed Services, while they are distinguished, competent, able and of fine character, must take primarily the finding, judgment, and expression and argument which are put forth by the Secretary of the Navy. Of course, they will stand up against him when they think he is in error. However, the Secretary of the Navy has a great advantage when a congressional committee is his principal check, or only check. So far as the recommendation of the President is concerned, we must remember that he is a very busy man. Certainly he must primarily rely on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy.

All this is an argument against having as the Secretary of the Navy a man who might be biased or not objective, or whose judgment cannot be accepted at face value by the President and by congressional committees.

Mr. CARROLL. I come now to my third question. We have dealt with this type of contract. I remember that the question of the possibility of increasing or reducing the production was brought up before our Antimonopoly Subcommittee by Rear Adm. O. P. Lattu, who in 1957 was the Executive Director of the Military Petroleum Supply Agency of the Navy Department's Supply Corps.

As I remember, it was testified that the Navy purchases all the oil for the Military Establishment. The Navy spent in 1957, the year of our hearings, a billion dollars a year, and I assume the amount has been increased since then.

I assume these contracts are let by competitive bidding. Is there any evidence in the record before the committee that the company for which this young man was the attorney had been doing any business with the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. The evidence showed clearly that the estate of Richardson, while it is a large oil company, had never done one dollar's worth of business with the Government of the United States or with any agency of the U.S. Government.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe I can show that that is not the case. Sid Richardson has owned an interest in a firm which has done business with the Government of the United States, and it appears, on the basis of the evidence I have, that the estate of Richardson may have done business with the U.S. Government, too. I would be very much interested in the reaction of the Senator from Georgia when I come to this particular point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be very glad to listen to what the Senator has to say. I hope what he says will be more susceptible of proof than some of the innuendoes that the distinguished Senator has given us heretofore.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to draw this distinction between three categories. We have the situation of the Military Establishment purchasing a billion dollars' worth of petroleum a year. Is it done by contract? Do the subcommittees of Congress review those contracts? Or is this within the purview of the Department itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. We do not review each and every contract for the purchase of petroleum, no. Such purchases are made all over the world. As I recall—and I think I am correct in this statement—the Mediterranean fleet uses oil that is purchased in the Middle East because the oil is closer and cheaper to get than to have it shipped from the United States.

No, we do not review every one of these contracts. There are any number of them in effect under which the Navy is purchasing oil. It purchases every kind of petroleum product, including jet fuel for the Air Force. The committee does not review all those contracts, any more than it reviews the various contracts for the transportation of goods and household effects. There is much more than a billion dollars a year spent for those items by the various elements of the Defense Department.

Mr. CARROLL. Can the chairman tell us how much was spent last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I cannot. I have in my mind the figure of $1,200 million, but please do not bind me to it. It is a very large sum of money. Nearly everything that is used in the Department of Defense, from missiles to halftracks and trucks, is fueled with petroleum products. Most of our ships at sea and all our land transportation, including trucks and halftracks, airplanes and missiles, and the facilities used to launch missiles—practically all of them are powered by petroleum products.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I ask my fellow Senators to help me, if possible, to get through with my presentation. I have no desire to hold the floor. I am sure Senators want to proceed with the nominations as fast as possible. I should very much appreciate it if the colloquy could be limited. I realize that in these circumstances it is desirable to have colloquy, because in this delicate position a man's future is involved. A Senator should be expected to be interrogated, but I should like to have the interruptions limited as much as possible.

I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the courtesy and patience which are always shown by the Senator from Wisconsin. May I ask another question of the Senator from Georgia, with the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin will not lose the floor, in order to amplify an answer given by the distinguished chairman of the committee?

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact, from reading the RECORD, that what oil production the Richardson estate has is sold at the wellhead, and is thus commingled with the production of other producers in the same field; and that the only way it would humanly be possible for the Government to use any of this oil would be oil that one of a dozen or thirty pipelines working in the various

fields owned by oil producing or oil refining companies channels into the refinery?

The Government does not buy crude oil, as I understand; it buys refined oil products, and the refineries have pipelines which serve the various fields. So it would be as physically impossible to say that this company has direct interests in the sale of oil as it would be to say that a farmer in Kansas had a direct interest in the purchase of flour or bread that the Army might have in its supply, because he had generated the sale of the basic product which went into the final product that the military purchased.

Mr. RUSSELL. We endeavored to be reasonably careful in the discharge of our duty in examining this nominee. I refer to page 7 of the hearings on the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., where the following interrogation took place:

Chairman RUSSELL. Does the Sid W. Richardson estate do any direct oil business with the Government of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, sir, it does not.

Chairman RUSSELL. None at all?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, sir.

I had thought perhaps it did. I continue to quote:

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Richardson was a rather large independent operator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, sir, he was. But there again, Senator, his operations were strictly the production. And his production was sold at the wellhead, or at a central point in the field to any one of 30 or 40 different crude purchasers, depending on where the properties lay, and who was buying in the area.

Mr. Connally has testified, at some point, that Mr. Richardson's business or his estate, during the time he was employed by it, was strictly that of a producer of raw products which were sold to refiners or processors of oil.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have never questioned that. On that point, I expect to develop in a moment the fact that there can be substantial benefits to the Richardson interests.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement of his satisfaction concerning the moral character, integrity, and high standing of the appointee. It was my pleasure to appear before the committee in Mr. Connally's behalf. Perhaps my statement now could be considered to be somewhat biased, in a sense. It is my unusual pleasure to have known Mr. Connally for a great many years, both personally and businesswise. Therefore, I wish to express especial appreciation to the Senator from Wisconsin for accepting Mr. Connally's position as that of a man of high moral standing in our Nation.

One further thought: In reaching the position of conflict of interest, would it be considered that because a person had been associated or closely allied with a certain particular industry, that he might have influenced, he might be accused or suspected of a conflict of interest? For instance, only a day or so ago I had the great pleasure of voting to confirm the nomination of former Governor Freeman to be Secretary of Agriculture. I thought one of the outstanding supports for Governor Freeman was not only his understanding and knowledge of the problems of agriculture, but also his interest in agricultural problems.

With that statement, and not desiring to speak any longer, I was wondering if this theory were to follow: If the great, distinguished, outstanding military record of Mr. Connally in the Navy would be called upon to stand against his qualifications to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that the record of the nominee in the Navy is greatly in his favor. He has a record of valor and of fine distinction. But I have said, and I repeat, it does not qualify him to be Secretary of the Navy. I think there are thousands of persons having fine records in the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps—wonderful men—who deserve the best from their country, and deserve the admiration, respect, and gratitude of all of us. But that does not mean in any sense that they are qualified for a particular administrative position. This does not mean that those attributes disqualify Mr. Connally in any way at all.

Mr. BLAKLEY. They do not disqualify him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Does his knowledge and experience in the oil industry disqualify him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; certainly his experience and knowledge of the oil industry are useful to him. All I am saying is that, this experience and knowledge has, inevitably, come, it seems to me, on the basis of this particular nominee's life, associations, record and identification of interests with the petroleum industry and with the petroleum industry's profits and welfare.

I think I can show, at least to my own satisfaction, that this will be of specific pecuniary benefit to Mr. Connally after he retires from government service.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I join with the Senator from Georgia in expressing the hope that the evidence which will be presented by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin will be genuinely explicit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

NAVY SECRETARY HAS POWER TO BLOCK NAVY CONVERSION TO ATOMIC FUEL—COMPETITIVE WITH PETROLEUM AND TO SLOW OR SPEED ATOMIC RESEARCH

The Navy is an enormous customer for oil, as was brought out a moment ago in the colloquy between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oklahoma. Certainly, the Navy is one of the biggest customers for oil in the world. The Secretary of the Navy buys oil for the other services. He buys some $1 billion worth of oil per year. At the same time, the Navy has closely watched the atom-powered submarine Nautilus, which logged 62,500 miles before changing its nuclear core.

Admiral Rickover has calculated that a conventional submarine of equal displacement and horsepower would have burned about 2,170,000 gallons of oil. This would fill 217 tank cars. The admiral has also recently said that "We are right in the middle of a vast program for changing our Navy."

I recall very well how the Senate debated last year whether we should build an atomic-powered aircraft carrier or a conventional-powered aircraft carrier. How rapidly we proceed to convert the submarine fleet from petroleum fuel will affect the oil industry. This is a decision as to which the President and Congress will have to look to the Secretary of the Navy. He is the key man, in a crucial position to make this decision. It is clear that the Navy may convert faster or slower from petroleum power to atomic power. Should we have more aircraft carriers powered by atomic fuel or by conventional fuel? Should we have more aircraft carriers powered by atomic energy fuel or by conventional fuel? Who will make that decision? Oil operator John Connally will have to make the decisions on that point, knowing his future income will depend on it.

How assiduously will the Navy pursue its research in these fields? With this atomic fuel available and competitive with petroleum, and so greatly threatening to reduce the value of all oil fields and holdings—or, shall we say, the value of the fabulous Richardson holdings—these matters will be greatly affected by the attitude of the Secretary of the Navy.

In view of all this, I assert the proposition that while it may be valuable to have a man who knows something about oil as Secretary of the Navy, many American citizens may be concerned that the Secretary is a man whose principal occupation before he was appointed Secretary of the Navy was oil producer, on the inside of the oil industry.

Madam President, the fact is that the man now nominated to be Secretary of the Navy has not severed his personal connections with the oil industry, which have been—and whenever he severs his connection with the Navy, will again be—enormously valuable to him. Together with two others, he is coexecutor of the estate of the late Sid Richardson. Under the laws of Texas and under the arrangement made, the nominee received, until his appointment, one-third of the executor fees from this estate. After he leaves the service he will once again receive—unless at that time he resigns—one third of the fees of this estate.

It seems to me that if he is going to resign, the time to resign is now. But he has held on to this position.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has correctly brought out, while Mr. Connally serves as Secretary of the Navy, he will receive nothing from the estate; but I shall now state what he can look forward to. Let me say, Madam President, that this morning I talked to the nominee; and he told me, personally, that the fees are 5 percent of the amount paid into the estate and 5 percent of the expenses paid out; but no fee is earned on any distribution of the body of the estate, as I understand.

How much will that amount to? He said the size of the estate has been greatly exaggerated in the statements which have been made. He said it is not $1 billion or $500 million, but that the

value is closer to $100 million. With a gross income of around $2 million or $3 million or so and including expenses, and that is the way the fees of an executor are computed—of another $1 million or so, his share of the fees would be around $40,000 to $80,000. Would the gross income from this estate vary as the military speeds up or slows down its conversion from petroleum to atomic power? What do you think?

It seems to me that the answer is apparent, as this tremendously important customer for the entire petroleum industry contracts or expands its purchases of petroleum and as it pushes ahead with its research program, which has an enormous impact on the petroleum industry. In those circumstances, of course the future of John Connally will be tremendously affected. Disregarding for a moment his connection with that industry and his service as an important spokesman for it, does not what I have just now pointed out suggest a direct pecuniary conflict of interest, especially in view of the fact that the nominee's recital, before the committee, of his holding and income indicates that the fees from this estate would be by far the greatest share of his income?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I do not think any conflict of interest is involved, under any law of which I have knowledge or under any code of ethics with which I am familiar.

If we jump to conclusions, if we carry this further and further, we can become suspicious of almost anything. The Senator from Wisconsin has trained at this matter, but I see no conflict of interest here.

I think the Senator could make a much stronger case of conflict of interest—if we are to proceed on the basis of suspicion and innuendo—if he were to state that the President of the United States should be watched very closely because he has sold all of his common stocks and has put the proceeds into Government bonds. The President has appointed the Secretary of the Treasury and other officials in the Treasury Department, and just think what a wonderful opportunity will thus be afforded to the President of the United States to raise the interest rates on Government bonds and thereby greatly to increase the value of the substantial amount of Government bonds that he has acquired.

If the Senator wished to distrust everyone and did not wish to believe in the integrity of anyone, and even if he wished to impute all kinds of improper motives and a willingness to perform immoral acts to various people, the Senator could make a much stronger case against the President of the United States. But I do not believe it. I think the President of the United States is going to try to bring down the interest rates on Government bonds.

I also think—in light of the testimony taken before our committee—that John Connally will honestly and honorably administer the duties of Secretary of the Navy; and I see no bugaboo in the point that after he concludes his service as Secretary of the Navy, he will take up again the duties in connection with the administration of the estate to which reference has been made. I see no reason why such an argument is a valid one.

I do not know all about the nominee's investments. The Senator from Wisconsin obtained, this morning, more knowledge about the Richardson estate than I did at the hearings. During the hearings, after the nominee said that none of the oil wells in which the estate has some interest are in any way connected with any of the naval reserves or even are in close physical proximity, and after he said that the estate does not now have and, to his knowledge, Mr. Richardson never had, an oil and gas lease or a royalty interest of any kind or character, or a mineral interest of any kind or character in any of the States in which the naval petroleum reserves are located, I decided that in my opinion this situation did not disqualify him under the conflict of interest law—unless we simply desire to impute illegal and immoral acts to the nominee; and I know of no reason why we should do that.

So my answer to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is in the negative.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that the fact is that the nominee's holdings—as clearly set forth in the hearings—include insurance interests and a small share in a Texas bank, and he owns an oil lease, and still owns it; and his total investment income—in a few minutes I shall discuss the oil lease—would be approximately $13,000, $14,000, or $15,000. If a man looks forward to a $40,000 to $80,000 annual income after he finishes his services in the President's Cabinet, it seems to me it is very clear—disregarding any notion that I challenge his integrity or anything of the kind—that—if the conflict of interest statutes mean anything—a man in that position would be in an indelicate, embarrassing, and compromising position under such circumstances, in view of the great power and authority the Secretary of the Navy has, particularly with regard to developing the competitive atomic energy fuel, which directly competes, and may devastatingly compete, with the petroleum industry.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have any estimate of what the petroleum industry's own indications are as to the use of petroleum in the future, even with the competition from atomic energy? It might interest the Senator from Wisconsin to know that the oil companies estimate—and, incidentally, they are hedging, so far as atomic energy is concerned, and are purchasing uranium deposits, and so forth, so as to be in the fuel business in any event—are that 10 years from now we shall be using at least 50 percent more petroleum than we are using now, and perhaps much more than that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How many years from now?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Ten years from now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But it is not given to us to see the future. What happens then will depend on our research programs. As the Senator from Louisiana knows far better than I do, the Federal Government is the big source of research funds, and the Navy is an enormously important part of this. If the Navy presses very fast its research in the field of atomic fuel and tries to apply it, that can make a great difference to the petroleum industry. If the Navy does not do so, it may be that 10 or 12 years from now the petroleum industry will be selling more petroleum than it is selling now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the point is that its estimates are based on a greatly expanded use of atomic power. The estimates are based on the fact that there is such a tremendous demand for and use of petroleum and petroleum products, and new uses are being developed all the time—for instance, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, there are literally thousands of future uses for petroleum products, in terms of plastics and goodness knows what. As for atomic energy, although it is a very expensive fuel, atomic fuel is being used for submarines; and certainly we should push in the direction of development of its uses as rapidly as possible.

Even as one coming from an oil-producing State, I would recognize that fact. Nevertheless, there is a tremendous demand for petroleum, and, even with the very optimistic demand anticipated for atomic power, there will still be an added, rather than a reduced, demand for petroleum products.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The oil industry is a sick industry right now. The oil industry cannot sell all of its petroleum. It may be that the oil industry will be able to sell increased production in the future. However, the future cannot be foreseen. There may be an adverse effect on the Navy's position in research in promoting a competing fuel, which can be dependent primarily on the future attitude of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The present problems that the oil industry has do not have anything to do with the expansion of atomic energy. The effect of atomic energy is so infinitesimal that it is hardly worth talking about. The problem of the oil industry is the problem of dumping oil imports into this country. The same would be true with regard to the cheese and milk industry of Wisconsin, if the tax barriers were put down, and imports of those products were allowed to come into this country at a 1 percent ad valorem tax. Such a procedure could give Wisconsin "fits."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Secretary Benson has done exactly this.

Let me continue.

The nominee told the committee that he still holds oil leases from which he is currently receiving $325 monthly, or nearly $4,000 per year. This constitutes about a third of the nominee's investment income, and as secretary it will be 10% of his total income. In view of the

fact that all oil production and oil prices can and will be influenced by Navy policy, why does not this constitute a conflict of interest in principle?

It has been argued that the Secretary of Defense had to dispose of his holdings at a great sacrifice. The President had to dispose of his holdings. The Attorney General did the same. Here is a man who could dispose of his holdings without any sacrifice at all. I admit that resigning from the S. W. Richardson interest would have involved a very great sacrifice. The nominee did not make it. I disagree with that but I understand it. I do not understand why he held on to this oil lease. It constitutes a very substantial amount of income. $4,000 annual income is a large sum of money to most of us. It may not be much to a wealthy man. This man is in about the same income bracket as most Senators. Certainly, I would recognize $325 a month, or $4,000 a year, as a substantial income. I do not see why he cannot dispose of the lease.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi questioned Mr. Connally on this matter. The Senator, of course, knows that this oil lease involves oil which is in the ground. It does not pertain to any company with which he has made a deal. The oil is sold to the gathering company or the pipeline companies that may be in the area. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree 100 percent. There is no contract with the Government, but it would be affected by the policy of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. STENNIS. The situation would be the same as that involved in taking out of the ground sand or clay, or the growing of products. The oil is a product of the ground. It is not connected in any way with the Secretary or the Navy. So the effect of a policy of the Navy would be relatively infinitesimal on a small lease as to its increased worth, on a monthly basis. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

I am going to make a point raised several times by the Senator from Massachusetts and by other Senators, which was very emphatically stated by the nominee, when he said, as appears on page 5 of the hearings:

> Let me parenthetically say here that the estate does no business with the Defense Establishment to my knowledge of any kind or character.

Then, as appears on page 7, he said:

> But there again, Senator, his operations were strictly the production. And his production was sold at the wellhead, or at a central point in the field to any one of 30 or 40 different crude purchasers, depending on where the properties lay, and who was buying in the area.

On Friday the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] put into the RECORD an article from Fortune magazine which discussed the almost fantastic favoritism shown by the Navy in a contract with the Transport Co. of Texas. The article, dated last month, December 1960, states that Sid Richardson was the third largest stockholder in this firm that contracted with the Navy. I read from Fortune, which is conservative and very careful in its statements:

> The third-largest TCT stockholder at the time of incorporation in 1951 and presumably until his death in 1959 was oilman Sid Richardson.

Mr. President, this was a substantial contract. It was for $5,200,000, and has been extended to reach $13,300,000. The $18,500,000 includes $1 million in fees for TCT.

Now, on page 5 of the hearings the nominee says:

> The estate does no business with the Defense Establishment to my knowledge of any kind or character whatsoever.

I ask the Senator from Georgia, in the absence of a direct assertion from the nominee that this property has been disposed of by the estate—or that the Fortune story was not accurate—does it not appear that there would be a conflict of interest between the nominee acting as Secretary of the Navy on the one hand, in dealing with the Transport Co. of Texas as a contractor, and as the former and future coexecutor of the estate, which presumably is still the third largest stockholder in that contractor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, this question was brought to the attention of the Senate on Saturday last by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I earlier had occasion to bring it to Mr. Connally's attention. I asked him what the facts were. He has gone into it in a letter, and I will read the letter he has written me:

> JANUARY 20, 1961.
>
> Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
> *Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Certain accusations in the public press concerning an alleged relationship between the late S. W. Richardson and Transport Co. of Texas and Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger have been called to my attention.
>
> This is my reply:
>
> The S. W. Richardson estate does not now own and never has owned at any time in its existence any stock or any interest whatsoever in the Transport Co. of Texas, or in any business or enterprise owned or controlled by Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger, or in any contracts or agreements which Transport Co. of Texas, or Mr. Linkenhoger, or any of his companies might have with the Department of Defense, the U.S. Navy, or any person, firm or corporation whatsoever.
>
> A careful study made for the purposes of preparing the inventory of the estate of S. W. Richardson has indicated the existence of no business association whatsoever between the estate of S. W. Richardson and Transport Co. of Texas, or Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger, or any company or business owned or controlled by Mr. Linkenhoger.
>
> Our full investigation indicates, and I am informed, that Mr. Richardson on or about October 27, 1951, purchased $10,000 of capital stock in Transport Co. of Texas. This stock, which never paid any dividends, was sold by Mr. Richardson for $15,000, representing a profit of $5,000, on or about May 29, 1958. I am further informed that these transactions represent the only business transactions which were ever had between Mr. S. W. Richardson and the Transport Co. of Texas, Mr. Edgar Linkenhoger, or any business or company owned or controlled or participated in by Mr. Linkenhoger.
>
> Neither the purchase nor the sale of the stock by Mr. Richardson was ever discussed with me by either Mr. Richardson or Mr. Linkenhoger at any time. Furthermore, the only knowledge I have of the Kwajalein contract has been obtained through the public press. It has never been discussed with me by any of the participants—in or out of the Government.
>
> The purchase of this stock in 1951 predated my employment by Richardson and Bass by some 5 months. Its resale by Mr. Richardson was in May of 1958. According to the public press, this predated by some months even the conception of the Kwajalein Island contracts between Transport Co. of Texas and the Navy.
>
> Mr. Richardson died on September 30, 1959, and at the time of his death owned no interest in Transport Co. of Texas or in any business owned or controlled by Mr. Linkenhoger.
>
> Respectfully submitted.
>
> JOHN B. CONNALLY.

So it appears that unless this statement is out of the whole cloth, conclusions based on this article from Fortune magazine, a conservative magazine, can be erroneous.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Georgia. I think his statement is very useful and very helpful. The fact is that the statement was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Saturday. I think this particular letter satisfactorily answers the statement or the insertion in the RECORD from Fortune magazine, and I am glad to find that the nominee has cleared it up, because it was an obvious contradiction of his testimony.

Madam President, I think it is apparent that I am not relying on this particular item to support my position.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his graciousness and for his patience. I should like now to take 2 or 3 more minutes to sum up my arguments. I have no further questions for the Senator from Georgia.

Madam President, in recapitulation, in the first place:

The nominee has one principal qualification to be Secretary of the Navy, and only one. He has been one of the principal administrators of one of the world's richest private oil empires. He knows oil.

Second. The nominee for Secretary of the Navy was a leader—a member of the 24-man steering committee of the general gas committee, the organization whose lobbying activities were sharply censured by President Eisenhower in his veto of the natural gas bill in 1956. In this capacity the nominee was clearly identified as a spokesman for the petroleum industry, which for 50 years has been badgering Secretaries of the Navy to get at the Navy's oil reserves, and which has expressed resounding denunciation of the whole principle of naval reserves.

As Secretary of the Navy, the nominee will have great discretion over the reserves, including unchecked power to reduce their production and to lessen competition with the private oil industry. He will have massive and often decisive recommending influence with regard to contracts with private interests for operation of the reserves.

Third. This leading private oil operator would, as Secretary of the Navy, have the principal responsibility for buying oil for all the services; and would be the key—the critical man in recommending a decision and making a decision on the conversion by the Navy from petroleum power to atomic power. Also, John Connally, the oil operator, would be in a crucial position to influence the Navy's research and development program for atomic fuel, the big competitor of oil.

Fourth. The fact is that the nominee has not severed his personal connections in the oil industry. He has the $325-a-month oil lease. Many people, I suppose, would say, "That is peanuts." It would not be "peanuts" for me. I do not think it would be "peanuts" for most Americans. It is $325 a month, or nearly $4,000 a year; which constitutes, as I said, about 30 percent of the investment income of the nominee. It is a very substantial amount.

It makes no sense at all to me to say that this particular lease cannot be liquidated, cannot be sold, in order to avoid a conflict of interest. There would be no substantial sacrifice on the part of the nominee, and it seems to me there is a clear conflict of interest.

Mr. President, this next point is the big point, of course. The nominee will continue as the coexecutor of the Richardson estate, with his own compensation directly dependent on the policies adopted by himself as Secretary of the Navy. The compensation in fees from this estate would be in excess of $40,000 annually and would constitute, by all odds, the nominee's principal income after leaving the office of the Secretary of the Navy.

It seems to me that we should not approve the nomination of a man who looks forward to a principal income in the future—a very, very large income—from an estate which is overwhelmingly an oil estate, when the man will have the big responsibility in our Federal Government with respect to oil, will be the big purchaser of oil, will be the man who buys oil for all the services, will be the man who has discretion with respect to research. This constitutes a conflict of interest if there can be such a thing.

As I stated before, Madam President, I have been reluctant to make this fight. I very heartily approve of the President of the United States. I have approved of him for a long, long time. I was enthusiastically for him before the Democratic convention.

I approve the President's appointments. I think these men are excellent and outstanding men. I dislike very much to vote against one of the President's nominees.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, in commenting on the Pauley nomination for Under Secretary—I realize the situation was somewhat different, but I think the point Mr. Lippmann makes is applicable one for one—said:

> Where oil is involved the high officials of the Navy Department should be above all suspicion, political or personal, warranted or unwarranted. Mr. Pauley would always be suspect, and every action of the U.S. Government in critical areas like the Middle East and Indonesia, where oil is so important, would be laid open to suspicion.

Madam President, this certainly applies to the new Secretary of the Navy.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will yield to the Senator from New York in a moment.

Of course, I do not expect to block the appointment. I doubt if another Senator will join me. In fact, I presume no other Senators will vote with me, except the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who indicated his position on Saturday. I have had no indication of support from other Senators, although I think I have made my views known to them, privately.

I realize that the purpose of this fight is to try to make a record, to try to make as emphatic a record as I can that the nominee should be placed on notice that his conduct is going to be closely watched.

Furthermore, Madam President, I am adopting once again the motto I adopted in February of 1959, when I made a speech with respect to the then majority leader. That motto is from William the Silent: "It is unnecessary to hope in order to undertake; or to succeed in order to persevere."

I hope this effort of mine will serve notice on those who are concerned with oil that there are voices in the U.S. Senate which will be raised in loud protest as they move to extend their special advantages in taxation, regulation, and military procurement. This is no "bogeyman." This is as real as every tax we pay, every gas bill we have to meet, and the immense reliance every American citizen must place on the Navy and the military services to defend our Nation without the interference of selfish special interests.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Do I correctly understand that the nominee has stated he will not receive any income as executor of the estate during the period of his tenure as Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is absolutely correct. Not only that, but he will not receive the fees he previously earned while he is the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KEATING. Do I correctly understand that Mr. Connally will, at the end of his service as Secretary of the Navy, draw fees from the estate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I asked the nominee this question today, and he said that he may or may not return as coexecutor of the estate. It is pretty apparent that if he is not going to return he should resign. He wants to have the opportunity to return.

That is very understandable. After all, what man would wish to resign as an executor of an estate which will pay him from $40,000 to $80,000? It would seem very logical and very predictable that the nominee will return as an executor of the estate and will receive a percentage of the gross income and a percentage of the expenses paid out by the estate.

Mr. KEATING. I was a little puzzled as to why the estate would run on so long. Is the nominee also a trustee under the estate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will say to the Senator from New York that this estate, as the Senator knows, is an enormous estate. It involves in excess of $100 million. As the Senator well knows, some estates run on 4, 5, 8, or 10 years. The estate may not run on that long. It may terminate. It is perfectly possible it will.

Mr. KEATING. Normally the estates do not run on so long. Even a large estate has to be closed up under the laws of most States after a relatively short period of time. There may be trusts created under the will which would continue for a longer time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that this nominee is not a beneficiary, to my knowledge, in any sense from the estate. He would get nothing. He is an executor. This would be his only compensation.

Mr. KEATING. Is he a trustee as well as an executor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no knowledge. I assume he is not a trustee. I do not know. He may be.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the Senator from New York has fallen into the same error that beset me when I heard about the subject. I started to apply the laws of my State on administration to the present facts, and I discovered that the laws are very different. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] pointed out, one of several executors can pass title to any part of the estate except the realty without consulting the others. Such a power is entirely different from the law of my State and the law of most of the common law States. I came to the conclusion after listening to the debate that an executorship in Texas is what we call a trusteeship in my State.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and apologize for getting into the field of Texas law, of which I am completely ignorant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I believe it would be of interest to read section 240 of the Probate Code of the State of Texas. I quote:

> Should there be more than one executor or administrator of the same estate at the same time, the acts of one of them as such executor or administrator shall be as valid as if all had acted jointly;

This is completely different from the law that I know in my own State when I was a practitioner.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to ask a question about the law of Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will not carry me far beyond the section to which I referred.

Mr. KEATING. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia can tell the Senate whether there would be any power of removal of the executor for anything except misconduct in office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not answer that question.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that would be so. I recognize the burden of the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is that the nominee,

while he would be surrendering his income during the time he would serve as Secretary of the Navy, might still have a conflict of interest because it is his intention to return, and that if he had a conflict between oil interests and his duties as Secretary of the Navy, and if he landed on the side of the country rather than the oil interests, he might then be subject to some disciplinary action as an executor of the estate. Apart from the character of the nominee, I think that probability would be very remote. In other words, I assume that he could not be removed as an executor of the estate merely because he made a decision as Secretary of the Navy which might be against the oil interests.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am confident that this would not be true. The statute to which I referred would exonerate him on that issue.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I do not wish to imply that I possess any unusual knowledge, but I have practiced law in Texas for about 35 years and I can say that under a will independent executors are, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia read, able to act independently and separately, and no executor is held liable for the act or endeavors of another executor; neither is he held responsible for the result.

Mr. KEATING. If I may impose on the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Texas a question——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I shall yield the floor in a moment. It seems to me the principal point is not whether the two other coexecutors can act in the absence of the nominee. It seems to me the point is whether we are confronted with an effective trusteeship in Texas called receivership that can go on indefinitely even though, technically, the nominee is not a trustee.

I think it is possible, as the nominee made clear, that the bulk of the estate will go to charity. It may be that the surviving beneficiaries will benefit from the estate as long as they live, and then the estate may pass on to charity. It seems to me that the point was not made clear in the hearings. It is a perfectly possible situation, and it is a situation in which the nominee would receive substantial benefit from an oil estate for many years after he had left the service—perhaps through his life.

Mr. KEATING. Do I not correctly interpret the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin to be that he feels there is a conflict of interest for the reason that the nominee, after serving as Secretary of the Navy, would again become an executor of the estate, and that the prospect of returning to the capacity of such executor might or would in some way affect his judgment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. The Secretary-designate would continue as executor of the estate. He would continue to perform ministerial duties. He would not draw or earn compensation during the period of his secretaryship, but he would not have to claim his executor status. He would automatically assume it as soon as he resigned from the public service.

Mr. KEATING. The entire field is difficult. I commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for raising the question. I know he is very sincere in what he has said. He has raised a question that every Senator must decide for himself in voting time after time. It seems to me that it becomes very difficult to differentiate between the character qualifications of a nominee and his qualifications concerning conflict of interest. A conflict of interest could be so outstanding—and perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin feels that this conflict is in that category—that it could override the character qualification. I realize how careful the Senator has been not to get into the character qualification. I know the nominee. I know others who are not in the oil business who hold him in the highest regard. I have known him for some time. I know of his work in Congress. I consider him to be a man of high character, and I am prepared to give the President the nominee he has asked for, and allow the character qualification to overweigh, in my consideration, the questions which the Senator has brought out. I recognize the seriousness of the questions. And of course, confirmation of Mr. Connally will not excuse him from complying with any applicable conflict-of-interest laws. I think the Senator has performed a constructive service in bringing them to the attention of the Senate. But I shall support the nominee, because I believe him to be a man of high character. I believe he will do a good and conscientious job as Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator. I am ready to yield the floor. First, however, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has requested me to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I desire to make a few observations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was recognized, but I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, it may seem a little awkward or strange that one on this side of the aisle should defend the New Frontiersman against his own frontiersmen, but I have known John B. Connally, Jr., and I have great faith in him.

However, I have an interest beyond that point, which is that I do not want to see a person destroyed. We came close to destroying a good man 18 months ago. I refer to Lewis Strauss, the nominee of President Eisenhower to be Secretary of the Department of Commerce. If Mr. Strauss were not a man of such grace, adaptability and greatness, the issue might well have destroyed him.

I shall never forget the incident, because two Senators on this side of the aisle were absent. I made no bones about the problem. I asked the White House to provide military planes to return those two Senators. I do not care how much others scolded about it. One of the Senators we got back here in time. But we failed in that endeavor on the 19th of June 1959, because shortly after midnight, by a vote of 49 to 46, the nomination of Mr. Lewis Strauss was rejected by the Senate.

However, it is rather interesting to look at the Supreme Court decision. Even though it is in part dicta by the Chief Justice, certainly no other Justice took issue with him. On that occasion the Chief Justice had the following to say with respect to the question:

> No one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project.

And they indicated some surprise.

Yet, Madam President, the word went out that he was unfit, for one reason or another, to serve as a member of the Cabinet of President Eisenhower.

Here we have a young man—and John Connally is reasonably young—against whom a case is endeavored to be made, first, because of his interest in oil. I know the story. It is that his first $10,000 investment is no good. I am sure that anyone who wants those stock certificates for wall paper can get them for nothing.

His second venture, an oil well, has in 9 years produced $1,200. He spent $10,000. So if he lives for 63 years more he will get his money back.

My friend argues that a principle is involved. Perhaps a great many Senators own some oil stock. I do not know. I once had an undivided interest in oil that paid me $2 a month, until it stopped paying. I do not know what happened to it. One may say that a principle is involved, but in our present complicated economic situation, how is it possible to find a man who would not have a few shares of oil stock? If he lives 63 years more, when he will be over 100, and has a long gray beard, he will get his second $10,000 back.

He has another investment of $10,000 in oil. That is very complicated, Madam President. I believe it is a one-thirteenth of one twenty-first over 64 undivided interest. If anyone will get out his logarithms and slide rule and quadratics, he can figure it out. I do not know even whether under Texas law he can sell it.

It can be argued, possibly, that because he gets $325 a month out of oil it will warp his judgment. I do not believe so.

I was on the other side when John Connally first showed up in Washington. I have seen his operations. I have a

little faith in him. I cannot imagine a man who has devoted so much time to the defense of his country letting his country down for a few paltry dollars. There must be some emphasis on character in these situations. If a man of solid character cannot rise above some of these considerations, we are sunk as a country. I believe we overdo the business of conflict of interest. We get into all sorts of incongruities with respect to it. I heard what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said. He said, "Of course, you can divest yourself of it, but that is not the whole story." He said, "Can you divest yourself of the indoctrination you got when you were identified with the industry?"

Why did not the Senator raise that question with Arthur Goldberg, who since 1920 has been identified with labor? In the Labor Committee I said, "Mr. Goldberg, after all your identification, do you think you can divest yourself of that indoctrination?"

He said, "I think I can, and I will work at it." I believe he will. It depends on what shoe one wears. I believe that John Connally is big enough to divest himself of any indoctrination or inclination or feeling or affection or tendency or anything else that might color his judgment so far as the job of Secretary of the Navy is concerned.

The second point made is his identity with the industry. The testimony is clear. He did not know anything about the lobbying activities insofar as they affected the Superior Oil Co. or Mr. Keck. He was a hired man. What is wrong with it? When all of that business was going on, the first man who walked into my door was a former U.S. Senator. He was representing the other side. I said, "Are you getting a good, big fee?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "Can I help you get it made bigger? I disagree with you, but go back and tell the people who hired you that after all you did in trying to sell me, you have failed. You deserve a bigger fee than you are getting for the sweat you put in trying to convert the Senator from Illinois."

He was a hired man. He had a right to come into my office.

John Connally had a right to come into my office because he was working for pay. I do not believe that is any reason for rejecting him or reflecting upon him.

He testified that his family owns an interest in an oil well or has some oil stock and that he owns some insurance stock, a mutual fund stock, but that that is limited. It is Insurance Securities, Inc. It is a mutual fund, and under its charter it cannot buy stock other than insurance stock. So we see that it cannot buy any oil stock, and, therefore, there is no great conflict of interest.

I cannot believe that a man who owns roughly 7½ percent of two sixty-fourths of an undivided interest in West Texas land comes within the purview of the conflict-of-interest statute. He bought an undivided interest in a piece of land. If there were no oil under it, obviously, not a single question would ever be raised.

I am willing to take John Connally's word on it, and I am willing to take a chance on his character, having seen him in action, and having seen him perform, and knowing, of course, that he was a candid witness before the committee and laid it all on the table. I still think that we can pretty well know a man like that. Therefore, I trust his nomination will be approved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I wish to take only a moment to discuss the nomination. I was one of those who had some doubts when the nomination was sent to the Senate, as to whether it was a wise course for the then President-elect to take. Even though I knew Mr. Connally only casually, that casual acquaintance was one that was impressive. I found him to be a very friendly, sociable, and intelligent man. It was quite clear that he was, as the record indicates and as the press reports indicate, identified with oil.

I have listened to the arguments. I have listened to the Senator from Oregon. He made an able argument. He made a restrained argument and a responsible argument. I have listened to the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin. He has been exceedingly careful in his argument not to impugn the character of the nominee, or in any way impair his effectiveness when and if his nomination is confirmed.

I have read the columns in the newspapers which relate to Mr. Connally. As a result, I decided to call up Mr. Connally and have my own kind of cross-examination of him. I read the testimony given before the Committee on Armed Services on January 8, 1961. I also read a number of news stories and columns concerning the alleged activities of Mr. Connally. I asked Mr. Connally to come to my office this morning at 10 o'clock, and he did.

When he arrived I had all of the so-called evidence laid out across the desk. I said, "Mr. Connally, I want to be very frank with you. First of all, on two counts I should like to support your nomination. First, I consider you to be a good man. You are a patriot. Your record demonstrates that. Secondly, you have been named by the President, a man whom I supported for the office of President and one who, I gather, looks to me for some support for his program. On the basis of those two counts, I should like to tell you openly that I want to support your nomination, and that I shall do so. But, Mr. Connally, before I can give you that kind of assurance—not that, perhaps, it is so significant to you—I want to ask you about a dozen questions. I want you to give me some frank answers. I do not want any diplomatic talk: 'Maybe' or 'could be'; I want 'yes' and 'no,' and I want some facts."

I spent 40 minutes with Mr. Connally. During that time I called the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. Then we, together, had some discussion with Mr. Connally. I may say right now that the Senator from Wisconsin cross-examined Mr. Connally very carefully. The Senator from Wisconsin at no time indicated anything else but a high regard and personal respect for Mr. Connally in terms of his character, his ability, and his competence. But he said, with equal candor, that he had serious doubts as to whether the Secretary-designate of the Department of the Navy could administer his office without, at least, bordering upon a conflict of interest. I believe I state the case rather fairly.

I have given this question a great deal of what might be called soul-searching thought. I do not believe it is right for a Senator to call upon his colleagues to share in an experience that relates to the integrity of the man as well as the job without standing up and giving his own point of view, once he has gone through this experience.

I came to the conclusion that if I were both the judge and the jury, or either the judge or the jury, after listening to all the testimony of Mr. Connally, I would have to vote "not guilty"; and I would further have to say, "You have a good record. You are worthy of the trust that has been reposed in you by those with whom you will be associated and by those who are called upon to confirm the nomination."

So I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Connally.

I shall advert, however, to the fact that I think the oil industry gets far too many special considerations. I have no intention of changing my point of view about the depletion allowance. I am always aware of the activities of the so-called gas lobby. I believe in Federal regulation of the gas industry. I shall be watching with a careful eye every activity of this administration relating to the conservation and regulation of our natural resources.

But, having said that, I do not believe we have a right to be suspicious of a man, particularly when the evidence demonstrates that he is a man who is able to keep his word, a man of integrity, a man who has divested himself of any interest, if he ever had any, that was in conflict with the Government or his position.

I remind Senators that I do not think a single one of us can take the position that there is any evidence available that the Secretary-designate of the Navy will in any way put his private interests above the public interests. For him to do so would, first of all, be to betray the man who appointed him—the President of the United States. The President, as a former Member of this body and also of the House of Representatives, voted repeatedly, as did the Senator from Minnesota, on the question of the taxation of the oil industry and the regulation of the gas industry.

So, first, of all, if the nominee were to place his private interests above the public interest, he would betray the man who appointed him to his position. Secondly, he would expose himself to public scorn. I cannot believe he would do that.

We do not confirm the nomination of a man on the basis that he is a good fellow. Of course, we need good fellows, but we need, more than that, men of good character, courage, and integrity. I hope, and I believe, that Mr. Connally possesses most of those qualities, if not all.

I cannot believe that a man who is 43 years of age, who has worked himself up in the world, who was a child of rela-

tively poor parents, and who got a college education by his own efforts would stand in the way of research for the fuel that is necessary to keep America strong. I cannot imagine that a man who gave 5 years to his country in the Navy would stand in the way of research for atomic fuel for our Navy or for whatever other mechanisms or vehicles are required for our defense. I think Mr. Connally is more on the spot than someone else would be. The public eye will be upon him.

I have the feeling that a man who is able, energetic, and intelligent, as John Connally is, will perhaps make the Department of the Navy hum.

I say to my own good friends that one of the qualifications of a New Frontiersman is to have a little zip, vim, vitality, and perhaps a shot of vitamins, so that we can be up and at it 18 hours a day.

I believe Mr. Connally has those qualities. I hope he has. I urge upon him that he have that sense of mission.

I trust his nomination will be confirmed, so as to demonstrate that we in the Senate first rely upon a man's character and recognize at all times that we have ways of supervising him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, in connection with my remarks about the former Strauss nomination, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "An Obiter Dictum of Some Antiquarian Interest," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of January 17, 1961; and an editorial entitled "Conflict of Interest," published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1961.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1961]

AN OBITER DICTUM OF SOME ANTIQUARIAN INTEREST

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Shortly after midnight, June 19, 1959, the Senate by a vote of 49 to 46 declined to confirm President Eisenhower's nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Commerce. Many of the Senators who voted to reject, including the majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, gave no reason for participating in an action by which the President of the United States has only on eight occasions been overruled in his Cabinet selections.

Senator Kennedy generalized the rejection as a disagreeable job done in the national interest. But others of the 49 explained they voted against Strauss' confirmation because, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, he had been active in behalf of negotiating the Dixon-Yates contract.

As sometimes before when the Senate has sought more popular ground on which to base an action dominated by partisan politics and/or personal vendetta, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, had provided it. Senators MCGEE and O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, had already done some effective scouting in the area. Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, had previously made it clear to some Democrats who were disposed to vote for Strauss that he would take rejection as an endorsement of his position in the longstanding controversy between him and the AEC Chairman. And news reporters had found a strong impression in the Democratic cloakroom that a vote against Strauss would be far from displeasing to Majority Leader JOHNSON, who eventually also voted to reject the nomination.

Then rose Senator MORSE to say as follows: "I do not deny that Mr. Strauss is probably a very intelligent man * * *. I do not think he is disloyal to our country and our form of government. [Strauss had been accused of obstructing the right of Congress to be given executive information within its constitutional sphere.] * * * I do not find that Mr. Strauss has used his powers or office, or will use them, to enrich himself * * *. There is no indication of [his] personal conflict of interest."

"But," he continued, "the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has given the Senate a carefully documented account of the Dixon-Yates scandal and the role Mr. Strauss played in its negotiation, * * * [and] in his effort to foist this illegal contract upon the country Mr. Strauss was an enemy of the American people."

Last week the Supreme Court decided, six to three, that this contract between the Government and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. (the Dixon-Yates combine) was indeed illegal and therefore unenforcible. Chief Justice Warren, for the Court, upheld the Department of Justice's claim to this effect, on the ground that the role of Adolphe E. Wenzell as a Budget Bureau consultant in the negotiation of the contract, while retaining his connection with and pay from the First Boston Corp., violated the conflict-of-interest statute. The Chief Justice held it to be irrelevant that the Budget Bureau sought and encouraged Wenzell's participation with full knowledge of his dual role. And he rejected a Court of Claims award, made on the basis of this knowledge, to the M.V.G. Co. of about $1.9 million for costs it had incurred in preparations to execute the Government-signed contract.

However, the Chief Justice wrote by way of dictum, "True as it is" that Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau knew of "his activities and of his interest in First Boston, it is significant, we think, that: * * * No one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project."

It is also significant, though now of mere antiquarian interest to anyone but the victim of the charge made by MORSE and other Democrats as a principal reason for rejecting Strauss, that in this period he was Chairman of that very AEC in which no one knew of the duality of Wenzell and which had been reluctant at all times to negotiate the contract. But it is characteristic of politics, and therefore, not at all significant that no Senator who made the charge against Strauss of "an effort to foist this illegal contract on the country" has taken any notice whatever of the finding to the exact contrary by the entire Supreme Court, dissenters included.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 12, 1961]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In confirming the patent conflict of interest that existed in the controversial Dixon-Yates contract of 1954, the Supreme Court has done what the U.S. Court of Claims should have done 18 months ago. Adolphe H. Wenzell of the First Boston Corp., who acted as the agent of the Government in helping to arrange a contract for a private utility combination to furnish power to the Tennessee Valley Authority, was in a possible position to benefit financially from the transaction.

The fact that his interest was only indirect, as noted by Justice Harlan in a dissenting opinion joined by Justices Whittaker and Stewart, does not negate the applicability of the conflict-of-interest statute. Wenzell's primary allegiance as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget "was to First Boston," Chief Justice Warren observed for the Court majority, and "his loyalty to the Government was a fleeting one."

The Dixon-Yates contract was contrived by the Bureau of the Budget so as to avoid construction of the new TVA power facilities and still permit TVA to continue serving plants of the Atomic Energy Commission. The particular point at issue was whether the private firms represented in the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. could recover damages from the Government because the contract was canceled.

Contrary to the 3 to 2 decision of the Court of Claims in 1959, the Supreme Court ruled that the company is not entitled to damages even though it was guilty of no wrongdoing, because the contract was tainted. Sponsors of the contract, the Court noted, recognized Wenzell's conflict of interest almost at the beginning, but continued negotiating with him.

Several conclusions emerge from this wretched bungle. The first is that, whatever Mr. Wenzell's fault, the basic responsibility was that of the Bureau of the Budget. The conflict of interest, in the Court's words, "was directly caused by high officials of the Bureau of the Budget." The Atomic Energy Commission, which came into the proceedings at a later date, was not to blame for the details. That is a point made repeatedly by this newspaper. It is a substantial vindication of former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, even though Mr. Strauss complicated his own position by his dogged defense of the contract.

Second, the role of the administration throughout the matter was, to say the least, devious and ambiguous. After siring the contract, the administration disowned its child and sought to leave others—particularly the Dixon-Yates group—holding the wet baby. The antecedent of this slick maneuver was a doctrinaire political effort to cripple the TVA as an example of creeping socialism. It is an affair that sheds no glory on any of the principals, from the President on down.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have listened with great interest to the debate this afternoon on the nomination by the President of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy. I have known John Connally for a number of years, because he served as an administrative assistant in both the House and the Senate. I have known him in Texas and outside Texas. I have nothing but the highest regard for him. I believe him to be a man of good character. I think his record is not impeachable. I hope, most sincerely, that the Senate will confirm his nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the majority leader whether he proposes to have the Senate complete action today on all nominations that were submitted; and whether it is his intention to have the Senate adjourn over until Wednesday or Thursday, in the event we complete action on the nominations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in response to the question of the distinguished minority leader, it is the hope of the leadership that we can finish action on all the nominations before us today. Several Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who has a speech to make and will do so, desire to address the Senate. It is my hope that if we can finish action on the nominations today, we can adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, the results of the actions of Mr. Connally as Secretary of the Navy may very well be felt within the oil industry. I do not assume that any Senator who, out of the good judgment of his thoughtful mind, votes for Mr. Connally will not hesitate to take whatever position he may feel obliged to take with reference to the oil industry, and with reference to the part of Texas in the oil industry. That I would accept and recognize. But, most of all, I wish to express appreciation, on behalf of our State, for its native son, and hope that the body of the Senate will consider him and accept him on the basis of his qualifications and on the basis of his stature as a man.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I realize that the die is cast and that this nomination will be confirmed. I am certainly the last Member of the Senate who wishes to labor a question or to speak unnecessarily for the RECORD.

I feel, however, in view of the fact that I am chairman of the committee which considered the nomination, that in all justice to Mr. Connally and the members of his family, I should make a brief statement.

I listened with avid interest to all that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] had to say on this subject. He started by talking about facts. I listened to all the inferences, imputations, and innuendoes. As nearly as I could understand them, two facts were stated that bear on this question.

One of them is the fact—and, Madam President, I say very frankly that I am stating this for the RECORD, particularly for the benefit of those who will read it, in justice to Mr. Connally—that Mr. Connally may later serve again as executor of the S. W. Richardson estate. Almost every month that Congress is in session, as well as whenever a session of Congress begins, the Senate confirms the nominations of persons who leave a great law practice, and who say that while they serve the country, they will not receive any fees from that law practice. But after they leave the Government service, they return to that practice. So let us not apply only to Mr. Connally what the Senator from Wisconsin has said on that point. In that connection, I think also of Robert Stevens, who will be remembered for his controversy with the late Senator McCarthy. Mr. Stevens left a great textile empire; and everyone knew that when he left the secretaryship of the Army he proposed to return to that empire. In fact, I could cite dozens of instances of men who severed their connections with private industry when they entered Government service, but thereafter returned to their former employment or activities.

The Ford Motor Co. has had contracts with the Government; but no one has asked Mr. McNamara to make an oath that he will not later return to the Ford Motor Co., and I do not think he should be called upon to make a statement of that kind. So when such a rule is invoked, let those who read the RECORD know it will be the first time it has been invoked. Never before has it been claimed that, following service to his Government, a man should not return, in good faith, to a concern with which he previously was connected, although he severed those connections during the time when he served the Government of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, at this point will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. Connally stated unequivocally that he would remain 4 years or for as long as he was asked or as long as was desired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, he said he would continue to serve for as long as his services were satisfactory to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the nominee did not sever his connections with the Richardson estate. He continues as executor, but simply foregoes the earnings during this period, but with the clear understanding that as soon as the period is over, he may accept the earnings, and certainly with the absolute expectation that he would do so. My point is that if Mr. McNamara continued to be president of the Ford Motor Co., but received no compensation during this period, the two situations would be analogous, and I think there would be a conflict of interest.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is simply splitting hairs very fine; but the Senator knows that has been true of all the points he has made in this debate.

The other charge that has been made here is that because Mr. Connally receives some return—a certain number of dollars a month—from an oil well, that disqualifies him. However, everyone knows that the petroleum from the well is sold in its raw state, as it comes from the well, whereas the Government uses only petroleum products, after they have been refined. So I submit it would be just as logical to say that the Senate should not confirm the nomination of a wheat farmer to serve in a position of importance in the Government, simply because the various armed services purchase large quantities of flour. If one argument holds true, the other would. This is a very tenuous argument, and we have never gone that far in any application of the conflict-of-interest rule. Never before has it been claimed that because a man has sold a raw product to a processor and because some of the processed commodity may eventually find its way into Government use, the one who sold the raw product should be disqualified from serving the Government. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that an attempt has been made to apply such a rule.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HART. Do I correctly understand that there has been read into the RECORD the portion of the hearings which showed that this point was made by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]? Did not the Senator from Georgia ask Mr. Connally directly whether the estate of which Mr. Connally is executor had sold oil to the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I did. I approached this subject with some qualms, because I thought the Richardson estate had some dealings with the Government. But it was shown that this could not possibly involve a conflict of interest, because even the S. W. Richardson estate does not do any direct business with the Government.

Mr. HART. I appreciate the Senator's answer. I understood that the matter had been referred to in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, and I have already read it into the RECORD.

Mr. HART. I am sorry that I did not know that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I do not wish to go into all the charges to the effect that the oil industry is suspect. For my part, I do not approve of all the advantages the oil industry has, under present laws. But I do not propose to condemn a person who has worked in the oil industry merely because the Congress has not seen fit to correct all the complications and eliminate some of the inequities in those statutes. However, that would be done in this case, if the charges to which we have listened today were to be supported. We have been told, today, that it is improper for this nominee to serve in this office, because he has been connected with the oil business. However, I submit that is an unjust position to take.

The nominee has stated his qualifications. He has been a lawyer. He was engaged in various capacities as a lawyer before he became connected with Mr. Richardson. He served in Washington; I knew him during that period, and formed a very high opinion of him. That high opinion was enhanced after he left Washington. He spent 5 years in the Navy in a variety of assignments. He was cited on two occasions for heroism in combat. Later he was brought back to Washington. He is familiar with the Navy, and he is qualified in every respect, by virtue of his background.

I think it is a compliment to him that he was sought to represent an operation as large as the one S. W. Richardson had; and unless there is some direct conflict of interest, that fact in itself is a tribute, because businesses of that size employ only the most efficient of those whose services are available.

Mr. Connally was judged to be an extremely outstanding officer when he served as radar and radio officer, and later as fighter direction officer, on the aircraft carrier *Essex*, and when for a time he also served as CIC officer for Task Group 38.1, during which service he participated in many actions in the Pacific. In connection with his service there, Admiral Sprague observed him to be an extremely outstanding officer; and Admiral Sprague, who was in command of Task Group 38.1, said the nominee's work was, in great part, responsible for the success of the task group.

The nominee was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with combat "V", and a citation reading in part as follows:

For heroic achievement while serving as fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex* during a concentrated attack by enemy (Japanese) aircraft against that vessel in the forward Pacific area on April 6, 1945.

He received the Gold Star in lieu of the second Bronze Star Medal, but it was rescinded in favor of the Legion of Merit, with combat "V"; and the citation read in part as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as force fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex* in later combat.

Madam President, I ask that these citations of Mr. Connally, as taken from his official record in the service of his country, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with combat "V," and citation, in part, as follows: "For heroic achievement while serving as fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex* during a concentrated attack by enemy Japanese aircraft against that vessel in the forward Pacific area on April 6, 1945. Alert and aggressive in the performance of duty as an overwhelming force of hostile planes flew in over the task group, Lieutenant Connally rendered gallant and effectual service in coordinating a determined and prompt aerial offensive and, by his professional skill, brilliant tactics, and cool courage in the face of grave peril, contributed essentially to the success of embarked planes in shooting down 69 Japanese aircraft and to the security of the *Essex* from all damage."

A Gold Star in lieu of the second Bronze Star Medal was awarded, but rescinded in favor of the Legion of Merit, with combat "V," citation to which follows, in part: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as force fighter director officer on board the U.S.S. *Essex*, flagship of Task Force 58, from July 7, 1944, to June 26, 1945; and later as task group fighter director on the staff of Commander Fast Carrier Task Group 38.1, with flag in the U.S.S. *Bennington* during operations against Japanese forces at sea and against the Japanese mainland from June 26 to August 28, 1945. An officer of resourcefulness, mature judgment, and clarity of mind, Lieutenant Connally effected notable improvements in fighter director and CIC policy and doctrine. His practical application of these doctrines together with his thorough knowledge of aerial tactics made possible the utilization of the air power available to cause maximum destruction of Japanese planes threatening our forces and to afford the greatest protection for elements of the carrier task group. * * * By his distinctive service in this vital phase of operations, (he) made a substantial contribution to the success of our offensives in the major campaigns conducted during this period, thereby upholding the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I think that no charge that has been made in this RECORD justifies the Senate's even considering disapproving the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Armed Services that this nomination be confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I desire to join the Senator from Georgia in stating that this nomination should be confirmed by the Senate. I had intended to make additional remarks on the nomination. However, in view of the lateness of the hour, and also in view of the statements which already have been made, I shall not speak further at this time, except to say that in the committee we went into this situation as thoroughly as we possibly could. Those who knew Mr. Connally personally gave him a very high endorsement. Certainly his qualifications, on the basis of what he has done in the past, and his statement of what he is giving up in order to take up the duties of the position to which he has been nominated, indicate, I believe, that he will make an excellent Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, I have known John Connally a good many years. He is a friend of mine and of many of us, and the more one is in this profession, the more one values friendships one has grown to cherish. Nevertheless, if I did not believe he would be an outstanding Secretary of the Navy, most certainly I would not vote for him.

Another matter that occurs as we continue to pursue this whole question of conflict of interest, in the executive branch, is the paradox of applying to the members of the executive branch rules we do not apply at all to ourselves. It seems to me that the statutes on conflict of interest should embrace us all through full disclosure.

Mr. Connally came before our committee after many years of Government service, and after having achieved that high record of distinction in combat and elsewhere so well presented to us by the senior Senator from Georgia, distinguished chairman of the committee before which the nominee appeared. In his presentation, Mr. Connally assured us he has done everything he should do in order to comply with both the spirit and letter of the conflict-of-interests law.

I have complete respect for those who do not believe Mr. Connally is the right man for this job. But, I cannot agree with them. I believe that John Connally has proved many times by his previous record that whatever he does in this new position will be done in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield, but I agreed to yield to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I shall take only a moment or two. I merely wish to associate myself with those favorable comments that have been made about John Connally. It has been my privilege to have known him 10 years. He is obviously a man of great ability, or he would not have accomplished the many things he has done. He is a man who has proved that he is a patriot. He has demonstrated that he has character. He has stated he will do only that which is in the best interests of his country. I certainly believe his record entitles him to be believed. I know he will be an outstanding Secretary of the Navy. Because almost every Senator feels that way, I believe his nomination will be overwhelmingly confirmed.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly shall not detain the Senate long, but I have followed this matter from the first mention of Mr. Connally's name, through the hearings, and until the argument today.

The one outstanding thing that impresses me is the unanimity as to this man's character, his capacity, and his valued and varied experience. It is my very definite conclusion that it is to the benefit of the Navy and the Government that those experiences include some very practical experience in oil matters, problems, and questions, and how to deal with Navy purchase of oil, and other related matters. It is crystal clear to me that, whoever does so, will have to do it at arm's length; and I am sure that he, representing the Government, will be a man of very fine capacity and excellent judgment on that as well as other subjects.

If I may make a comparison, it reminds me very much of 8 years ago, when a gentleman unknown to this group and to Washington came here from Texas with a similar background, to a degree. He was manager of the Waggoner estate, as I recall, which included vast oil interests. His name was Robert Anderson. His nomination as Secretary of the Navy was first confirmed in the Senate. His nomination as Deputy Secretary of Defense was later confirmed. Later his nomination as Secretary of the Treasury was confirmed. He retired last week with one of the best records on achievement, and with the very highest respect of every Member of this body, as well as of the people of the Nation.

I think it may well be that the record of the present nominee will almost parallel and almost equal that of Mr. Anderson.

I wish there could be a unanimous vote on the nomination, but I hope that every Senator will seriously consider it, and that the Senate will overwhelmingly confirm the nomination.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I shall be very proud to vote to confirm John Connally's nomination. It was my privilege to know him very briefly while he was here in Washington. I believe he will make a fine Secretary of the Navy. I think the record very well supports that belief based on the experience of those who know him.

Madam President, I would not want the RECORD to be closed, however, by an

inference anywhere that purchases of oil from naval reserves represent any significant portion of the oil production of this country. It is my impression that less than 6 million barrels a year are produced from U.S. naval reserves. The private producers produce about 6 million barrels a day. So one can see that the production of U.S. naval reserves is only about one-quarter of 1 percent of the oil production of this country. I do not think any major oil company would regard the U.S. Navy as being a competitor in the production of oil, with only one-quarter of 1 percent of the oil production of the country, and that being produced mostly in areas where there is production offsetting Navy reserves.

If someone owns land alongside naval reserves and is producing oil from that land, in order to prevent oil from being drained away from the naval reserves the Navy is required to drill offsetting wells. There his been no competitive conflict between private oil and naval oil production.

Insofar as naval purchases of oil are concerned, there are no purchases, so far as we know, from the Sid Richardson estate. All purchase of oil is completely competitive in this country, and is based on competitive conditions throughout the entire industry. No one is willing to pay any more than the going market price throughout the country.

So I really cannot see that there is any basis for the charge of conflict of interest because someone happens to have some interest in oil production.

As one who represents an oil-producing State, I very much look forward to the United States advancing its capacity to use atomic power. It is essential to the defense of this country and the protection of our freedom. I think it is completely unfair to suggest that anyone in the oil industry, including the major oil companies, should hold back the maximum development of atomic power which is in the best interests of the United States. Certainly the interest of Mr. Connally, who has merely a royalty interest of $325 a month, involves no conflict of interest. It would be like saying that no one could represent the Treasury if that person were a taxpayer himself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall, no doubt, as I recall, that we did not provide atomic power for the new aircraft carrier last year, because we believed it would be more valuable to us if it burned oil. It is not clear that we are going to equip every new ship with atomic power, by any means.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is true. If atomic power reaches a point where it can be used competitively, at a lower cost, it may be desirable to have all Navy ships in the future constructed to use atomic power. At present this is a very high cost fuel, as the Senator knows. So far as I have been able to determine, it is not the most economical fuel for the Navy, although in many cases it will prove to be the most desirable.

Even if such were the case, the use of petroleum as a fuel will continue to expand for many years in the future. There is a tremendous growing demand in the automotive industry, to cite only one example.

I shall be happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of John Connally, who I believe will make a very able and competent Secretary of the Navy. I am certain that he will serve the Nation admirably.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, John Connally is an able and dedicated man. He is a true patriot. He has made a fine record in peace and in war. It is my opinion, he will be a great Secretary of the Navy, and I shall take pleasure in casting my vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. BEALL. Madam President, I rise to support the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., to be Secretary of the Navy.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I was present during the hearings on this appointment. Not only does Mr. Connally possess the necessary background and ability to discharge the duties of this office—but, he has a record of distinguished service in both Government and civilian endeavors.

The Governor of my State, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, has given Mr. Connally a strong recommendation.

There has been some suggestion of a possible conflict of interest in this case.

Madam President, the testimony before the Armed Services Committee should remove any doubts concerning the nominee's ability to render impartial service.

I intend to support the nomination of Mr. Connally with the knowledge that his record proves him to be a man of ability, dedication, and integrity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, if there is no objection I should like to ask unanimous consent that the other nominations for positions in the Department of Defense with respect to which no opposition has been recorded be confirmed. The Senate is in executive session.

NOMINATION OF EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES JOHNSTON HITCH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF PAUL H. NITZE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR SYLVESTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. MORRIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF CYRUS ROBERTS VANCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH V. CHARYK, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF LYLE S. GARLOCK, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JAMES HENRY WAKELIN, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

NOMINATIONS OF BYRON R. WHITE, OF COLORADO, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL; OF ARCHIBALD COX, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; AND OF H. W. BRAWLEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General; of Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States; and of H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General; be considered en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed by the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of Senators, the remaining nomination is that of Mr. Chester Bowles. The nomination will be considered after the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] concludes his speech.

OUR BUDGETARY PROBLEMS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I wish to speak today about the budget of the United States, recently presented to us by President Eisenhower, and about its relation to President Kennedy's financial programs as he forecast them during his campaign.

During the campaign, President Kennedy made a speech in New York City to the Associated Business Publications Conference on October 12, 1960. In this speech he set forth his views on American economic policy. These views were reiterated and emphasized in a statement issued in Philadelphia on October 30, 1960.

The principles expressed by President Kennedy in his speech in New York and in the statement released in Philadelphia, in my judgment, are sound and constructive and should be followed by this Congress.

Speaking of the budget, President Kennedy advocated using this tool positively—as an instrument of economic stabilization. He said in his New York speech, as I myself have advocated for many years, that the budget should be more than balanced over the whole period of the business cycle, and that the public debt should be reduced when business is operating at a high level. Failure to heed this principle has cost us dearly in the past. For instance, a major factor contributing to maladjustments in our economy in 1960 was the large deficit which faced the Treasury in calendar 1959—generally a year of rapid recovery and expanding activity—throwing the Treasury into competition with private industry for the Nation's savings.

To achieve all of the necessary things which we hope to accomplish in the years ahead, I believe strongly that we must bring fiscal policy under control and use it effectively to contribute to stability. We must not commit ourselves to programs of extraordinary expenditure in periods of temporary slack, which will carry over and come to fruition in periods when we are pressing our capacity to produce the growth that we need and expect.

If extraordinary expenditures are really necessary to combat economic recession, these can and must be made. But they must be accompanied by measures which will assure that the balance is reversed rapidly as recovery proceeds. We must not again permit, as in calendar 1959, a large Federal deficit to converge on the financial markets at the same time that growing demands, stemming from rapid recovery in the private sector, also converge upon them. This pushes up interest rates unnecessarily and places the Treasury in a nearly intolerable position.

For specific examples of such expenditure programs, let us look at several of the Federal housing programs. From the viewpoint of the current budget, one of the most expensive is public housing, where local communities build or acquire projects with borrowed funds and the Federal Government pledges itself to make whatever annual contributions are needed, over and above net operating receipts, to amortize the costs of construction or acquisition.

In fiscal 1961, the Federal Government's payment of annual contributions toward eligible projects is estimated in the budget document to be almost $152 million; in fiscal 1962, as much as $169 million may be required. As large as these amounts are, they are only part of the story. The Federal Government has committed itself to pay annual contributions over a period of up to 40 years—and only thereafter may some of these outlays eventually be recovered. On the basis of contracts already executed or authorized, the Federal Government has agreed to pay maximum annual contributions of up to about $258 million yearly for this one program.

Nor is that all. In addition, the Federal Government expends millions of dollars annually toward administering the low-rent program; in fiscal 1961 alone, it is estimated that these administrative expenses will exceed $13 million. The United States loses millions of dollars more through Federal tax exemption of bonds issued by local housing authorities to finance the subsidized projects.

Last year's omnibus housing bill (S. 3670), which passed the Senate, provided for authority to build 25,000 more public housing units involving an estimated development cost of $625 million over the 40-year life of the loans. This bill did not become law, but I understand pressure is being brought to bear to ask for 100,000 more units in 1961. This would mean an additional Federal Government commitment of nearly $2½ billion over a 40-year period.

Another housing program requiring large amounts of Federal funds is the urban renewal program. Contract authority totaling $2 billion has been authorized so far for urban renewal. Present law calls for the Federal Government to pay $2 in grants for every $1 in local contributions toward the net cost of urban renewal projects. This ratio of two-thirds is excessive. Our cities could and should carry a larger share of the total burden.

On a number of occasions, the proposal has been made to reduce the Federal share to 50 percent, which would make it consistent with a number of other Federal programs. Unfortunately, the Congress did not approve this change in the formula, but I believe it should be seriously considered again this year. There is no reason why Federal aid to cities for city land improvement should be at any greater ratio than soil conservation aid to farmers for farmland improvement—a 50–50 program.

If urban renewal assistance were extended on a 50–50 basis rather than under the present 2-to-1 formula, a given amount of Federal aid could be used to finance a greater number of urban renewal projects. Alternatively, less aid would be required to underwrite a given number of projects, thus reducing budgetary expenditures. Currently, for instance, $1 million in Federal urban renewal grants are needed to underwrite a project with a total net cost of $1½ million. Under a 50–50 formula, the same $1 million in Federal grants would be stretched one-third by helping to finance not only the $1½ million project but also an additional project costing as much as $500,000. Alternatively, the Federal Government would save one-fourth in urban renewal grants by paying out $750,000 rather than $1 million toward the $1½ million project.

Our cities could well afford to carry a larger share. The city of Hartford, Conn., for instance, was recently reported to have invested $1,350,000 in one urban renewal project. In return for this investment, the assessed value of the property in the renewal area will increase from $2 million to an estimated

$35 million at the completion of the project. This will yield taxes of approximately $1 million yearly to the city. The same kind of analysis has been made in many other places, and I believe the substantial benefits to cities require their carrying a larger share of the cost.

These examples from the housing field show the dangers of rushing into vast expenditure programs that tend to change only in one direction—upward—and hence increase the difficulty of adhering to the principles I mentioned earlier.

Fiscal policy must, of course, be kept in proper balance with monetary policy. Regarding the monetary structure, President Kennedy said in his same address in New York City that he did not "advoacte any changes in the constitution of the Federal Reserve System. It is important to keep the day-to-day operations of the Federal Reserve removed from political pressures."

To this I say "amen." I earnestly hope that President Kennedy will never tamper with the independence and objectivity of this great institution, established during the administration of President Wilson, largely as the result of the untiring efforts of Senator Glass and other members of the Democratic Party.

President Kennedy did say that we should have "a flexible, balanced, and, above all, a coordinated monetary and fiscal policy." Properly conceived, such a policy would use all the available instruments—budget surpluses, expenditure reductions, and monetary restraint—to check an inflationary spiral. Such a policy should go far toward minimizing, if not eliminating, the need for counterrecessionary action because it would prevent the maladjustments that lead to recession.

During the campaign, President Kennedy criticized the rate of economic growth which the United States has shown during recent years under the Republican administration. But in pledging to follow policies which will raise the rate of economic growth, he also promised to maintain traditionally conservative financial policies.

To combine at the same time the pursuit of an accelerated rate of economic growth and a balanced budget will require careful and precise policy formulation, and the full cooperation of labor and management to prevent the wage-price spiral. Appropriate policies will have to be executed with near-perfect timing. Our new President is aware that he must sail a difficult course between the Scylla of inadequate growth and the Charybdis of unbalanced and inflationary budgets. I am hopeful that President Kennedy can accomplish this difficult feat of navigation. I wish him well in his attempt, and I personally intend to give him my wholehearted support in achieving those objectives.

In order to accelerate our economic growth, however, we must continue to reject any proposal to depreciate the currency. That would lead, not to growth, but to decay. Previous experience in artificially supporting the price of Government securities by Federal Reserve purchases proves that such steps undermine the soundness of our money—both at home and abroad—and depreciate the integrity of our economic leadership.

Fortunately, these are not the things that President Kennedy proposed, in discussing the subject of economic growth. With respect to prices, he expressed specific concern for the "upward drift since World War II," and stated that "reasonable stability in the price level is a vital goal of economic policy." With regard to the endless expansion of bank credit involved in rigidly supporting the Government securities market by the central bank, he has generally recognized the need for flexible monetary policies and specifically acknowledged "monetary stringency as a potential method of curbing extravagant booms."

Turning now to foreign economic problems, our new President has acknowledged the need for proper concern about our balance of international payments and for keeping our financial house in order. In his economic speech delivered in New York City last October, he said;

> There is still no substitute—for the Nation as well as the individual—for a good cash position.

We can no longer feel isolated and protected from the rest of the world when it comes to our economic and financial dealings.

It is of the greatest importance that our exports of goods and services remain well above our imports in order to cover our essential international commitments—economic as well as military and diplomatic. We must maintain adequate military aid as well as military forces around the world. To do this requires a continuing substantial surplus of exports over imports. To the extent we continue to earn a substantial surplus, concern about the loss of foreign confidence in the dollar, about so-called hot money, and about the gold outflow, will eventually disappear.

But where do we stand now? One of the most dramatic signs of our current position is the gold situation, including the rapid increase in the gold outflow, the speculation in gold in foreign markets, and the related substantial deficit in U.S. balance of payments. In all years but one during the past decade, the United States has had a substantial unfavorable balance of payments amounting in all to a net figure of $17.6 billion. In 1958, the unfavorable balance was almost $3.5 billion; in 1959 it was over $3.8 billion. Although the average over the first half of 1960 was lower than this, in the third quarter the deficit in the balance of payments rose to an annual rate of over $4 billion.

Our stock of gold, which reached a peak of $24.6 billion toward the end of 1949, was down to approximately $17.8 billion last month, and is even $252 million lower than that today. In fact, since the end of 1957, our gold stock has dropped about $5 billion, or by more than one-fifth. During the fourth quarter of 1960, the outflow of gold was estimated to be over $900 million, which if continued over 1 calendar year would amount to more than $3½ billion. Had it not been for the special sale of $300 million of gold to the United States by the International Monetary Fund, the total outflow in the fourth quarter would have been greater than $1.2 billion. Moreover, it is probable that short-term liabilities to foreigners—other than international institutions—which have been increasing recently, substantially exceed our total stock of gold. Such short-term liabilities take the form chiefly of deposits in our banks, as well as Treasury bills and certificates, owned by foreign holders.

These trends cannot be permitted to continue. They must be stopped but not in a spirit of panic. After all, our gold supply still represents more than 40 percent of the total stock of gold throughout the entire free world. No other free government holds even one-fifth as much gold as we do.

What makes the situation particularly bad at the present time is that at least part of the current outflow of gold, and in particular the speculative flurries in the price of gold abroad, has reflected doubt that the United States seriously intends to do whatever is necessary to maintain a sound dollar. Unless we make it crystal clear that we firmly intend to maintain a sound dollar, we may expect that more and more of our short-term foreign liabilities will be exchanged for gold by foreigners fearing devaluation of the dollar.

Time does not now permit a full discussion of what we need to do to end the gold outflow and the unfavorable balance-of-payments situation. I should like, however, to stress three things. First, there must be cooperation between management and labor in industry to prevent price inflation, so that American commodities remain competitive in world markets. Second, we must adjust our foreign loans and grants to the drastic necessity for a balanced budget. In doing so, we must ask nations of the free world whose financial situations are increasingly strong to carry their fair share of the burden of our mutual security and the growth of underdeveloped areas that wish to be allied with the free world. Third, we must maintain a sound and stable domestic economy, both in order to keep our products in a competitive position with the rest of the world and in order to give complete assurance to foreigners that their funds will be safe in the United States.

Recently the pace of economic activity has slackened, causing doubts in the minds of the most optimistic that the budgets for fiscal 1961 or 1962 will be balanced. In the fourth quarter of last year, gross national product—representing our Nation's output of goods and services at market prices—remained at $503½ billion. This was only slightly below the seasonally adjusted annual rate of $505 billion in the second quarter, an alltime high. The small decline in gross national product has reflected a further cutback in business inventories which was nearly offset by an additional rise, to a record high, in all other demands for goods and services.

In December, the index of industrial production again declined and was 7 percent below the record level at the beginning of last year. The seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment rose to 6.8 percent. The parity ratio of the prices received and paid by farmers remained at 81. In November, consumer prices continued to rise slightly.

The Federal budget for the current fiscal year was originally supposed to provide a substantial surplus. Even as late as October, a surplus of more than $1 billion was expected. The budget document released recently, however, postulates only a minute surplus of $79 million with a larger surplus of $1,468 million in the following year.

I earnestly hope that both budgets will be balanced. But deficits rather than surpluses appear more likely even if one accepts the rosy prediction in the document:

> Higher production, employment, and income as the calendar year 1961 progresses.

Some assumptions, for instance, underlying the budget estimates appear highly questionable. To cite only one example: the small surplus of $79 million for fiscal 1961 is based upon the assumption that postal rates will be increased not later than April 1, 1961. The effect of this proposed increase, along with appropriate administrative action, would be to raise revenue by $160 million in the current fiscal year and by $843 million in 1962. Failure to adopt this single change, in other words, would unbalance the 1961 budget and more than halve the surplus for 1962.

But even the remaining surplus of $625 million for fiscal 1962 is contingent, as the budget document candidly points out, on adopting proposed legislation which would increase receipts and decrease expenditures by a total of over $3.2 billion, excluding the effects of the assumed increase in postal rates. Among the proposals is a $1 billion tax rate extension on corporation income taxes. Also included is a proposal, involving approximately $800 million, to raise the excise tax rate on aviation gasoline to 4½ cents per gallon, to impose the same excise tax rate on jet fuels, now untaxed, and to increase by ½ cent per gallon the present tax rate on motor fuels. A third proposal, involving $164 million, calls for the temporary prepayment of premiums by associations insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, at the rate of 2 percent annually on the net increases in savings in the institutions. If any of these proposed changes were not adopted, the remaining surplus for fiscal 1962 could well become a deficit of perhaps significant proportions.

Repeated deficits in 1961 and 1962, to the extent that they promoted inflationary developments in our domestic economy, would increase the foreign demand for gold in exchange for depreciated dollars. For this reason, plus the fact that we cannot permit ourselves to be priced out of international markets, we must proceed with great caution in adopting, however temporarily, any policies designed to expand the economy at the expense of inflation.

As long as deficits persist in our balance of payments, we cannot afford to follow free spending policies either at home or abroad. No one would really benefit if actions were taken prematurely in an effort to remedy the domestic economic situation or if prescribed remedies were administered in excessive doses. We should not overreact to a situation which may go far toward correcting itself if we adhere to the sound economic principles which I have discussed earlier.

In particular, I would like to reemphasize the admonition that we must avoid embracing crash programs that involve large commitments or expenditures in periods of economic slack which will, in fact, carry over to be honored during periods of prosperity. Such programs may not only fail to remedy the slack conditions they were designed to alleviate. They may also needlessly overtax our resources in more prosperous times, thus fostering unwelcome inflationary developments which lead to later domestic and international economic woes.

Even though Edmund Burke said that nations do not learn by experience, we are too young a nation to forget the fundamental principles upon which our national strength was built: faith in God, faith in our manifest destiny, a capacity for hard work, and a willingness to sacrifice. Any national program that appeals to our softness instead of our strength, that substitutes principles of the welfare state for those of private enterprise, and that advocates the support of the people by the government instead of the support of the government by the people, will give new significance to the Khrushchev boast that "we will bury you."

NOMINATION OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I desire to announce that the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness. Let the record show that were he present he would have been in favor of confirmation of all the nominations specifically submitted today by the President of the United States.

MANY MOVED BY CBS TELEVISION DOCUMENTARY "HARVEST OF SHAME" DEPICTING PLIGHT OF MIGRATORY WORKERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, last fall when I was traveling extensively in Wisconsin I was deeply impressed by a sudden and overwhelming wave of compassion for migratory workers. If an army of firebrand orators had swept into Wisconsin pleading with the 4 million people of my State to concern themselves with the plight of migrant farmworkers, their impact would not have compared to the effect caused by a single television program, the CBS documentary "Harvest of Shame."

It has been said that a picture is worth 10,000 words. Well, a moving picture of a 30-year-old woman who looks 60, bowed and broken by exploitation in excess toil since childhood, can arouse widespread concern when it is multiplied and related to the systematic, continuing misery which is the lot of the bulk of our migratory workers. This program enabled us to be firsthand witnesses of the unforgivable conditions in which these unfortunate people live. We witness the malnutrition bordering on starvation. We see the children working long hours in the fields at an age when they should be learning to read and write in school. We note the almost total lack of security, as the migratory workers remain at the mercy of the seasons, of their hiring bosses and crew leaders, and of the vagaries of a fluctuating farm economy.

This program touched an unusual chord of response in the American people. I was personally solicited on this matter over and over and over again in Wisconsin last fall. I receive a great many letters on a multitude of subjects. But rarely have I received such an outpouring of mail expressing concern about a social issue with which the correspondents had no direct connection. What the writers had in common was the fact that they had watched CBS television between 9:30 and 10:30 p.m., e.s.t., on the night of November 25, 1960. At that time they saw "Harvest of Shame," and having seen it they were moved to action.

The reporter for "Harvest of Shame" was the distinguished broadcaster Edward R. Murrow, and the producer was David Lowe, who did much of the on-the-spot camera work in the field which so movingly illustrated the plight of these "excluded Americans." The executive producer was Fred Friendly, and the program was sponsored by Philip Morris, Inc.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of "Harvest of Shame" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

> FIRST HAWKER. Seventy over here. Over here—70 cents.
>
> SECOND HAWKER. Over here—70 cents a day. We're paying today. We'll pay more and the longest hours. Seventy cents. Here we is today.

THIRD HAWKER. Seventy cents today. Seventy cents—all day jumping. All you have to do is——

FOURTH HAWKER. Eight cents a box and we guarantee you if you pull today and we pull what we got to pull today, you'll have $11 in your pocket.

Mr. MURROW. This scene is not taking place in the Congo. It has nothing to do with Johannesburg or Capetown. It is not Nyasaland or Nigeria. This is Florida. These are citizens of the United States, 1960. This is a shapeup for migrant workers.

The hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields. This is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best-fed people in the world get hired. One farmer looked at this and said, "We used to own our slaves, now we just rent them."

The Secretary of Labor looked at the migrant plight and said:

Mr. MITCHELL. I think they're the great mass of what I call the excluded Americans. They are people who cry out, workers and their children and their wives, who cry out for some assistance and whose plight is the shame—the shame of America.

Mr. MURROW. The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest farmers' organization, says:

Mr. SHUMAN. I think that most social workers will agree that it's better for a man to be employed, even if his capacity is such as to limit his income, and we take the position that it's far better to have thousands of these folks who are practically unemployable, earning some money, doing some productive work for at least a few days in the year.

Mr. MURROW. This is an American story that begins in Florida and ends in New Jersey and New York State with the harvest. It is a 1960 "grapes of wrath," that begins at the Mexican border in California and ends in Oregon and Washington. It is the story of men and women and children who work 136 days of the year, and average $900 a year. They travel in buses. They ride trucks. They follow the sun.

Mrs. DOBY. Well, I don't know. It don't look like we'll ever get ahead. I guess we'll just have to keep going till we can find something better.

Mr. MURROW. A minister named Cassidy who works with them says:

Mr. CASSIDY. They are just as bad as the slaves. Only in name they are not a slave, but in the way they are treated, they are worser than slaves. And somebody has made thousands of dollars out of his sweat? Is that a slave or not?

Mr. MURROW. They are the migrants, workers in the sweatshops of the soil, the Harvest of Shame.

This is CBS Reports, "Harvest Of Shame." It has to do with the men, women and children who harvest the crops in this country of ours, the best-fed Nation on earth. These are the forgotten people; the underprotected; the undereducated; the underclothed; the underfed. We present this report on Thanksgiving because were it not for the labor of the people you are going to meet, you might not starve, but your table would not be laden with the luxuries that we have all come to regard as essentials. We should like you to meet some of your fellow citizens who harvest the food for the best-fed Nation on earth.

David Lowe talks to Mrs. Doby, 34 years old, mother of nine children.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Doby, what things do you pick up north?

Mrs. DOBY. We pick strawberries and cherries.

Mr. LOWE. Who works with you out of this family here?

Mrs. DOBY. Everybody except the baby.

Mr. LOWE. Who takes care of them in the fields?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, they just kind of stay along with us, or take care of theirself. The one that can't walk usually stays in the baby buggy.

Mr. LOWE. What is an average dinner for the family?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, we just—you mean what do we have in——

Mr. LOWE. Yes.

Mrs. DOBY. We—well, I cook a pot of beans and fry some potatoes——

Mr. LOWE. Yes.

Mrs. DOBY. Some corn or something like that.

Mr. LOWE. How many quarts of milk do you buy for the children?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, we don't—I don't—we don't have milk except maybe when we draw our paycheck; we have milk about once a week.

Mr. LOWE. For all these children you have just——

Mrs. DOBY. The baby has, but—she is on the bottle, and she uses about 15 cans of milk a week, but the older children have milk about once a week.

Mr. LOWE. Do they like to drink milk, Mrs. Doby?

Mrs. DOBY. Yes; they like milk.

Mr. LOWE. The only reason I asked that question, I was quite shocked that they had milk only once a week.

Mrs. DOBY. You thought they didn't like it. But they—they like milk, but it's—well there's so many—a gallon of milk will make 'em a glass around, and so we just can't afford it every day.

Mr. LOWE. What do you want most for your children, Mrs. Doby?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, I'd like for 'em to have a career or whatever they'd want to be when they get older. Course the smaller ones—they're not—don't realize yet to know what they'd like to be, but the older—older girl, she'd like to go to school if she could. She'll probably be like the boy, have to quit soon as she's old enough. She—she really likes to go to school, but she had to miss last week because she had to keep the baby for me to work.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Doby, wouldn't you ever care to have a house of your own?

Mrs. DOBY. I'd like to have a house that—we plan to buy one if we could ever get enough to pay down on one; we'd buy one.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think this will ever happen?

Mrs. DOBY. Well, it don't seem like it.

Mr. MURROW. This is Belle Glade, Fla., where the exodus has its beginning every year. The migrants call it their home, what the circus people call their winter quarters near Sarasota.

Charles Goodlet, chief of police of Belle Glade, says:

Mr. GOODLET. The problem that we have now are the ones that—that come here that don't have the money to rent a room. They—they'll sleep around the bars, in the grass, in the packinghouses, around the lake area, in the parks—any place they can find to sleep, to rest for a few hours. They come here with one thought in mind. It's to survive till the end of this season and save enough money to get to the next State going north.

Mr. MURROW. From towns like this throughout Florida and throughout the South the 2 to 3 millions move out on their annual migration, which ends late in November. They carry with them whatever little they possess, whatever little they are. At the Okeechobee labor camp, while families were preparing to move north, there was still some work in the beanfields. Children, as usual, were left to fend for themselves.

Mr. LOWE. Jerome, how old are you?

JEROME. Nine.

Mr. LOWE. Nine? Do you go to school?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you go to school, Jerome?

JEROME. At the Okeechobee Elementary School.

Mr. LOWE. I see. What is your sister's name?

JEROME. Lois.

Mr. LOWE. That's Lois. And what are your other sisters?

JEROME. Katherine and Beulah.

Mr. LOWE. Katherine and Beulah. What happened to your foot, Jerome?

JEROME. I drive a nail in out there by the washhouse.

Mr. LOWE. So you drove a nail in out by the washhouse? What did your mother do for that?

JEROME. Put some alcohol on it.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you sleep, Jerome?

JEROME. In this bed.

Mr. LOWE. You have this big bed?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. What happened? How did you get that hole in that bed there, Jerome?

JEROME. Rats.

Mr. LOWE. The what?

JEROME. Rats.

Mr. LOWE. Now, Jerome, you are taking care of Kathy, of Beulah, and Lois?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. Now, are you going to give them lunch today?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. What are you going to feed them?

JEROME. I don't know, sir.

Mr. LOWE. Do you have any food here to give them?

JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWE. I see. What time does your mother come home?

JEROME. I don't know, sir.

Mr. MURROW. The following day Alean King, the mother of Jerome, Kathy, Lois, and Beulah again was picking beans.

Mr. LOWE. Alean King, I saw your children yesterday at the Okeechobee camp. Why didn't you put them in the nursery?

Mrs. KING. Don't make enough to pay for it.

Mr. LOWE. How much does it cost to put them in?

Mrs. KING. 85 cents.

Mr. LOWE. 85 cents?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. What time did you come out to the field this morning?

Mrs. KING. Six o'clock.

Mr. LOWE. What time will you get home?

Mrs. KING. About 3:30—4 o'clock.

Mr. LOWE. Six this morning to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. How much did you earn?

Mrs. KING. A dollar.

Mr. LOWE. $1?

Mrs. KING. That's right—$1.

Mr. LOWE. Is that because the beans were of poor quality?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. Has this happened before?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. How much will your food cost you today?

Mrs. KING. About $2.

Mr. LOWE. Alean, how old are you?

Mrs. KING. Twenty-nine.

Mr. LOWE. How many children do you have?

Mrs. KING. Fourteen.

Mr. LOWE. How old were you when you first started working in the fields?

Mrs. KING. Eight.

Mr. LOWE. You been working 21 years in the fields?

Mrs. KING. That's right.

Mr. LOWE. Alean, do you ever think you'll ever be able to get out of this kind of work?

Mrs. KING. No, sir.

Mr. MURROW. All the migrants travel fourth class. If there is a privileged class, they ride in their own jalopy, in the best Joad family tradition. The long journey begins—through Atlanta, Nashville, Indianapolis, en route to the fields and orchards of America.

Lowe has been following the migrants for the past 9 months. Some are freewheelers who travel as a family unit. He met the Parsons family as they were about to leave Belle Glade tomatoes for Indiana strawberries.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Parsons, do you think the farmers you work for care about your problems?

Mr. PARSONS. No. sir. They're not in particular worried about you. They just want their stuff out and you get away as quick as possible.

Mr. LOWE. Would you say that you're welcomed when you're needed?

Mr. PARSONS. Well, that is the only time that you are welcome, is when they're needing you. They're friendly and everything, but once they're done with you, why they'd rather for you to move.

Mr. LOWE. Did they ever ask you to leave their places?

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, yes. They tell you, if you're finishing up like tomorrow why they had rather for you to be out and gone in about 3 days, and that way it'll cut down on their electric bills and all the other stuff.

Mr. LOWE. What do you want most in this world for you and your family?

Mr. PARSONS. I'd like for my family to be well, stay together as much as possible. I'd like to be on a farm somewhere out away from so many people to where they could attend one church and be interested mostly in one school, and that way I believe they'd all be better satisfied.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Parsons, do you think this will ever happen?

Mr. PARSONS. Not at the rate that I'm going now, no.

Mr. MURROW. Most of them ride 1,500 to 2,000 miles to work, in vehicles owned by crew leaders who recruit the workers for the migration north. This is the Roach family looking for work.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Roach, how did you happen to come to this place?

Mr. ROACH. Well, I came to Augusta and I talked with some people and they told me to come on down to Waycross, it was lots more work around Waycross, see.

Mr. LOWE. Well, how—how many miles you've been traveling looking for work so far?

Mr. ROACH. About 1,600 and something.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Roach, where did you spend the night last night with your family?

Mr. ROACH. Over in the woods. Pulled off on the side of the road—on a little dirt road—and slept in the woods outside the car.

Mr. LOWE. May I ask you, sir, what did you have for dinner and your family last night?

Mr. ROACH. Well, we had bologna sausage and a loaf of bread.

Mr. LOWE. That isn't very good food for a growing family, is it?

Mr. ROACH. Well, we made on it.

Mr. LOWE. How much money do you have in the world right at this moment?

Mr. ROACH. Oh, I have about a dollar and forty-five cents.

Mr. LOWE. Well, what do you intend to do about food for your family today?

Mr. ROACH. Well, I've always worked and I always figured I could get work. I have never been where I couldn't get a little something to do.

Mr. MURROW. The vegetables the migrants picked yesterday move north swiftly on rails. Produce en route to the tables of America by trailer is refrigerated and carefully packed to prevent bruising. Cattle carried to market by Federal regulation must be watered, fed and rested for 5 hours every 28 hours. People—men, women, and children, are carried to the fields of the North in journeys as long as 4 days and 3 nights. They often ride 10 hours without stop for food or facilities.

The first stop is normally at Yulee, Fla., 1 mile from the Georgia border, a checkpoint for farm labor leaving the State.

Mr. MAN. Okay. Okay.

Mr. MURROW. There are other stops—Kingsland, Ga., for bread and sandwich meats. Darien, Ga., for facilities. A roadside stop en route in South Carolina.

One thousand miles north of Belle Glade, Fla., by way of U.S. Routes 17 and 301, through Jacksonville, Savannah, Charleston, Wilmington, and New Bern, is Elizabeth City, N.C., a bean stop, good for 6 weeks' work. This camp was home for 40 days for the families of Tom Lockett's crew, now 30 hours out of Belle Glade.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Blakely, how many years have you been working in agricuture in the fields?

Mrs. BLAKELY. Oh, practically all of my life. I haven't did no other work much but in the field, all of my life. I raised all of my kids with it.

Mr. LOWE. I notice that there is some straw over there. What is that for?

Mrs. BLAKELY. Well, that was the straw they brought for the people to sleep on.

Mr. LOWE. Well, weren't mattresses supplied here?

Mrs. BLAKELY. They used to be but they ain't now.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Blakely, where is the water supply over here?

Mrs. BLAKELY. That's it right yonder.

Mr. LOWE. For how many people?

Mrs. BLAKELY. Well, this and that over yonder. All we use the same.

Mr. LOWE. And how many bathrooms are there here?

Mrs. BLAKELY. None.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you—where do you use the bathroom? Where is—where are the facilities?

Mrs. BLAKELY. We haven't one. We use our tin tubs.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Brown, how do the children fare on the journey up north?

Mrs. BROWN. Well, they got kind of sick, you know, you know that old ride, got sore riding, handling them but we made it.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Brown, may I ask how old you are?

Mrs. BROWN. I'm 37.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Brown, how many years have you been working in the fields?

Mrs. BROWN. All my life.

Mr. LOWE. Do you remember how old you were when you started?

Mrs. BROWN. I was about 8 years old.

Mr. LOWE. Would you like to get out of this work?

Mrs. BROWN. I sure would.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think you'll ever be able to?

Mrs. BROWN. I'm hopin' so.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think you'll be able to, though?

Mrs. BROWN. I don't know.

Mr. MURROW. Twenty miles from Kitty Hawk, N.C., the workers driven 900 miles north by Crew Leader Norman Hall pick beans at the prevailing rate of 50 cents a hamper.

Lunch is not a picnic, whether brought from the labor camp or purchased at the open-air kitchen or in a bottle, heated by the rays of the sun.

In a survey in 21 States conducted by the National Council of Churches, the migrants themselves listed the evils of labor camp life: Bad housing, flies, mosquitoes, dirty beds and mattresses, unsanitary toilets, and lack of hot water for bathing. One employer of hundreds of migrant laborers was asked, "Are they happy people?"

Mr. JONES. Well, I guess they got a little gypsy in their blood. They just like it. Lot of 'em wouldn't do anything else. Lot of 'em don't know any different. That's all they want to do. They love it. They love to go from place to place. They don't have a worry in the world. They're happier than we are. Today they eat. Tomorrow they don't worry about. They're the happiest race of people on earth.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Jones, do you think that the migratory laborer makes a living wage?

Mr. JONES. They make a poor living. In other words, sometimes just like the farmer. Sometimes when things are good, when the yields are good and they can make good money, they make a good living, but take year in and year out from different seasons, different sections of the country, I'd say no, that they make a poor living.

Mr. MURROW. There are days when beans are not ready for harvest and that's 1 more day with no income. Ed King, a crew leader, hauled his workers to this camp at Powell's Landing, Va., where they worked 5 weeks pulling corn and picking beans. And when the fields have been stripped in North Carolina and Virginia the trucks and buses again move north.

This is Little Creek Ferry outside of Norfolk. Twenty thousand migrants are ferried to the fertile fields of the Virginia Cape and the eastern shores of Maryland and Delaware for beans, tomatoes, asparagus and potatoes.

For one crew hardship was climaxed by disaster, the death of a migrant.

Mr. JOHNSON. We had a little trouble on the road about 4 o'clock this morning, Sunday morning, and our car—a little wreck—one was killed.

Mr. LOWE. Has this ever happened before with any crews coming up north?

Mr. MAN. Once that I remember in Fayetteville, N.C.

Mr. LOWE. What happened?

Mr. MAN. Everybody got killed.

Mr. MURROW. Every year, as predictable as the seasons, there are accidents resulting in death and serious injury to these laborers. On June 6, 1957, at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and State Highway 102, 9 miles from Fayetteville, N.C., 21 migrants were killed, 17 males, 3 females and a baby boy. The police report stated one of the causes of the high loss of life was the packaging of the occupants of the truck. Today only six States have laws providing for the safe transportation of migrants within their borders. The State of North Carolina is not one of the six. Secretary of Labor Mitchell.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hardly a year goes by that we don't read in the paper of some very serious accident where sometimes a dozen or more people have been killed purely because there is no interstate standard with regard to safety.

Mr. MURROW. Another complication of the migrant stream is the constant flow of foreign workers into the available pool of domestic workers. Hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros and thousands of offshore laborers from the Caribbean area, hired by contract, depress the wage scale of the domestic migrant. This controversy is most bitter on the west coast.

Joseph Woods, a Marine combat veteran of the Pacific, competes against the braceros. Lowe talked to the Woods family under a tree which was their home in California.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Woods, how did you happen to pick this spot to camp?

Mr. WOODS. Well, someone told us about it and they said it was all right to camp here.

Mr. LOWE. Where do you get your water supply?

Mr. WOODS. We go to town after it.

Mr. LOWE. And how do you bring it back here?

Mr. WOODS. In cans. We have a 10-gallon can.

Mr. LOWE. What do you use for sanitary facilities, Mr. Woods?

Mr. WOODS. Well, just get by the best we can.

Mr. LOWE. How many days will you have to be picking cherries in order to find enough money to move into a house?

Mr. WOODS. Well, probably quite a few. They usually want a month's rent in advance so by the time the cherries are over here we'll be moving somewhere else anyway.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Woods, tell me about the children? Do they go out in the orchards and work with you when you work?

Mrs. WOODS. Well, we have taken them out sometimes with us, but they're a little too small to work.

Mr. LOWE. Who takes care of them here?

Mrs. WOODS. My father stays here and takes care of them, usually.

Mr. LOWE. Do you think that you'll ever make enough money picking fruit, Mr. Woods, in order to get settled down in one place and have a home of your own?

Mr. WOODS. I don't think so.

Mr. MURROW. Throughout the United States there are others like the Woods family who are not able to enjoy the luxury of living in a labor camp. In New Jersey, a few miles from Princeton, is this labor camp. There are two water taps and two outhouses. Families live in one room, usually in one bed. The single men live in the "bullpit," their space one bunk. Four people live in this room in New Jersey. A family of six will move into this room. Nearby a trotting raceway has new stables for horses. They cost $500,000.

At Cutchogue, N.Y., 300 migrants live in this camp owned and operated by the Potato Growers Association of Long Island. This is migrant housing, 90 miles from Times Square. Some have tried to leave the endless migratory stream. Wherever this happens, the local slum areas expand. This is Riverhead, Long Island, N.Y. A minister said, "This is as primitive as man can live." This settlement of former migrants is called the Bottoms. In Chenango County, New York State, a farm labor camp, the ultimate goal of Ed King's crew, 1,257 miles from Belle Glade. The Migrant Mission serves one-half pint of milk and one cracker to each child. This is their lunch. Their parents eat lunch in the fields, sometimes 75 miles away.

This is the living space of Alean King and her five children. The room is similar to their winter quarters in Belle Glade, only smaller.

Charles Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, says:

Mr. SCHUMAN. We're the only group of people that furnish housing for workers and we furnish these extra benefits, prerequisites as some people will—some sections call it "the furnish" and it's almost impossible to calculate the value of these added benefits. At the same time we don't condone inadequate housing.

Mr. LOWE. Mr. Schuman, why does the American Farm Bureau Federation so violently oppose Federal legislation?

Mr. SCHUMAN. I think there'd be more rapid progress with State regulation than there will be with Federal regulation. We think that Federal legislation will follow the route that almost all Federal legislation does of additional and more stringent and more regulations, with more and more redtape and more cutting to a certain pattern all over the country. In effect, it would probably rule out the use of migrant labor very quickly.

Mr. MURROW. The middleman between the farmer and the migrant is the crew leader, a remnant of the padrone system in wide use 60 years ago. Ed King, a crew leader, says:

Mr. KING. Well, the crew leader he have to—in a way, he have to be the father and the mother and all when he takes this crew out because the whole crew will mostly be depending direct on you.

Mr. MURROW. Rev. Michael Cassidy, who travels with the migrants, says:

Mr. CASSIDY. Well, some of the crew leaders they are good but the majority of them they're bad. They're so bad that they are the worst that they can be. They're trying to skin alive these migrants. They take every dime they make. They try everything that's possible. For instance, they pay the owner—the grower pays them 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes, and then they turn around they pay the laborer 12 cents at the most—and naturally, they have 40 or 50 or a hundred people picking tomatoes. He makes, I know a man last year he makin' here, right in here, $14,000, the crew leader—and all the men that left here and I met 'em in Alabama, they were broke. They didn't have a dime, because they didn't make the money themselves.

Mr. MURROW. Everyone who knows anything about this situation agrees that the best hope for the future of the migrants lies in the education of their children. But for the children of migrants, education is not easy to come by. There are 600,000 of them. Most State child labor laws ignore farm children—and so far as the children of migrants are concerned, almost without exception they leave school at the age of 16 forever. The U.S. Office of Education reports that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in the country. Approximately, 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant laborers, finishes grade school. Approximately, 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma. Only six States have summer schools for migrants. The New Jersey School Center is at Cranbury.

Mr. LOWE. Laura, how old are you?

LAURA. Eleven.

Mr. LOWE. Eleven. What grade are you in?

LAURA. Sixth.

Mr. LOWE. Sixth grade. Do you intend to go to high school, Laura?

LAURA. Yes.

Mr. LOWE. What would you like to be?

LAURA. I'd like to be a teacher.

Mr. LOWE. What would you like to teach?

LAURA. I'd like to teach the fifth grade.

Mr. LOWE. What do you think about going to school here in Cranbury, N.J., Harriet?

HARRIET. I'd like it.

Mr. LOWE. Oh good, would you—do you have any idea what you want to do when you grow up?

HARRIET. Be a teacher.

Mr. LOWE. Oh, good. How old are you, Patricia Ann?

PATRICIA ANN. Eight, nine.

Mr. LOWE. What grade?

PATRICIA ANN. Nine.

Mr. LOWE. Nine? What grade are you in?

PATRICIA ANN. Fourth.

Mr. LOWE. Do you have any idea what you want to be when you grow up?

PATRICIA ANN. Yes.

Mr. LOWE. What's that?

PATRICIA ANN. A nurse.

Mr. LOWE. Otis, what would you like to do when you grow up?

OTIS. Be a doctor.

Mr. LOWE. Going to be a doctor?

OTIS. Yes.

Mr. LOWE. What kind of a doctor, do you know?

OTIS. I'd rather be a dentist.

Mr. LOWE. A dentist?

OTIS. Drill teeth.

Mr. MURROW. Mrs. Christine Shack, their teacher, was asked about her pupils.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Shack, do your pupils who are, most of them, children of migrant families, are they anxious to get an education?

Mrs. SHACK. Terribly anxious—even more so than the child in the normal school year.

Mr. LOWE. Do they get any help from their parents as far as school work is concerned?

Mrs. SHACK. Usually, you will find that the parents themselves are not educated. When we go out to enroll the children, oftentimes the parent will make an X, and the person interviewing will have to sign it in order to get permission for the child to be enrolled in school.

Mr. LOWE. Mrs. Shack, how does this problem affect you personally?

Mrs. SHACK. I think maybe I feel a bit of responsibility toward these children because I realize that we here in New Jersey reap the benefits of their parents' labor, and the children are suffering because their parents are here doing this.

Mr. LOWE. I saw one bright little girl, her name was Laura Weeks. Will she really have a chance to continue her education?

Mrs. SHACK. Laura is from a rural area in Florida, and she is from an exceedingly large family. In fact, I believe there are eight or nine girls, all girls, in the family. They have been coming to New Jersey now for about 3 or 4 years to my knowledge. Laura is one of my returning pupils. I've seen great progress, from year to year, in Laura; we've had her for three sessions. However, I think because of the family's financial condition and the size of the family and the fact that she is in a rural area, that she probably will get no farther than upper junior high school or maybe complete high school, with luck.

Mr. LOWE. What about Harriet Damon?

Mrs. SHACK. Harriet, too, is from a very large family. There are nine children in the Damon family; we have six of them here in the summer program. She is the oldest of the nine. I doubt seriously that Harriet will have an opportunity to advance her education. One can't help but have compassion for those who find themselves in such a condition.

Mr. MURROW. The Federal Government spends $6½ million annually protecting migratory wildlife. This year Congress failed to appropriate $3½ million to educate migratory children. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, was asked if State or Federal legislation was the answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Many aspects can only be successfully dealt with at a national level. For example, wages. We can't—we see States in competitive positions; they're reluctant to raise wages through legislation in their State because their farmers are competing with farmers in other States. And we see in education some States who have taken great strides. But we can't expect States to do it alone when they know their neighboring State with whom their farmers compete are not doing anything. We know that just about everybody in this country has some Federal support for adequate housing through FHA or whatever the program is, except the farm community—and the migrant farmer is the most poorly housed member of our society.

Mr. MURROW. Senator WILLIAMS, a Democrat, and Secretary of Labor Mitchell, a Republican, have called for legislation which will probably come before the next session of Congress. And only last week President Eisenhower made the Presidential Committee on Migrants a permanent body. But the real problem is that there are many kinds of farmers and many kinds of crops. The big, mechanized grain and dairy farmers use little or no migrant labor. Some of the

major canneries do pay fair wages and provide adequate housing. However, it must be stated that most of the fruit and vegetable farmers find it economically impossible to build good housing, like this, to be used only 6 weeks a year. The farmer claims he is trapped between what society expects and his market demands. Howard Jones, a grower in Florida, was asked if he knew what his beans, picked that day, would bring in the market.

Mr. JONES. Well, you can't tell from one day to another. Some days you go down there and you'll get $5—and I've seen them drop to a dollar and a half the next day. Or one day they'll be $3, the next day they might be two or one day they'll be two and the next day they could be four.

Mr. LOWE. Who sets your price?

Mr. JONES. Well, that's what we're all tryin' to figure out. Everybody—I don't know the answer but the chains seem to have more to do with setting the prices than anyone else. There's too much difference between the price that they're paying the farmers all over the country. And somethin' * * * we've thought about trying to get somebody to investigate it, some of the Congressmen, the Senators. But you go up there to Washington—we had a group of boys go up there, here * * * a couple years ago. They gave them a runaround. The Agriculture Department, they all give them a runaround. We believe that those chains have lobbyists in Washington, and they're going to do pretty well just what they please.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Mitchell, some of the growers have told us that the chainstores fix the prices, and they cannot meet those prices if they pay their labor a higher wage. What about that?

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I wonder if that's a very valid argument that might be said of many other industries. It might be said, for example, of the garment industry and I've heard it alleged that retailers dictate to the manufacturer the price they will pay for a garment and, in effect, say "You produce the garment at that price no matter what it takes to produce it." However, the garment worker in this country fares very well, in terms of standard of living, due in large measure to the efforts of people like Mr. Potofsky and Mr. Dubinsky of the ILGWU and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and others who have taken what was a very substandard industry not so long ago, 1911, great fire in New York. Today these workers are thriving members of the community, and the price that my wife pays for a garment today she gets a much better garment than her mother ever had at a lower price. So this argument that the farmer has to meet the dictation of the chainstore leaves me rather cold.

Mr. MURROW. The migrant farmworker occupies the lowest level of any major group in the American economy. The soil has produced no Samuel Gompers or John L. Lewis, as Secretary of Labor Mitchell states.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the AFL–CIO, in the past, has been too preoccupied with other affairs and probably the farm problem was so tough that they were reluctant to tackle it. I think their attitude and policy has changed, and they're making a greater effort now to organize than they ever have in the past.

Mr. MURROW. Farm labor, however, is excluded from all Federal legislation designed to protect the rights of those engaged in interstate commerce to organize and bargain collectively.

In 1959, the AFL-CIO set aside $100,000 in an effort to organize the fruitpickers of California. One of the large growers in California was asked what he thought of this effort to organize the fruitpickers.

Mr. ZUCKERMAN. I think their very lack of progress and their very lack of success in signing up members has shown that the industrial type of union which they represent has no place or application to agriculture.

Mr. MURROW. Charles Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was asked how his organization felt about unions.

Mr. SCHUMAN. I think that the agricultural worker needs to have the right to change jobs, freedom to move about, freedom to quit if he doesn't like it, freedom to protest, freedom to negotiate where they are organized, but the right to strike at the time of harvest ought to be regulated in some manner.

Mr. MURROW. The AFL–CIO organizing committee in California thinks differently. Earlier this year, they called a strike meeting of cherrypickers in Stockton. "They're always on the go—for a winter's take in summer—and the pay has been too low."

A meeting reminiscent of the days of auto and steel organizing in the thirties.

Louis Krainock, an official of the organizing committee.

Mr. KRAINOCK. Your negotiating committee met with cherry industry representatives for the first time in the history of agriculture. They set a minimum of $1.10 per 16-quart bucket for good and average picking. Now, some contractors and growers will try to beat down that minimum price, and they'll say that they can't afford to pay $1.10 a bucket for the big crops, that they're squeezed, that the Chrysler Imperial needs fixing, or junior's Thunderbird is on the blink. Now, it's up to you and the rest of the pickers. It's your program. It represents united action.

SECOND SPEAKER. Sure, you can get a job but if you can't live on what you make, what good is the job?

THIRD SPEAKER. You make $5 or $10 today and tomorrow you just alookin' for a job and you stand on the street looking for a job. Now, you ain't got no job for another day. What does the local people forced to do?

FOURTH SPEAKER. We live anywhere, in a tent, under a shade tree, under the river bridge. We drink water out of a creek or anywhere we can get it. Five or six families drink out of one cup, tin can or anything else. Well, we're to blame. We tolerate that stuff. If we'd stick together and say we won't do it, we won't pick your cherries until you give us some restrooms in the field for the ladies, and some for the men, and some water fit to drink, we won't pick 'em. We'd get 'em.

Mr. MURROW. The fruits of the earth must be harvested to feed and sustain mankind.

The question posed by thoughtful men is, must the 2 to 3 million migrants who help feed their fellow Americans work, travel, and live under conditions that wrong the dignity of man?

Howard Van Smith, awarded a Pulitzer Prize for his series of articles on migrant labor in the Miami News, says this:

Mr. SMITH. I knew next to nothing of the migrant situation 4 to 5 years ago. I knew there were migrant camps, but a migrant was just a person who worked on a farm to me. After seeing what I have, I am sure that I will devote the rest of my life to doing what little I can to help solve this problem.

Mr. MURROW. Secretary of Labor James Mitchell says:

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel sad. I feel sad because I think that it's a blot on my conscience as well as the conscience of all of us whom society has treated a little more favorably than these people. They have no voice in the legislative halls. They certainly have no voice in Congress, and their employers do have a voice. Their employers are highly organized and make their wants and terms and conditions known to our legislators. I know of no greater pressure lobbies, so-called, in Washington than the farm group. In all the matters in which I am interested in, I have been frustrated to a greater extent than in any other sphere of activity, as Secretary of Labor, in my inability to make any impact at all in terms of either regulations or law that would help the farmworkers, and the pressures of the farm groups are tremendous. We guarantee to the farmer no loss in certain crops. There the farmer likes to participate in Government largess, but Lord help the fellow like myself who dares suggest that perhaps the Government should do something about the workers that work on farms. It seems to me that, in our kind of a country, we no longer quarrel with the idea that man's worthy of his hire, a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. After all, the employers of this country, as indeed the workers, are part of our way of life. And it's morally wrong, it seems to me, for any man, any employer, to exploit his workers. In this day and age, I don't think we should tolerate it. As a citizen, in or out of this office, I propose to continue to raise my voice until the country recognizes that it has an obligation to do something for them.

Mr. MURROW. And while men of good will seek to right injustice, the migrant, the lonely wanderer, the outcast, is trapped in the stream.

Now it is November, the last of the laborers, in trucks, buses, and cars, approach the Southern States to start the cycle all over again.

The Sunshine State welcomes them back: Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee, Belle Glade, and hundreds of other communities. This is home. New housing is available. The rent, $15 per room, per week.

The migrant is at the mercy of the weather. This year in Florida there was a freeze, killing beans, tomatoes, celery, corn. Its byproduct was a breadline. Migratory farmworkers are not eligible for unemployment insurance. This happened in the United States in 1960, a line of humans waiting for a ration of tinned goods, milk, and bread.

The Secretary of Labor says: "For the rest of my life, in or out of office, I propose to do something for them."

A hardened newspaperman says, "For the rest of my life, I will do what little I can to help."

But perhaps Julian Griggs, a chaplain for the migrants, speaks for all of us:

Mr. GRIGGS. Is it possible to have love without justice? Is it possible that we think too much in terms of charity, in terms of Thanksgiving Day baskets, in terms of Christmas baskets, and not in terms enough of eliminating poverty?

Mr. MURROW. The migrants are back in Belle Glade winter quarters after months of travel and work. One said he brought back a dollar and sixty-five cents; another said $6. Another said, we broke even; we were broke when we left; broke when we got back. We asked him what they thought they could do to help themselves, and they said, nothing. What can we do?

Last week a Presidential committee, made up of the Secretaries of Labor, Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, made certain recommendations regarding the migrants. Here are some of them: Extend child labor laws to cover agricultural workers. Eliminate residence requirements so that migrants will be eligible for health, education, and welfare programs. A Federal law requiring crew leaders to register, thus protecting migrants from exploitation—extension of workmen's compensation laws to agriculture. New housing regulations—States to pay local school boards for the education of migrant children.

There will, of course, be opposition to these recommendations; too much Government interference, too expensive, socialism. Similar proposals have been made before. In fact, a hundred and fifty different attempts have been made in Congress to do something about the plight of the migrants. All except one has failed. The migrants have no lobby. Only an enlightened, aroused, and perhaps angered public opinion can do anything about the migrants. The people you have seen have the strength to harvest your fruit and vegetables. They do not have the strength to influence legislation. Maybe we do. Good night and good luck.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. FRANKE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is in the hospital. I understand he was operated on today. I am happy to report that he is getting along quite well, I think. He had hoped very much he could be present to pay tribute to the Honorable William B. Franke, the recently resigned Secretary of the Navy. In behalf of my colleague from Vermont I respectfully request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a short tribute to the former Secretary of the Navy.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROUTY

I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a dedicated and patriotic public servant—William B. Franke, the recently resigned Secretary of the Navy. I am sure that the other Members of the Senate join me in this expression of appreciation to Bill Franke for his many years of valuable services in positions of great trust and difficulty in the Department of Defense.

Never one to indulge in self-aggrandizement, Secretary Franke has in his quiet and unassuming way been one of the most stalwart members of the Defense team, and the excellent state of readiness of our Navy and Marine Corps forces is due in no small measure to his inspiring and devoted leadership.

Born in Troy, N.Y., and educated in the public schools of that city, Mr. Franke showed early evidence of self-reliance and a fondness for hard work by obtaining self-supporting employment while receiving his accounting training at the Pace Institute of Accountancy, New York City. Upon graduation and successful completion of the examination for certified public accountant, he then forged ahead in the business world, eventually forming his own firm in New York City. To cap a successful business career, Mr. Franke brought a wealth of experience to the service of his country when he first accepted a position as a member of the U.S. Army Controllers Civilian Panel in 1948. He was a Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in 1951–52 and in 1951 was given the Patriotic Civilian Commendation by the U.S. Army. In 1952 he was awarded the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Award. He then served as the Navy's first Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management) from October 1954 until April 1957, and as Under Secretary of the Navy from April 1957 until June 1959. He was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of the Navy and took his oath of office on June 8, 1959. In this post he has served with great distinction and has made an outstanding contribution to the financial management and business administration of the Department.

Secretary Franke's leadership, integrity, judgment, and objectivity have made him an invaluable member of the Defense secretariat. I firmly believe that we have been most fortunate to have had Bill Franke in a key post in our defense organization. I consider it an honor to count him among my friends. I believe the people of the United States owe him a great debt for his dedicated and valuable services, performed so willingly with personal financial sacrifice. Further, I know that with his deep and sincere patriotism the Government can always turn to him as a valuable source of wisdom on Government affairs. I am sure that I voice the feeling of all the Members in wishing him and Mrs. Franke all good fortune in the years ahead.

I trust that they will both have many years in which to enjoy their charming home in Rutland, Vt.

THE NEW YORK HARBOR STRIKE

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, happily, the New York harbor strike is settled. The trains will be running tomorrow. The many thousands of commuters who have been so greatly inconvenienced by this dispute will return to happier families and will be able to have their meals on time.

The frayed nerves of thousands of commuters will be soothed. Fruits, vegetables, and other supplies will flow in an orderly way into the great city of New York. Freight and passenger traffic throughout the east coast will return to normal.

I want to take just a moment today to commend all who played a part in bringing about this settlement. The new administration and the Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, are indeed off to a good start in demonstrating their willingness to stand up for the public interest in serious and disruptive national labor-management disputes.

I want especially to commend Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, for his vigorous efforts to resolve this dispute. Few people realize the extent to which the Governor has devoted his full energies to resolving this dispute. I have been in touch with the Governor's office, and I know how hard he worked at this.

Last Thursday, the Governor went to New York City, to personally see to it that the parties continued to meet in good faith. He stayed with the negotiations around the clock, day and night. From the early mornings until late in the evenings, he cajoled and prodded in the name of the traveling public and in the interest of resolving the huge transportation tieup that then threatened the entire Northeast.

This morning, he stayed with the negotiators until 6 a.m., when the break finally came and a temporary settlement was reached. Without getting any sleep, he then returned to Albany, to catch up on the affairs of the State.

Madam President, the Governor has performed a great service and has set a fine example in urging—with all the might of his office—that the two parties in this dispute come to some agreement.

He has persevered, and I commend him. He is very tired today. But he and all the rest of us shall sleep more comfortably now, in the knowledge that the New York harbor dispute is over.

Madam President, I hope this settlement will set an example by which, in the future, Federal and State authorities will cooperate to serve all of us in difficult and particularly disruptive labor-management breakdowns.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I wish to speak in behalf of confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Bowles has many qualifications which should make him capable of fulfilling the requirements of the position to which the President has nominated him.

Mr. Bowles served with distinction as United States Ambassador to India. He served—again with distinction—as Governor of a great State. He made a fine record as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Connecticut. In all those positions he conducted himself with understanding, courage, and tolerance.

It is my recollection that this nomination was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I hope the Senate in its wisdom will see fit to confirm the nomination of this outstanding man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, last Thursday, as the majority leader has said, the Foreign Relations Committee considered the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State. During the several hours of the committee's session—the meeting began at 10 a.m., as I recall, and continued until 1 p.m.—the various committee members subjected Mr. Bowles to a wide variety of questions dealing with many subjects. Some emphasized especially his view about Red China and our country's relations to it. But, in addition, there were wide-ranging questions about India, Europe, and Latin America. I believe that a reading of the committee record, which is before the Senate, will convince Senators that Mr. Bowles is eminently qualified to be the Under Secretary of State. Not only has he served in the diplomatic service of our country as Ambassador to India, but he has also written extensively on foreign-policy subjects in connection with nearly every field of our international relations.

I think Mr. Bowles will bring to the State Department a wide knowledge and, certainly, new initiative, originality, and integrity.

So, Madam President, I certainly hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

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

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

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I can agree with and concur in the statements which have been made by the distinguished majority leader and by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee about the capacity, the qualifications, the integrity, the character, the patriotism, and the diligence of Chester Bowles.

Nevertheless, I am compelled, with reluctance, to voice opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

A week ago I made some remarks on the floor of the Senate, prior to Mr. Bowles' appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, in which I raised some questions relating to his position and his attitude on our recognition of Communist China and the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. In testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee Mr. Bowles clarified his position in an admirable manner. I felt that he met many of the issues, on the whole, fully and head on.

However, I feel that Mr. Bowles left unchanged certain distinct impressions which I have, and which I believe many in this country and in other countries have, regarding his real feeling on this matter.

Mr. Bowles was quoted, some time ago, as saying, during a television interview:

> In the long run we can solve this situation on China through some kind of two-China policy.

On January 19, when he was before the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Bowles stated, in reply to a question from the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]:

> Well, as a matter of practical necessity, we are dealing with a government on Formosa called the Republic of China; we have contracts, agreement, treaties with them.
>
> We are also agreeing with some other kind of government or meeting with some other kind of government, whatever you want to call it, in Warsaw. We have had over a hundred meetings with this other government.
>
> Now, whether you want to call it the other government, the other China, or whatever you want to call it, it is something we are meeting there with. I think we can get lost in this two-China argument. But there are two entities here, and we are dealing with both of them, whether we admit it or not.

Madam President, there are certain other points on which I might comment. But, to me, this is the crux of the whole question.

To my mind, there can be no doubt that Mr. Bowles, in his heart—and, more than that, by his statements through recent years and at present—feels, and, I suspect, quite strongly, that we have been dealing, in a manner, with 2 Chinas, with 600 million Chinese living on the mainland under a Communist government, and that, sooner or later, by force of circumstances, or, as he phrased it, by facing the realities, we shall be compelled to recognize Red China as governing the mainland while we continue to recognize the Republic of China as governing the island of Formosa.

This viewpoint, if it is the viewpoint, of Mr. Bowles—and I think it is—is shared, undoubtedly, by many Members of this body, who, from time to time, have been making speeches to the effect that we must be realistic; we must stop trying to hide our head in the sand, and stop trying to ignore the existence of 600 million Chinese on the Chinese mainland. Similar statements have been made in the press and by various public figures throughout this country.

Invariably I notice that they avoid taking the logical next step and saying that, sooner or later, we must recognize Red China.

Having said what Mr. Bowles said—and he surely said it with sincerity—they have shied away at a certain point. They then say, "But, oh, no, no, I am not in favor of recognizing Red China at this time." Then, sometimes they say, as he said before the committee, in regard to admitting Red China into the fellowship of the United Nations, there must be some "clear commitments." "Commitment," in my dictionary, means a future promise, not a unilateral action—like agreeing to open the door and releasing American prisoners.

Mr. Bowles is no more to be assailed because of his feeling in this matter than are many others, some of them Members of this body, who take the same position. But, these others are not candidates for or have not been designated as the American Under Secretary of State.

I am not so much interested, although I cannot vote for the nomination, in seeking to prevent confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles as Under Secretary of State as I am in trying to make the record clear in this body so that in the future—and possibly the rather near future—should we be facing the decision of determining whether Red China shall be recognized, this vote and this action cannot be raised as being in any sense an affirmative action on the part of the Senate on that question.

Madam President, on every side we hear the word "realism." We hear, "Let us face realities." As I said only a moment ago, what is meant is that, because there are 600 million people on the Chinese mainland, under the control and domination of 2 percent of that number, a Communist dictatorship, and because there is no immediate prospect of that situation being changed, to be realistic we must swim with the tide, cease swimming against it, and accept Red China.

Everything we have done under that term "realism" since the close of World War II has been a moral retreat. In fact, it began before then. I sat on the divans in the rear of the Senate Chamber as a young man, serving as a clerk of a committee and on the staff of a U.S. Senator, and listened to the debates in this room about the recognition of the Soviet Union. I heard some great and sincere Senators whose names are well known—for instance, Senator Borah, of Idaho—state on the floor of the Senate:

> Let us be realistic. How can we ignore the millions and millions of inhabitants across parts of two continents under the dominion of the Soviet Union? It is a fact, and we can do so much better by dealing with them.

And so we were lured into recognition of the Soviet Union. How much we have gained from that recognition could well be debated.

After World War II, in the name of realism, the United States stood by and even participated in the partition of Korea. It stood by and acquiesced in the dismemberment of Poland, and in the establishment of a Communist government there. It stood by and agreed to an unnatural, distorted, unheard of, unreasonable division of Germany, with the isolation of Berlin, that has come back to haunt us. We acquiesced in the taking over of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, of Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, by the Communists. And always the reason given was, "Let us be realistic. We are faced with a fait accompli, and there is no use swimming against the tide. We can deal with those people. We have to get along with them."

It was largely that concept of realism that caused us to acquiesce in the advance of the so-called agrarian reformers, thus betraying the Government of free China, to whom we were committed by the most sacred obligations, and allowing all of the mainland of China to slip away from our grasp.

So now people ask, "How can you continue to oppose the recognition? Let us be realistic. There is no prospect of any improvement. There is no prospect of the comparatively small number in Formosa going across the channel and reconquering the mainland. They are entrenched. You are faced with a fait accompli. Let us be realistic and learn to deal with them. Other nations are going to do it, anyway."

In the first place, I am not impressed by the argument that other nations are on the verge of recognizing or have already recognized Communist China.

We have spent 75 billion of American dollars abroad, throughout the world, since World War II, in seeking to assert our leadership, to bolster and build the bastions of liberty. We had the costly sacrifice of American lives in World War II and in the Korean conflict. If, with all this investment of blood and treasure, we are simply going to swim with the tide, and let the fruits of those efforts go out the window in the name of realism, then this country has spent billions of dollars and thousands upon thousands of lives uselessly because we are too flabby and too flaccid to stand up and to assert before the world a moral leadership.

We must remember, Madam President, the day we recognize Red China is the day we shall close the door, probably

forever, upon the hopes and aspirations of the Chinese in Formosa and the millions of Chinese overseas who still cherish in their hearts the dream, the vision, the hope and the belief that the day will come when the Chinese nation will no longer be dominated by 2 percent of its population and by a tyrannical dictatorship, and that the day will come once more when freedom will be revived. If we close the door by recognizing the government of Red China as the ruler of all the Chinese mainland, then we shall say to those who have been keeping the spark of freedom alive in Formosa, and in mainland China itself, "We are closing the door for you."

Mark my words: That ember would soon burn out and die away.

I have visited Formosa. I was there in company with my distinguished friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. I came away—and I suspect he did—with the very profound and deep impression that the thing which was keeping the people gathered in Formosa—a tremendous army of young people, with a population which is alive and alert, facing the horizon—was the hope and the belief that some day the march would go the other way.

I have been impressed by the words of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] who has said repeatedly in my hearing, "It is not enough to fight communism, we must beat communism."

We shall not beat communism by retreat.

Madam President, only a few days ago I stood with every other Member of the Senate and with a mighty throng of Americans outside this Capitol and heard a young, vigorous, fearless, fighting President. I admire President Kennedy; and I hope, as I know every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle hopes, he will have success in meeting and dealing with these problems. I heard him use these words:

> Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.
>
> This much we pledge—and more.
>
> To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends.

That does not stack up very well in my mind with all this talk about, "Let us be realistic. Let us face things as they are. We do not desire to recognize Red China now, but probably we shall be compelled to do so."

The inaugural address was a challenge and an inspiration to me, and I am sure it was to everyone who heard it.

I am not attacking Mr. Bowles, but if I read the English language correctly and if I have been able in past months to read it correctly, he is one of those who thinks with complete sincerity we should sooner or later—at least, as soon as we can get something in the nature of a quid pro quo—give recognition to Red China. We cannot have two Chinas, of course, obviously, without recognizing Communist China.

Though he is an able man, I think it is unfortunate that he was selected to stand before the world as the American Under Secretary of State. This is no time, as we face the so-called New Frontier, to lower our sights or to lower our standards.

Whatever Mr. Bowles may consciously feel, subconsciously and actually, I think there shines through his language as clear as day the fact that he is convinced, and honestly convinced, we can hold the citadel only a little longer so far as recognition of Red China is concerned.

Madam President, I am sorry to have taken so much time. I wish to say further that so far as I am concerned I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The reason I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote is not that I am afraid to stand all alone, or with only a few who will vote "no." It is not that I do not wish to put other Senators on the spot, because they feel, as I also feel, that insofar as possible we should give the President of the United States the privilege of choosing his official family, who are to carry out his policy.

I think this is much too grave a question for mere courtesy, or consideration of fellow Senators or anybody else.

I am very frank to say that so far as I am concerned the reason I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote is that I feel if, because of a feeling that the President should have his choice and that Mr. Bowles is a perfectly reputable man of good character and integrity, such a vote resulted in an overwhelming confirmation of the nomination with only a few Senators voting "no," inevitably that vote would be quoted in some months or years to come when the Senate may be facing the real question of recognition of Communist China, as a move in that direction. This vote must not stand as a record on recognition of Red China, so I say that, although I admire Mr. Bowles, who has and will have my very best wishes and my earnest cooperation—I hope for him every success—I shall ask unanimous consent that when the vote is taken, if it is a voice vote, the record may show that the junior Senator from New Hampshire voted "no."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the Senator has made a very impressive statement, and I quite agree with him that at some future time we shall find it necessary to come to grips with the problem. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished Senator that he should draft a resolution to the effect that it is the sense of the Senate, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, that recognition of Red China would constitute moral retreat and a forfeiture of our leadership, so that this Congress at an early date can go on record, even as did the 86th and 85th Congresses, so that all the world may see.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished minority leader, and with his assistance I shall gladly draft such a resolution and offer it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I rise to speak for a few moments on the subject of the nomination of Mr. Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State. At the outset, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not question the honesty of Mr. Bowles. I do not question his devotion to the country or his service. He has said in the course of the hearings that he is opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. I cannot stand on this floor and doubt the word of Mr. Bowles, and while the question concerns me because of his previous attitude relative to the question, that is not the reason that I would vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles if a vote were taken this evening.

What concerns me about Mr. Bowles' position relates to disarmament, and included in that question is nuclear testing. If disarmament means consultation with Red China—and I must assume it would involve such consultation from the statements of Mr. Bowles—then that in itself is tantamount to recognition of another Communist nation.

I believe history will record that one of the greatest mistakes ever made in the field of foreign policy by any nation was the recognition of Russia by the United States. I have many times on the floor of the Senate, and across the Nation advocated breaking off relations with Russia and other Communist-dominated countries.

I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] in his statement that if we are to be the world's leading power, we must act like the world's leading power and not allow other countries to formulate our foreign policy, which I am afraid has been the case in the past.

In the course of the hearings a question was asked by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I shall not quote the first sentence because it does not bear quotation. On page 45 of the transcript of the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations appears the following:

> It is true, is it not, that perhaps the most important—certainly to me the most important—thing in the world is the preservation of world peace?
>
> Mr. BOWLES. That is correct.

I might say parenthetically that we would all agree with that statement. Senator SYMINGTON then went on and asked:

> And to that interest the question of disarmament is paramount—perhaps better wording to use is "arms control"?
>
> Mr. BOWLES. Yes.

Further down in the course of the testimony the Senator from Missouri asked another question. He said:

> Just one more question: How could there ever be a meaningful arms control agreement, skipping the details, without recognizing in the agreement the people and the governments of Red China?
>
> Mr. BOWLES. Well, I think if we did not take into account the 650 million people of Red China in arriving at any arms control or disarmament agreement, the joke would be on the rest of the human race. I cannot

think of anything more fantastic than to have China building up her own armament and moving into the nuclear field, while the rest of us all disarmed.

In the first place, Mr. Bowles spoke about taking into account the 650 million people in Red China. I wish that someone in the State Department would take into account the 650 million people in Red China, and the two-thirds of the population of the world under the domination of communism. We have not done so. I think it is to our eternal discredit that we have turned our backs on the peoples of the world while being concerned only with a handful of the world that governs those people.

My concern in this field is that disarmament has been tried all throughout the course of human history. Disarmament has never worked. I can recall the efforts after World War I to get the peoples of the world to disarm, and if at this rather early age in man's history of civilization we could trust Communists, we might be able to talk meaningfully about disarmament. But we who are the greatest airpower in the world, greater than the combined airpowers of the remainder of the world, are speaking from a position of strength against a position of strength in an area where we are not particularly strong, namely, on the ground. If we speak about disarmament, the chief subject that will be broached by the Communists will be disarmament on our part in our air fleets. The Communist-dominated countries, not being vastly equipped in this field, would not be concerned. The area in which we might be worried is their refusal to disarm on the ground, in which field they are vastly stronger than we are from the standpoint of manpower.

As I stated at the outset, my concern is not with Mr. Bowles' honesty, his devotion or service to the country. My concern is rather that from his testimony he seems to be dedicated to the idea that we can proceed with disarmament at the present time. There is an absence of any testimony that I can find, although it may be in the transcript, with respect to the continuance of the ban on nuclear testing which, I might say, has already set this country back 2 or 3 years in the race of warhead power vis-a-vis the Soviet.

If a vote were taken tonight—and I shall not insist that there be one—I would vote against the nomination of Mr. Bowles, and I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have recorded my vote as being against Mr. Bowles if a vote were taken.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, I intended to make a few remarks on the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State. The hour is late. I think the subject has been very well covered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the very able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I share somewhat their feelings. I feel no question about Mr. Bowles' personal character. I have no question about his ability. I do have a great question about his past remarks and his past record which, to a large degree, so far as Red China is concerned, has been cleared up in his very forthright statements in the hearing. I do have reservations due to that past record and also on the very subjects covered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

I shall not request a vote on the nomination, but if a vote were to be taken, I would wish to be recorded as voting against the nomination of Chester Bowles.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, Chester Bowles is a modern American. He was born in the 20th century. He recognizes that we live in a time of deadly peril in the 1960's. By his success in business, in politics, and in diplomacy, he is in my judgment eminently qualified to be Under Secretary of State, perhaps as well qualified as any other living American. I do not intend to deal tonight with the complex question of China. There will be another time for that question to be considered. But when I listen to the kind of speeches made today by the two distinguished Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], and the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I wonder whether the Senate, which we all love, is not in some danger of becoming a serious roadblock to the safety of our country and to the peace of the world. I agree with Mr. Bowles, with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and with a host of other Senators on both sides of the aisle that disarmament is the paramount issue of our times.

Total disarmament must come, and it must come soon, if we are not to be blown to bits. I hope that, as the debate on the confirmation of the Bowles nomination goes forward to the American people, the press will appreciate that there are many Senators on both sides of the aisle who feel as I do but who also feel that the hour is late and, with confirmation being inevitable, perhaps it is not necessary to make any more of a record in support of Mr. Bowles than has been made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I say to the junior Senator from New Hampshire, who perhaps will read my statement in the RECORD tomorrow, and who undertook to quote a part of the great inaugural address made to the country and to Congress last Friday by the President of the United States, that he should take a look at other parts of the address and say whether he does not agree with it and if he is not very sure, indeed, that Mr. Bowles agrees with it thoroughly, too, as I am sure Secretary Rusk also agrees, as does the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson, whose nomination, as also the nomination of Secretary of State Rusk, was not opposed when brought to the floor of the Senate earlier.

I should like to read into the RECORD a part of the inaugural address:

> But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.
>
> So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.
>
> Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us.
>
> Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Then, with omissions:

> And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.
>
> All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

For God's sake, Madam President, let us begin.

I support the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Chester Bowles.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Madam President, I rise to indicate that I speak only for myself when I express some doubts as to my desire to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles to the important position for which he has been nominated. Like the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, as well as the senior Senator from New Hampshire, I do not question the patriotism, the motivation, the honesty, or the sincerity of approach of Mr. Bowles.

I believe that I cannot support his nomination because of how I feel toward the recognition, in the near future, or the establishment of a precedent which might point to the recognition of Red China.

As the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire has said, it was my good fortune to be in Formosa with him. It was on that occasion that I had an opportunity to talk with many of the Chinese from the mainland, who had hopes, aspirations, or desires that some day the overwhelming majority of the mainland Chinese, if left to their own good judgment, would not choose to be under the yoke under which they are today.

Although I have great admiration for Mr. Bowles, I wish to be very frank and fair and say that if there is a vote—and I am not going to ask for a record vote—my vote, unfortunate as it might seem to some people, must be "no" on the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I will not detain the Senate. I merely wish to say that I consider Mr. Bowles one of the most able and competent men in American public life. I feel that the President's nomination of Mr. Bowles as Under Secretary of State is a fine nomination. Mr. Bowles will bring to that position not only his managerial competence, which is well known, from his record of service in our Government in previous years, but will also bring with

it his imagination, his creativeness, and his inspiration, which both our foreign policy and the State Department need.

Mr. Bowles is very highly regarded throughout the Nation and throughout the world. He, along with Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Rusk, brings a great reservoir of good will to this country in its dealings with other nations.

I am pleased to have the privilege today, as a Member of the Senate, to say a few words in support of the nomination, and I surely will cast my vote in favor of the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I have known Mr. Bowles since he first entered the service of our Government in one of the most explosive and most difficult jobs that a man has ever been called on to perform: that of maintaining the purchasing power of the American dollar in the face of the inflationary impact of the gigantic spending during our effort to win World War II. He performed the job with great courage, skill, and understanding.

I have followed his career as a great Governor of the State of Connecticut, and later the dedication he showed when President Truman appointed him for the very important position of Ambassador to India.

Mr. Bowles at great personal sacrifice determined to see the real India and to have his children participate in India's schools, and to have his wife and others bring about a real understanding of this great people.

A traveler in India will hear most of his affection and service. Certainly Mr. Bowles will bring to the high post to which he has been named by President Kennedy vast knowledge of all facets of government, both domestic and foreign.

I intend to support with great pleasure the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, today I received from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] a note in which he states that it is necessary that he be at his home in Kentucky today and tomorrow; and he requests that when the nomination of Chester Bowles is before the Senate, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, the statement which Senator COOPER made in support of Mr. Bowles' nomination when that matter was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The statement is to be found on page 47 of the hearing, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR COOPER ON MR. BOWLES' APPOINTMENT

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bowles, we do not, under the traditions of the Senate, invite questions from Members other than of the committee, but we happen to have present this morning a very distinguished Member of the Senate who served in India after you did, and I would like to invite him to make a statement or say anything he wishes to say at this time.

Senator COOPER, of Kentucky.

Senator COOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I certainly do not want to break any precedents or create any precedents. I am not a member of this committee, and I do not want to entrench upon your time.

Certainly I know I am not supposed to ask any questions, but you have been kind enough to ask me to comment, and I would like to say that I am glad to come here and say that, as a Member of the Senate, I support very strongly the nomination of Mr. Bowles to be Under Secretary of State.

I do not have to comment upon this record. I think it is a rather unusual record of public service that he had made. He was Governor of his State, he was a Member of the Congress, he was one who served on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is in the unusual position of having represented a State government, of having been in Congress, and of having been on the executive side of the Government.

I would like also to say that he has had the opportunity to do what a great many of us would like to do, for between these periods of service he has had the chance to study, to think, to meditate, and to consider these great problems which trouble all of us. But I do want to say this, too: he has had the opportunity also to put them into application.

I had the honor to serve a short time as Ambassador to India and Nepal, where Mr. Bowles had served. Before him and after him there have been many distinguished men who have served, Mr. Grady, Mr. Henderson, and Mr. George Allen, and now Mr. Bunker, a very distinguished man, is serving there.

I did find out there in my service that in addition to performing the duties of an Ambassador, he had been able to communicate to the people of India an understanding of our country, of its system, of its people. And I think he developed that understanding for a more sympathetic response upon their part toward the United States and, perhaps, even more so, he developed a feeling that the people and the Government of our country were sympathetic to the aspirations of the Indian people. That is just one country, of course, but it is typical of other emerging and independent countries.

I have read a great deal of what Mr. Bowles has written in his speeches. I had been in college with him but I never knew him, as we were in different classes. But since that time I have had occasion to talk to him many times, and I think he does have an unusual understanding of what is happening in the world and what has been happening, particularly since World War II, not only in terms of the political revolution but also the economic revolution, and the necessity for our country being understood in its traditional and historical revolutionary tradition, and being understood as being sympathetic and helpful to these emerging countries and their people. I think he has this quality to a rare degree, and I just wanted to come here and say that. I feel that not only was it my duty to do so, but I also wanted to do it, and I am glad to have this chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator COOPER.

Mr. BOWLES. Senator COOPER, I am very grateful for these comments, particularly since they come from you, who have served in so many areas of foreign affairs, and who served with such great distinction, including India.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very encouraging to have such discriminating Republicans in the Senate. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Under Secretary of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. CURTIS subsequently said: Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may show, at the appropriate place, that had there been a yea-and-nay vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bowles, I would have voted "nay."

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

The Chair notes in the RECORD at this point the objection voiced by the Senators from New Hampshire, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles, and of the other confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will return to legislative session.

PARTICIPATION BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR IN THE SETTLEMENT OF THE HARBOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTE IN NEW YORK HARBOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to express a word of commendation to Mr. Arthur Goldberg, the new Secretary of Labor, for his splendid leadership in the settlement of the 2-week-old New York Harbor labor-management dispute which, according to dispatches in our press today, caused a paralyzing railroad tieup throughout a large part of the East. The dispute was producing very serious conditions, and its effects were spreading even as far inland as Cleveland, and into the Middle Atlantic States.

The press reports deal with Mr. Goldberg's participation in the settlement of the dispute. I read from an Associated Press dispatch published in this evening's Evening Star:

Both Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Governor Rockefeller, who had invited Mr. Goldberg to attend the sessions, praised the new Labor Secretary for his contribution to the settlement. The three officials looked haggard after their long sessions.

Mayor Wagner called Mr. Goldberg a tower of strength.

Mr. Goldberg flew from Washington to New York City. He participated in the negotiations over a period of many hours. I believe it was almost a 24-hour session.

He was able to perform what I consider to be an act of skill and diplomacy in the field of labor-management relations and thus bring about a prompt settlement of the dispute. It is indicated that both management and labor will readily ratify the conditions of the settlement, and that all will be well.

I consider this action a demonstration of the kind of vigor, vitality, and imagination with which this administration will tackle the problems that beset the Nation. The Secretary of Labor acted with the full knowledge and support and

at the request of the President. He acted, however, only after he had been invited to do so by the responsible local and State officials.

I commend Mr. Goldberg for his excellent work. He has performed a real service to the Nation.

NOMINATIONS PENDING IN COMMITTEES

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I desire to make the following statement:

Several nominations are still pending in various committees. The respective chairmen have been asked to hold hearings on these nominations as soon as possible, in order that the Senate may proceed to act on them.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 26, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Charles Johnston Hitch, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur Sylvester, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas D. Morris, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

H. W. Brawley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be Deputy Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., of West Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Leo Wesolowsky, rector of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of St. Vladimir, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, Almighty God. We thank you for all good which you send down on our country and its people.

We humbly pray to you to lead our Congress, the President, and his Cabinet by paths of your commandments to justice, freedom, peace, and abundance.

From hunger, fire, war, and every attack protect us, O God.

Turn your eyes, Merciful God, upon the millions of enslaved people of the world, who are under a social and national yoke of Communist imperialism. Give them your help in their struggle for independence. Remember, O God, among those enslaved peoples the people of the Ukraine during this, the year of the centennial of the death of Ukraine's genius and prophet, Taras Shevchenko, who sacrificed his life for his country; grant his desire for a "Washington with a new and just law" for Ukraine.

Bless, O God, the work of the Congress of the United States of America, the President and his Cabinet, keep them in good health and clear mind for the benefit of our country and the peoples of the world.

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 20, 1961, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from Washington present himself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office?

Mr. HORAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 117

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress, the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of fifty members.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 118

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Rules:

Howard W. Smith (chairman), Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Homer Thornberry, Texas; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 119

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations:

Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John L. Riley, South Carolina; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; John F. Shelley, California; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; Don Magnuson, Washington; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina; Alfred E. Santangelo, New York; Joseph M. Montoya, New Mexico; George E. Shipley, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 120) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Frank T. Bow, Ohio; Charles Raper Jonas, North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; John R. Pillion, New York; Phil Weaver, Nebraska; William E. Minshall, Ohio; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts.

Committee on Rules: Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee.

Committee on Ways and Means: Noah M. Mason, Illinois; John W. Brynes, Wisconsin; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; Victor A. Knox, Michigan; James B. Utt, California; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Bruce Alger, Texas; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO TWO DISTINGUISHED TEXANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point in two instances and include two resolutions passed by the Senate of Texas concerning two distinguished Texans who are serving at each end of the Capitol at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF TEXAS EXTENDING ITS CONGRATULATIONS AND BEST WISHES TO THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN FOR HIS OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS FOR AND ON BEHALF OF HIS STATE AND COUNTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of deep regret to many thoughtful people that living men have such poor and inadequate ways of saying thanks to one among us who has done exceptional, indeed, immeasurable service to his country.

Even so, the pressures of current events and the pressures of differing ambitions concerning the immediate policies of Government make it difficult for a large, official body even to say thanks. It is a rare man in the political arena who receives such an expression of thanks as has been given the Honorable SAM RAYBURN this month by the Senate of Texas. Speaker RAYBURN'S towering mark in history is unquestioned.

Under unanimous consent I insert Resolution 3, adopted by the Senate of Texas on January 10, 1961, to be reprinted in the RECORD as follows:

S. RES. 3

Whereas 50 years ago on this date, a young man from north Texas, serving in the Texas House of Representatives was elevated to the position of speaker of the house; and

Whereas following his service in such capacity, he was chosen by the people of his district to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives where he has served continuously, with distinction, since 1913; and

Whereas by hard work, integrity, devotion to duty, and dedication to the best interests of his adopted State, he grew in stature and in the respect of his colleagues in the House of Representatives in which he served as its majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses, followed by his selection as Speaker on September 16, 1940, which position he has held continuously since such time with the exception of the 80th Congress, during which he was the distinguished minority leader; and

Whereas by reason of his outstanding ability and fine character he has served his State and Nation in the Congress and as Speaker of the House longer than any other person in American history; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to mark this anniversary and congratulate this outstanding Texan upon his constructive contributions to our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, and it does hereby extend its congratulations and best wishes to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for his great and outstanding leadership and achievements for and on behalf of his State and country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded under the seal of the Senate of Texas, to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN and to the members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate,
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF TEXAS EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE SERVICES SO ABLY RENDERED TO THE STATE AND TO THE NATION BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON, AND EXTENDING TO HIM AND TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY BEST WISHES FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE AND STABLE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the Senate of Texas adopted a resolution expressing gratitude to a native Texan, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, for the ability, energy, integrity, and devotion to duty with which he has served his State and the Nation during his several terms in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, and during his long and successful tenure as Senate majority leader.

Under unanimous consent I insert Senate Resolution 7 to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

S. RES. 7

Whereas in the course of events the American people authorized a change in the administration of their Government with the election of Hon. John F. Kennedy as President and Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as Vice President; and

Whereas with the eyes of the world focused on the National Capital, the new President and Vice President will be inaugurated on January 20, 1961, and thus launch the country on a program of constructive achievements and stability in these precarious and troublous times; and

Whereas the transition in administrations is of tremendous importance to the free world and to our country and of particular interest to Texas and to Texans; and

Whereas in the person of Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON to become the Vice President of the United States and as such, President of the Senate of the United States, the State of Texas has given to the country a talented and able leader; and

Whereas this distinguished native Texan served his district in the U.S. House of Representatives, followed by representation of his State in the U.S. Senate, to which he was elected three times and by reason of his ability, energy, integrity and devotion to duty, was chosen as majority leader of the U.S. Senate in which capacity he exercised those qualities of leadership which gained the respect of all his colleagues and reflected credit upon himself, his State, and the Nation; and

Whereas during his long and successful tenure as Senate majority leader his cooperation with the administration, of a different political faith, demonstrated his patriotism, his capacity, and his desire to serve the best interests of his country; and

Whereas the Senate of Texas is grateful for the service rendered to the State and the Nation by its former U.S. Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and desires to extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, all good wishes in their new official roles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of Texas, That we do hereby express our appreciation for the services so ably rendered the State and the Nation by Vice President-elect JOHNSON and extend to him, and to President-elect Kennedy, our best wishes for a constructive and stable administration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, under the seal of the senate, be forwarded by the secretary of the senate, to Hon. John F. Kennedy; and to Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON; and to the members of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

HON. WILLIAM B. FRANKE

Mr. ARENDS. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my personal feeling of gratitude to the Honorable William B. Franke the distinguished Secretary of the Navy who is about to leave his high office with an enviable record of accomplishment.

Secretary Franke has generously and unselfishly served our country and the U.S. Navy. In his many years in Washington he held several top positions within the Navy Department. In the high and honored position of Secretary of the Navy he has provided the Navy with the leadership and inspiration to move forward in this rapidly changing nuclear world.

Throughout his service his broad knowledge, ability, and experience, provided the sound judgment necessary in the making of correct decisions. His ability along with his frank and honest manner have earned for him unbounded respect, here in the Congress and wherever his many tasks took him.

Not only the Department of the Navy, but our Government as a whole, including many of us here in the Congress, are deeply appreciative of the cooperation and the help so ably contributed by Secretary Franke. He has led his Department in a period of uneasy peace, when a Secretary of the Navy was called upon almost daily for decisions and guidance in questions vitally affecting the entire world. He has provided excellent leadership for his military subordinates and has assisted the Congress in carrying out those naval matters which are charged to the legislative division of the Government by the Constitution. The Congress has profited greatly by its association and work with Secretary Franke.

In bringing the attention and appreciation of the Congress to the work of Secretary Franke, I am delighted also to speak of his able assistants, the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, Messrs. Bantz, Jackson, Milne, and Wakelin who also have given unselfishly of themselves to aid the Secretary in his arduous duties.

Secretary Franke may be proud of the example he has set as an American citizen in giving to his country his time, his energy, his talents.

He has served his country with great distinction. This distinguished service has helped to build a finer Navy and a greater country. As he leaves his high position of Secretary of the Navy, I am sure the Navy and the Government as a whole say to him, "Well done, Mr. Secretary."

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS AND SUBCOMMITTEES—AUTHORIZATION TO SIT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 121), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY SPEAKS FOR WORLD FREEDOM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1961, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was inaugurated as President of the United States.

It was a bright, cold day.

The city of Washington was robed in gleaming white, sequined by the fresh-fallen snow.

A multitude of people had come to the Nation's Capital from the 50 States and beyond, to bear witness to a new birth of freedom.

Fifty years and more from now, many who were there on that eventful day in 1961, will tell their grandchildren: "I remember when young John Kennedy became President."

The weather was a bone-chilling challenge, as if testing the heart and mind of a liberty-loving people to find out if they measured up to the pioneering vision of their forebears.

In answer to it came the human courage and the human warmth, reaffirming the unconquerable belief of man in the divinity that shapes his quest for truth and dignity in this life.

It was heard in the spoken prayers of four clergymen who invoked the help of our Creator in the search for freedom with justice that will bless all the sons of man.

We who were there will never forget the beautiful voice of Marian Anderson, singing "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Or the young spirit of the aged poet, Robert Frost. As he spoke the rhythm-in-words he had written many years before, we sensed the future of our land, asking us to go forward and be worthy of it.

On the inaugural stand was the oldest President, departing with the gratitude of the Nation.

And the youngest elected President, taking the oath: "that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me, God."

From old to young, the unbroken continuity of leadership rising from the people, the symbol and sum of our aspirations guiding us toward the undiscovered fulfillment beyond the horizon.

To be there was to feel a people stirring with expectation, lifting their eyes from the imprisonment of the present, to the liberating goals of tomorrow.

Eagerly waiting for the voice to speak for their silent hopes and thoughts.

As the new President stood up to address the thousands before him, he also reached out through the magic of radio and television to communicate with the largest audience ever to participate in this pledge to work for the freedom of the world.

But millions of American children did not hear the message that spoke for the bright hopes and ideals that must be nourished so that the best within them will develop, for the realization of a better tomorrow. Even as many children of another time—100 years ago—did not hear the inspiring inaugural address of another President, who brought vision and purpose and strength to their fathers when they wanted to know what was required of them in the crisis of that generation.

Every boy and girl since then has studied the moving words of Abraham Lincoln, which encompassed the hopes of humanity.

In like manner, the pupils of today should identify themselves with the message of President Kennedy, and be inspired by the goals and the heartening purpose that he has set before us.

Because there is not much time left for leadership.

And we, their elders, need constant reminders from the young of the decisions we must make, and the peace we must build to justify their faith in us.

I therefore include, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy.

For I regard it as my personal responsibility to send reprints of this address to the schoolchildren of my district, so that they may be guided by it to prepare themselves for their future as good Americans and as citizens of a free world.

KENNEDY INAUGURAL TEXT

My fellow citizens, we observe today not a victory of party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change.

For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

WORLD DIFFERENT PLACE NOW

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all form of human poverty and all form of human life.

And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first Revolution.

Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, or oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

LOYALTY OF GOOD FRIENDS

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far greater iron tyranny.

We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought to find power by riding on the tiger's back ended up inside.

To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right.

If the free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

OFFERING A SPECIAL PLEDGE

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty.

But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas.

And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request:

That both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

COST OF WEAPONS A BURDEN

But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides join to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens * * * (and) let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation can be made in the jungles of suspicion, let both sides join in the next task: Creating, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

GRAVES AROUND THE WORLD

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans have been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered that call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it.

I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, and the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

WHAT CAN YOU DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY?

And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice that we ask of you.

With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing a bill to amend Public Law 86-382, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, so as to eliminate discrimination against female employees with nondependent husbands.

The Government's contribution for each enrolled employee who is paid biweekly is as follows: For an employee enrolled for self and family, $3.12; for a female employee enrolled for self and a family which excludes a nondependent husband, $1.82. This is a penalty for the female employee of $1.30 each biweekly pay period. The bill that I am introducing today will place the female employee enrolled for self and family, which excludes a nondependent husband, on the same financial contribution basis from the Federal Government as a male employee enrolled for self and family.

Section 1 of this bill amends the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act so as to eliminate a special provision for Government contribution to a female employee with a nondependent husband. This has the effect of providing for these employees the same contribution as is presently provided for other employees who elected to enroll for self and family. There are approximately 75,000 female employees with nondependent husbands enrolled for self and family under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, out of a total enrollment under the act in excess of 1,700,000. The cost of the additional Government contribution for these employees for 1 year at present rates is estimated at $2½ million. This cost would be in part recovered by a savings in accounting, statistical services, and other administrative costs on the part of Government agencies, carriers providing health benefits plans, and the Civil Service Commission, due to the elimination of certificates of dependency for husbands and to the elimination of special reporting requirements and accounting and statistical records for females with nondependent husbands. While these savings cannot be estimated, they will be appreciable.

Section 2 of the bill makes the amendment effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than 60 days after the date of enactment. This will afford sufficient time for the Commission to issue instructions to payroll offices for the change in rate of contribution for these employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am also today introducing a bill to amend Public Law 86-724 to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act to certain widows and other retired employees who are now excluded because these retired employees and annuitants received a deferred annuity.

Section 1 of this bill extends the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act to annuitants on the rolls July 1, 1960, who would be entitled to those benefits but for the fact that the title of annuity is deferred rather than immediate. There are about 55,000 of these retired employees. Approximately 16,000 to 18,000 of the estimated 55,000 total are widows who were not eligible for an annuity until after 1958 and most of these had been widows for 10 or more years. The cost of the Government contribution to these people for the first year is estimated not to exceed $2,700,000.

Section 2 of this bill makes the effective date of this amendment July 1, 1961, which is the effective date of the retired Federal employees' health benefits program.

CARE FOR OUR ELDERLY AND RETIRED CITIZENS

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems confronting the American people today is adequate care for our elderly and retired citizens. The early retirement of millions of our workers, together with the reluctance of certain industries to hire people who have passed middle age, has created problems which have resulted in economic hardship for many people.

The executive departments of our Government, as well as the Congress and private organizations, have become increasingly aware, during the past several years, of this situation. I have been particularly pleased to note that several very excellent studies have been made in connection with the problem. So far, however, nothing constructive has been done to assist the many thousands of our citizens who, because of age or disability, have not been able to find employment or qualify under existing law for social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, one of the contributing factors to the economic distress now being suffered by thousands of people in this country is their inability to qualify for disability benefits or the disability freeze under the present definition of total disability in the existing Social Security Act. Under the rigid provisions of the present law and the decisions made thereunder by the Social Security Administration, it has been impossible for thousands of our people, otherwise considered totally disabled by their em-

ployers and competent medical authority, to secure disability insurance benefits or to qualify for the disability freeze.

Under the present rigid definition of the term "disability" in existing law, a person must be so incapacitated as to permanently preclude him from engaging in any type of gainful employment. The result of the application of the present definition of disability has been to deny disability benefits to thousands of disabled persons who have become unable to perform work in which they have been engaged for a substantial portion of their lives. Many of these people, in addition to being considered totally disabled by their personal physicians and their employers, are not qualified to engage in any other type of employment due to age, lack of training, experience, and education. As a tragic consequence, thousands of our citizens who have made substantial contributions to the social security system have been forced to turn to welfare agencies for support or to become financial burdens on their relatives.

Few of us will take issue with the fact that the Social Security Act must, of necessity, provide that disability claimants should meet certain medical and employment tests in determining the extent of their disabilities. From the numerous cases I have observed during my service in the Congress, I am convinced, however, that the definition of total disability, as presently applied by the Social Security Administration under existing law, is too rigid and impossible for thousands of deserving claimants to meet.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct some of the inequity and hardship now being experienced under the interpretations placed upon the term "disability" in our present social security law, I have introduced a bill today to provide a more realistic definition of disability for social security purposes. My bill will not change the term "disability" in the present law other than to specify that a person will be deemed unable to engage in any substantial gainful employment if he is precluded by reason of his physical or mental impairment to engage in the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of his disabilities.

My measure simply provides, Mr. Speaker, that when a worker becomes totally disabled from performing the duties necessary for the job or profession for which he is trained and in which he has been employed for many years he will become eligible for disability benefits or the disability freeze.

It is my hope that my colleagues in the House will support my measure. I feel sure that every Member has had occasion to observe the inequities in our present law from investigating disability cases that have come to their attention. The enactment of my bill will be a step forward in providing a measure of support and a sense of security for countless numbers of our citizens who, through the strict application of the present disability features of our existing social security law, have been unable to qualify for benefits to which they are rightfully entitled.

AID TO EDUCATION FOR FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to extend for 4 years the entire current program of aid to federally impacted school districts, known as Public Laws 815 and 874.

In my opinion this is vital and urgent to school districts throughout the United States even if we have a general aid to education program, which I ardently hope we will have.

The law was first passed in 1950 to provide school construction aid to areas experiencing sudden population increases due to defense activities. It also provides operating funds to school districts that educate children whose parents live or are employed on Federal Government land.

The laws have been extended several times. In 1958 the provision for children whose parents live on Federal Government land was made permanent. The other provisions were extended until June 30, 1961.

In last year's budget, the administration recommended phasing out the provisions which are to expire in June and recommended cuts in appropriations. The Congress not only restored the cuts but increased the appropriation.

For thousands of schools, including many in my area, failure to continue this program means many school districts may virtually have to go out of business.

Vitally needed education would not be available. Other districts will be seriously crippled by lack of funds, because of the influx of people who work in the defense program. The quality of education in these districts would decline at a time when better education is urgent in this age of science.

Under the necessary Federal policy of dispersion of defense installations, most of our military facilities, employing millions of citizens, are located in rural areas. In many instances school districts which previously have educated only a few hundred children must now provide education for thousands. It makes no difference to these districts whether the children live on or off Federal lands. There is no logic to make two classifications in the law.

All 50 States, territories, and the District of Columbia are vitally affected.

Because I am most familiar with the situation in my district, I will cite examples from it.

One small district, the Atwater School District, reports more than 60 percent of its students are the result of Castle Air Force Base. The district tax limit has been pushed to the maximum to support its educational activities. It is completely inadequate to support the district without the Federal impact aid.

Construction of Lemoore Naval Air Station is now underway in the midst of a completely rural farming area. The Federal Government has invested up to $100 million in the project which will bring 30,000 persons into the area. It will throw the tremendous load of thousans of children into small rural school districts. The establishment of the base is taking land off the school tax roll not only for the base itself but for a large buffer zone.

The school district in this area will not be able to exist without continuance of the Federal impact aid program.

California has 917 Government installations. This includes more than 45 million acres of land of which less than 300,000 acres are in urban areas. There are almost 56,000 Federal buildings in the State. The value of the Federal holdings in California is $345,410,000 in land; $2,025,250,000, buildings; and $2,486,426, other structures and facilities, for a total Federal holdings in the State of $4,857,086,000.

All of these Federal facilities not only are free of taxes to support schools, but they actually correspondingly reduce available tax bases. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of persons whose children must be educated are employed on these school tax free facilities. The responsible school districts face an impossible dilemma, with less money to educate more children.

Most of the Members are faced by the same problems in the districts they represent and I am confident they will join in support of this urgently needed legislation.

TO INCREASE AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EARNINGS PERMITTED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted under the Social Security Act to $2,400 per year.

Surely, in view of our increased living costs today, such an increase is more than warranted. Many of our older people are anxious to do a limited amount of work. In many cases, they can contribute to our economy. There is no reason why there should be an earnings limitation. It may have been necessary at one time, but today it can be a detriment to a happy retirement for those affected as present social security benefits are just not adequate enough to maintain an average standard of living.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation early consideration.

TO PREVENT INTERFERENCE WITH MOVEMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in August 1960 I introduced legislation and again on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 64, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce and for other purposes. This was in light of the disastrous Long Island Railroad strike, followed a little later by the same type of strike against the Pennsylvania Railroad, whereby not only tens of thousands of commuters but freight, business, and industry were seriously handicapped.

Now, again in January 1961, 660 members of the railroad tugboat operators tied up not only the tugboats, but completely paralyzed the New Haven and New York Central Railroads. This strike and its effects cannot be calculated in terms of dollars alone, but of great disservice to the public.

I ask you, and the committees of Congress, to take immediate action, as soon as committees are organized in the House, that hearings be held and action taken to bring about compulsory arbitration in matters affecting the national interest and welfare. This sort of strike can no longer be tolerated with the public-be-damned attitude. It not only reacts against the public interest, but also against the very people it is intended to help, the workingman. Because, Mr. Speaker, this sort of strike puts out of work tens of thousands of other working people, who are innocent victims of this strike. The public will no longer consider merely words; they are entitled to action. I shall constantly press for action; it is needed at once.

FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. POFF. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act which I have recently introduced. This act, among other things, requires the registration of persons employed by certain foreign principals which disseminate propaganda in the United States. Section 1 of that act contains a definition of terms. Among those definitions is "foreign principal" and it is defined to include a domestic organization which is "subsidized" by a foreign government or a foreign political party. Experience in the administration of this act shows a need for the inclusion within the term "foreign principal" domestic organizations which are not only subsidized by a foreign government or political party, but also those which are substantially controlled, directed, or financed by a foreign government or foreign political party.

In other words, because of the existing definition of the term "foreign principal," agents of a domestic organization today need not register even though their organizations are financed, controlled, supervised, or directed by a foreign government or political party, unless the Department of Justice can establish that such domestic organization is "subsidized" by a foreign government or political party. The new bill will define foreign principal so as to bring domestic organizations within the purview of the registration requirements of the act, irrespective of whether they are subsidized, if a foreign government or foreign political party supervises, directs, controls, or finances them in such a manner as to exercise substantial control over their policies and activities.

Section 2 of the bill amends another provision of the act; namely, section 3(d). Section 3 relates to the so-called commercial exemption and exempts agents from the obligation of registering if their foreign principals are engaged only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal.

This exemption has proved to be ambiguous. The language has led to confusion and unnecessarily difficult problems in the administration of the law. Argument has been made that if a foreign principal meets any one of the above quoted conditions, as distinguished from meeting several or all of the requirements, its agents need not register. As rewritten the section with its proposed changes and sentence structure will make it clear that for an agent to qualify for exemption from the obligation of registering, the foreign principal must be engaged in activities which meet either of two sets of three requirements: The activities must be private and nonpolitical and financial, or private and nonpolitical and mercantile. If any one of these requirements is lacking, the agent cannot qualify for exemption and therefore must register under the act.

UKRAINE, SPEARHEAD OF FREEDOM'S ADVANCE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take notice of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, which occurred yesterday.

Ukraine today is not one of the free nations; but it had its taste of freedom, and the 40 million people of the Ukraine, comprising the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, will never forget that period of their history nor let up in their resourceful efforts to obtain complete and lasting freedom as an independent nation.

Among the nations, now almost at the 100 mark, united for peaceful solution of the problems of mankind, the Ukraine has a place as a member. It is a "republic" of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; but as such it is a captive nation, a satellite, an officially recognized component of the Russian system of stooges, and the government does not represent the people, nor do the people of that nation accept, except by force, their unhapy role as a part of the Soviet Union.

The bonds which hold the Ukrainian people within that Union, however, can be but temporary. They have struggled for centuries for freedom and independence. They won it, then lost it, but they have never diminished their own particular kind of cold war against the Russian oligarchs, in their efforts to regain and retain their freedom.

In the fight for freedom, in Europe and all over the world, the Ukraine, with our help and that of our allies, can be the spearhead. They and all of the other captive nations look to us, and with ingenuity, with timeliness, with determination, even with enlightened self-interest, we must help them in their fight for freedom. Every inch of gain strengthens the entire free world in the struggle for survival.

UNITED STATES TRADING CORPORATION

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous weapons currently being employed by the Soviet bloc in its struggle for world domination is the use of international trade to achieve that objective through economic means. This is a field in which the Soviets have shown increasing interest and skill and one in which the dictatorial Russian Government enjoys certain advantages over its competitors, the private businesses of the United States and other free countries of the world.

In the study which the Joint Economic Committee undertook last year into the comparisons of the Soviet and American economies, it was shown that we in this country have a large and impressive lead in the economic race of nation against nation. This lead, it was demonstrated, has its foundation in the basic strength and progress of our free enterprise system, and this lead is one which our free enterprise economy can safely maintain. These hearings also pointed out that the Soviets are growing economically, that their capacity for waging the economic features of the cold war is increasing.

The real danger of the Russian economic capacity in this battle for world trade is not that they will overwhelm us in every country and in every product in which our businesses compete. Rather it is that, in the interim before the basic economic facts of life catch up with the inhuman and unprogressive system

of communism, the Soviets may use the powers of planning and control which characterize their economy to launch attacks in specific and limited areas, accepting a temporary loss to drive the competition from the field and recoup these losses by exploitation, and in some cases enslavement, of small nations, when the competition has been driven out.

This is the classic concept of monopoly power at work, the destruction of competition in one area or for one product by planned losses, losses which will be more than repaid by subsequent exploitation when there is no competition to serve as a restraint. The effects of this type of competition, or rather destruction of competition, has the same deleterious result in the international economy as do the effects of monopolistic practices in our national economy. Economic assaults of the type mentioned, coupled with the subversion which accompanies Russian and satellite trade missions and economic assistance advisers, present a very grave threat to our national security. And, as mentioned, the Soviets may direct this threat to such points of economic competition as will best serve their political ends.

Individual American businesses may be faced down by the concentrated power of the Soviet economy, although on a national scale our output, capacity, and growth potential far exceed that of the Soviet bloc. It is the imbalance of nation competing against private business that gives an advantage to the Russians in this field. In an effort to overcome this imbalance, we must not fall into the trap of adopting the policies of the Communists. We must be in a position to aid and help individual business enterprises and the capitalist system, so that there will be no encroachment by the Government on free business. We must achieve a cooperation between private business and government to counteract this Communist threat.

As a part of this effort, I am today reintroducing a bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation. This Corporation would provide assistance to American business to help it compete in the markets in which Soviet policy dictated an economic assault. If Soviet Russia does not engage in this kind of activity, the corporation would not have to act. If it does, the Corporation would be there to insure that through such temporary activity, although it lasts for several years, would not result in Russia's taking over any market, destroying any competition or enslaving the economy of any nation.

The bill which I introduce is not a final solution to the problem which I have outlined. Rather, it is a definition of the problem and one concrete proposal in reference to it. I urge that the Congress and the country give sincere consideration to this proposal and to the problem which it is designed to help solve.

I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a news feature by Sid Goldberg, syndicated by the North American Newspaper Alliance, on this proposed United States Trading Corporation.

NEW YORK.—A key Congressman, in response to Premier Khrushchev's declaration of economic war, proposes strong countermeasures to Soviet dumping—a complete revamping of the U.S. tariff system, and creation of a Secretary of Foreign Economics as a full Cabinet member.

"Khrushchev has challenged us to economic war, but our arsenal is empty of effective weapons in this field," says Representative TOM CURTIS, of St. Louis. "We've got the bombs and missiles to stand up to Russia in a military showdown, but in a battle between economies—the kind we're now being forced into—the United States is almost defenseless."

Representative CURTIS, the only Missouri Republican holding high elective office, is the ranking minority member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and fourth-ranking Republican in the House Ways and Means Committee.

RUNNING MATE

Now completing his fifth term in the House, the 48-year-old Congressman has been mentioned as a running mate for either Vice President Nixon or, should he be drafted, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

The first of Representative CURTIS' unorthodox proposals is the establishment of a United States Trading Corporation, capitalized by the Government at $1 billion with a potential of up to $4 billion. Purpose of the Corporation would be to enable U.S. firms to compete with the artificially low prices set by Soviet state trading monopolies.

Payments from the Corporation would assure a U.S. firm of a fair profit margin if it were forced to drastically lower its prices to meet the monopoly prices of Russia.

"Right now Russia is engaged in the same kind of unscrupulous business practices that were outlawed by our antitrust legislation in the last century," CURTIS explained in an interview during a visit here.

UNFAIR FIGHT

"The U.S. exporter, in competing with Soviet monopolies, often is up against the type of unfair competition that many small businessmen faced in America before the Sherman Antitrust Act," he said.

The St. Louis Congressman stresses that the Corporation would be designed as a defense only against totalitarian economies such as Russia's, and would go into action only when U.S. firms could prove they were up against unscrupulous foreign competition.

"There must be built-in safeguards against U.S. firms taking advantage of the Corporation," he continued. "Some firms inevitably would try to blackmail the Corporation into helping them underbid foreign competitors. But payments would be made only when the competition could be shown blatantly unfair."

Mr. CURTIS cites several examples of how Russia cuts corners in its economic war with the West. Two years ago it tried to create anarchy in the world aluminum market by dumping vast quantities of the metal at below-cost prices. At the same time it outbid the United States for Icelandic fish, trying to tie the island's entire foreign trade to Kremlin purchases.

He also points out that Poland recently agreed to supply Cuba with textile machinery; yet for several months Poland was negotiating to buy textile machinery from the United States, claiming a serious shortage at home.

THREAT MAY DETER

"This kind of trade deal often is expensive economically to the Soviet bloc, and is entered only when an outstanding political goal can be achieved," Representative CURTIS said. "Perhaps the mere threat of U.S. retaliation through the trading corporation would be enough to dissuade the Russians from these practices.

"Just as the possession of the hydrogen bomb works as a deterrent to military aggression, existence of the trading corporation could work as a deterrent to economic forms of aggression," he suggested.

Mr. CURTIS hopes that the Corporation, if set up, some day could be internationalized, growing into an "Economic Court of Justice" that would eliminate the cut-throat practices that still persist in international trade.

RESOLUTION TO CREATE COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT UNIONS AND UNRECOGNIZED GROUPS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been quite concerned for some time about the lack of recognition accorded the unorganized labor groups and independent unions throughout the country, particularly on the Federal level. It has been my feeling for some time that the Congress has fallen down in its duty to this large segment of our population and, because of this, I have today reintroduced a resolution which provides for the establishment of a committee on independent unions and unrecognized labor groups. It is my belief that such a committee is necessary and it should be comparable in dignity and in operation to the House Committee on Small Business. Small unions and small business comprise the largest portion of their respective field by far; for this reason alone they deserve recognition.

I envision this committee as giving the small unions and unrecognized labor groups an opportunity to air their problems before an appropriate congressional forum, and giving us in Congress a better idea of the operation and needs of these groups. This, in turn, would be of inestimable value to Congress in drafting appropriate legislation to meet the problems which are presented.

I believe that experience has proven that interests which do not have a forum from which to present their views to the Congress are often lost in the shuffle. Small labor represents an estimated 30 million workers, twice the number represented by the AFL–CIO; certainly groups speaking for this large a number of Americans deserves to be heard.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CHRISTINE FAHRENBRUCH

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a private bill for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a bill identical to one passed by this House in the previous Congress. Because of the limitations of time, action on it was not taken in the other body. This bill would reimburse Christine and her parents, Sgt. and Mrs. Raymond Fahrenbruch, for the expenses which they have incurred in the treatment of Christine's hearing defects and the special school required by it.

The nature of the injury to Christine's hearing is such that she will be permanently deaf. Special medical treatment and special education to equip her to lead as normal a life as possible have resulted in great expenses to the Fahrenbruch family. It is for these expenses this bill would reimburse the Fahrenbruchs.

Christine was born in 1950 in an Army hospital in Germany. When she was only days old, an illness of undetermined origin and nature swept the hospital nursery, killing three of the seven children in the nursery. This illness resulted in the hearing defects from which she now suffers.

At the time of the hearings on this matter in the last Congress, it came to light that the illness which struck the nursery in the hospital in which Christine was born had been caused by the negligent action of one of the Army orderlies working in the hospital. On the basis of this new information, the Department of the Army undertook to revise its previously adverse report on the bill. With this new understanding of the situation, this bill was passed in this House but, as noted, no action was taken in the other body.

It is only through action on the part of the Congress, acting as it may upon the extraordinary claims against the U.S. Government, that this relief can be given.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CHURCH. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate today an occasion significant to the people of the Ukraine and equally significant to the millions throughout the world dedicated to the cause of freedom. Although it was January 22—yesterday—that marked the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic, it is fitting that on this Monday, when the Congress of a free people meets, we pay tribute not only to the anniversary but to the men and women of courage who on January 22, 1918, regained their liberty and national independence following over a century of subjugation.

None of us can forget that the current conquerors, by use of force and fraud, deprived the Ukrainian people of their right to determine their own political, economic, and social institutions a scant 4 years after the proclamation of their Republic. The world well remembers the harsh nature of the aggression and colonialism which, through military, economic, and political means, has brought slavery to over 100 millions of people in eastern and central Europe and denied to them their divine right to liberty and individual freedom. We would emphasize today that it is indeed only through such force and through such negation of individual rights that alien governments are presently maintained in many countries of this world. Even the master in control must know, despite all assertions to the contrary, that the governments in being do not represent the will of the governed. And among those people who are denied this basic right of self-determination none are more to be remembered and honored than the valiant inhabitants of the Ukraine. No imperialism to which they may fall victim can drive from their hearts, nor the hearts of their brothers throughout the world, the instinct and yearning to be free.

We, today, who do honor to our own free Nation in marking this great Ukrainian anniversary know full well that so long as men and women anywhere are deprived of their basic freedoms, the peace for which the world longs and prays will not become a reality. Such peace, indeed, will have no chance of becoming a reality until human rights and freedom prevail for all peoples.

It is appropriate to look back to days of victory for freedom and to the courage and idealism which originally established even a short-lived Ukrainian National Republic. It is equally appropriate to point out that this hour calls for a united and firm stand against totalitarianism and against the intimidation of the human spirit which it produces. It is appropriate to acknowledge that the deprivation of freedom and liberty any place in this world is a threat equally to the continuation of freedom and liberty among those peoples which are privileged now to hold that gift in their fortunate hands. It is most of all appropriate for us here, today, in commemoration of this Ukrainian anniversary, to acknowledge that we must work for the delivery of those in slavery and strengthen those who waiver in the battle of freedom for the world.

Especially, Mr. Speaker, would I add a tribute to the Americans of Ukrainian descent who have made such valuable contributions to the political heritage and culture of our own country. Our devotion to democratic ideals has been strengthened by the heritage which they have brought us. Today, we take honor in joining with all Ukrainians, therefore, in paying tribute to the courage of the captive Ukrainians who continue to strive and fight for their freedom. Today we, with freemen everywhere, rededicate ourselves to the great cause of human liberty.

THE LATE HONORABLE KEITH THOMSON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to pay tribute to a former Member of this body, the late Honorable KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, as there are many Members of this body who are not able to be present today, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, we in Wyoming have lost an outstanding citizen, a dedicated public servant, and a close friend in the sudden death of Senator-elect KEITH THOMSON on December 9. It was a shock to all of us to realize we had lost one whom we had come to count on so much. The loss to his family was even greater. They lost a loving husband and father, one whom they will always remember with love and affection and with pride because of his achievements and the esteem in which he was held by all.

Those of you who served with him during his 6 years of service in this body, representing the State of Wyoming, know that he worked with only one thought in mind—that of serving his State and country ably and well. Not only was he recognized in this body and elsewhere for his outstanding abilities, but he was also especially known for his unwavering dedication to those principles in which he believed and for which he fought.

As a young man of humble beginnings, he devoted himself to long hours of hard work and to uncomplaining self-denial and sacrifice to rise to a position of influence, prominence, and esteem. He was a man of action, a doer; a man of intensity, striving relentlessly to accomplish worthwhile things for the people of Wyoming and of the Nation.

His record as a combat officer in the Armed Forces of his country in World War II, and as a husband and father shows the same dedication to the highest ideals of love and service.

I was particularly impressed with the remarks made by the Reverend John M. Pattison, his pastor and friend, at the services for KEITH in Cheyenne, Wyo. Dr. Pattison expresses better than I can the love and affection felt by all of us for KEITH THOMSON.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Reverend John M. Pattison be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDRESS GIVEN AT THE FUNERAL OF HON. KEITH THOMSON, CONGRESSMAN FROM WYOMING, AND SENATOR-ELECT FROM WYOMING, IN FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, CHEYENNE, WYO., BY THE REVEREND DR. JOHN M. PATTISON DECEMBER 13, 1960

The news of the sudden death of my esteemed friend and public servant KEITH THOMSON came as a hammer blow. It left me stunned and shocked. It had a paralytic effect upon me and my family. I feel sure that most people throughout the region felt the same way as I did when they first learned the tragic news. A veritable pall of gloom settled over our hearts and over the population of our State.

His sudden passing, in the prime of life and when he had just reached a plateau in his life which gave promise of a long and distinguished career in our national life and of service to the State he so much loved, is difficult to understand.

I knew the deceased and his family most intimately. It was my good pleasure to be pastor here when the family was received into the fellowship and communion of this church. I followed his meteoric rise to fame with much satisfaction, and rejoiced with him in every honor which came to him and in all the good fortune which he was able to attain.

He served as a member of our board of deacons before he was elected to Congress and had to move from our city. He was a constant and loyal member of the Sunday congregation and a good supporter of his parish. We exchanged letters frequently during the years he was in Washington, and often we were together at social functions when he was in our city visiting his old friends.

The career of this young man of 41 years has come altogether too soon to its close. During those short years of his life he reached the supremacy of achievement in 41 years that would cover twice those years in experience and accomplishment of most people.

One of KEITH'S good friends and an honored citizen of our State wrote this and gave it to me:

"His humble beginning as a cowboy soon became obscured by his appearance in World War II as the youngest and ablest Infantry Officer of his rank in the entire U.S. Army. On his return to civil life his brilliance in the legal profession brought local and national recognition.

"He entered the field of politics with equal success—he became a State legislator, then Congressman for 3 terms—then U.S. Senator-elect by one of the greatest tributes ever paid by an appreciative electorate in the State. National recognition of his talents was of such magnitude that many offers for his services were made—and refused—for he had become dedicated to service for the people of Wyoming and the cause of private enterprise.

"He drove himself relentlessly each day and night to justify the confidence of his electorate. He once said, 'To be a good Congressman requires 18 hours a day,' and he gave that and more. Possibly that is why we are sorrowing together today in the loss of a friend who meant much to the State and the Nation.

"Truly, a great man, who has given every ounce of devotion and application of his brilliant mind to the multiple problems that confront our Republic has laid his life on the altar of sacrifice for those he so ably represented.

"His keen mind that grasped instantly the tactics of military warfare, of litigation, and of national policies is now at rest. We have lost one who was said, 'Knew most about missiles, including the scientists themselves'—one who had compassion and kindness, firmness and conviction—one who expressed the thoughts and ideals of people from all walks of life—because he had served in all of them in his meteoric career from cowboy to U.S.-Senator-elect.

"We wonder how Divine Providence could strike down one who had reached a plateau of his career that looked forward to a distant horizon of realization of his objectives. Some day we will know. Suffice it to say now that he has brought inspiration, hope and renewed courage to those who have had their faith restored and their individual dignity honored.

"Throughout this brief career KEITH had the support and encouragement of a lovely wife and family; for whom, with others, he has created a nation of security, promise, opportunity and peace."

We all know that KEITH was an indefatigable worker. He drove himself relentlessly day and night. No matter what he undertook he threw himself into the task with all his ability, force and capacity. He gave every ounce of his strength and the application of his keen and brilliant mind to the endless problems that confront our Nation in this hour. As one of his friends said so ably: "He has laid down his life on the altar of sacrifice for those he so capably represented."

KEITH was not only a devoted public servant but also a family man. Even in the endless rush of such a busy life as that which he lived, he always found time for his wife and boys. His love and affection for his family was outstanding, and it was a source of much regret to him that his position in life took so much time away from his growing boys. I would say in this connection that his wife was constantly at his side, giving him her loyal support, encouragement, and inspiration. She shared with him his success, she also shared in his disappointment when they came, as they always do come in the life of a public servant. They were a happy couple, and no home could have been more ideal than theirs.

All of us realize that Wyoming has lost one of its finest young men—yes, one of its great statesmen. But we also know that his wife and family have lost a wonderful husband and a loving father. The loss which these have sustained in this sudden death cannot be filled either by election or appointment, because no one on earth can fill the vacancy in the lives of these who were closest to him.

We rejoice today in our Christian faith in life eternal and in the knowledge that, "To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord."

Our religious faith and our basic beliefs teach us that life, the true life of the soul, is not terminated by physical death. KEITH has laid aside his physical form, he has gone from us in life's prime, but his spirit is with God who gave it.

Life must never be estimated, or its worth measured, by longevity. It is wonderful to live a long and useful life. Yet, we know that there are some, like our deceased friend, who live more in 40 years than some others live in 9 decades. Again I say, he lived intensely, he lived enthusiastically, he lived and served and attained great heights. Now he lives a fuller, happier and more abundant life than any of us can ever know on this earth.

No word of mine can add to or detract from the luster of his name, nor from the high opinion which all people had who knew him. His life is his greatest eulogy, and his achievements will live as a memorial unto him for ever.

I know that all of you join with me in expressing our sincere and deep sympathy with Mrs. Thomson, her boys, the parents and all other members of the bereaved family in the loss which they have sustained. Our prayers will ascend on their behalf, that the peace of God which passes all understanding may keep their hearts and minds now and always.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the passing of KEITH THOMSON will be deeply felt by all of us. His life and his achievements will be an inspiration and our love and affection go out to his loving family who have lost so much. We will miss him here in the House, and Wyoming will lose the services of an outstanding citizen as their Senator.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion for all of us when the time comes to pay our last respects to the memory of a colleague who is no longer with us.

Usually there is some small consolation in the fact that death has come only after a long and honorable career of service. But there is no such consolation as we speak here now of the life and achievements of KEITH THOMSON, for he left us far too young in years. His was truly an untimely death. It was untimely because it took from the scene of the very important affairs of this great Republic of ours a young man of great promise.

During his three terms in the House KEITH THOMSON distinguished himself as a man of unusual diligence who took his responsibilities with the utmost seriousness. His was a rare combination of energy, talent, and personal charm that won for him widespread admiration and respect. KEITH THOMSON gave to the Congress the same courage that earned him citations for bravery as a young combat officer in World War II. He brought with him to the Congress the same dedication to public service that won for him high honors as a citizen in his hometown of Cheyenne.

His many friends here, while sorry to see him leaving our ranks for a seat in the other body, were happy and proud of his success in the recent election.

Those of us who knew him best were certain that KEITH THOMSON was about to embark on a new series of achievements for the people of Wyoming and the Nation.

It is not for us to question the wisdom of a Divine Providence in mourning the death of our friend.

Having visited with KEITH in Wyoming on several occasions in recent years I feel a particularly personal sense of loss in his passing. KEITH THOMSON'S was indeed a bright star, a star prematurely dimmed by a power that is above us all.

In their bereavement I offer my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and her fine sons and to all of KEITH'S family and friends.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, KEITH THOMSON was one of the best Congressmen I have ever known. I was impressed

with him when he first became a Member of the House of Representatives 6 years ago. I saw in him a man of integrity who was wholly devoted to his job. He was a thorough student of legislation, and I always felt KEITH knew what he was talking about when he took the floor.

It was difficult for us to understand why such a young man, perhaps at the apex of his career, should so suddenly be taken from us. We know it was God's will and so must be reconciled to the loss that is ours. KEITH THOMSON was loved and respected by all those who knew him and we shall miss him in the days ahead. We take consolation in the fact that he served well his day and generation and has left behind him only happy memories of our association together. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and all members of the family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN.]

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand why divine providence in its wisdom sees fit to take from us, and from our beloved Republic, a man of the abilities, the stature, and the capacities of KEITH THOMSON. Those of us who were privileged to serve in the Congress with him know something of his character, and of his good work in behalf of this country of ours. He not only served his Nation in time of peace, when he battled for the principles that have made this country great and strong, but he also served with great distinction on the battlefields of World War II defending this Nation against its foreign enemies.

He was honored by the people of his State by election last November to the Senate of the United States, an honor that seldom comes to a young man of his age. Then, suddenly, death struck him down.

His passing is not only a loss to Wyoming, but a great loss for all the people of America, regardless of political affiliation. We, of Ohio, especially feel that in the passing of KEITH THOMSON, those of us who have worked with him have lost a great friend and a most able leader.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of KEITH THOMSON. KEITH THOMSON fought for our country with great valor in time of war. When he came to the Congress, he continued to fight for the country in a different area of endeavor. He wanted to keep this country strong and free. He became a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and in that capacity he worked hard to keep this country strong and free. I think I have never known a man who worked with greater dedication and intensity than KEITH THOMSON. He had the admiration and respect of those of us who worked with him on this important assignment. He had his feet on the ground, and his heart was with the best interest of our Nation. He put the best interest of the country above partisan considerations. He was able and effective in his work.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of so fine a man as KEITH THOMSON, and I also want to join with you in words of sympathy for his charming wife and family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues, I, too, rise to express my deep regrets over the passing of a wonderful man, KEITH THOMSON.

While with my family on a southern vacation during the holidays, I picked up a newspaper to note his untimely passing. This shocked me because here was a young man, vigorous, energetic, so full of life, yet at the age of 40 years taken from us at the height of his career.

In the 6 years he was a Member of this body I had close association with him. As the party whip it was always a pleasure to sit down and talk with him about pending issues under discussion and to be voted on. He often presented fresh ideas. He invariably had something new to offer. It was enlightening to get his thinking as he approached what he was about to do on various questions.

I knew of no man I would rather call a friend than KEITH THOMSON. Having served his Nation on the battlefield and in the House of Representatives, he was elected U.S. Senator last November. He was a man of real ability and felt the Senate would provide him with a larger opportunity for service to his State and the country.

To his wonderful family, his wife and his boys, I express my heartfelt sympathy. May God bless them in their time of sorrow.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound shock that I learned of the death of KEITH THOMSON. Here was a dynamic personality cut down at the very threshold of his greatest potentialities. He was one of America's great young leaders. Here was a man who enjoyed the confidence and friendship of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It was my pleasure to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations and on the Defense Subcommittee of that great committee. He was always fair, objective, and able, and his contributions were very important to the work of the committee and the Congress. It has been my privilege to visit in his home and to enjoy the warm hospitality which was always extended there. I considered him a close personal friend whom I shall miss very much indeed. I know his family and I share in their grief. I extend my earnest and heartfelt sympathy to each of them in the great loss which they and our Nation have sustained.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and unselfish services of the late KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming. I was shocked when I heard the news of his untimely death, which cut short an outstanding career at a time when our distinguished colleague was about to enter on a new and challenging phase of that career. Our late coworker served as a colleague on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a number of years and I came to know him there for his sincerity in working for what he believed was right and for his fairness in considering the views of those who might happen to differ with him.

In the last session of the 86th Congress, it was KEITH THOMSON who contributed greatly to the successful work of the House in amending the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. This was a service of love and dedication for he was at that time a member of the Committee on Appropriations rather than a member of the committee handling the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and my fellow Members of the House from the Rocky Mountain area especially and the Nation generally, join in expressing our heartfelt sorrow at the loss of a great public servant from the West. Mrs. Aspinall and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the boys in their loss of a fine husband and a proud father.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the death of KEITH THOMSON removes from our midst a talented legislator with great promise of a long career of public service. It is rare to find one so young who has achieved promise in so many fields as our former colleague. An outstanding military record, a successful law practice, and a brilliant record in the House of Representatives, marked him as a man destined for leadership in the Senate to which he had been elected.

I was shocked to hear of his untimely passing and I am saddened at his loss not only because he was a distinguished public servant, but because he was a close personal friend. I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to KEITH THOMSON as one who gave much to his country and express my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I join the gentleman from Wyoming and our other colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of KEITH THOMSON.

KEITH THOMSON and I came to Congress within a few months of each other. We, as well as our families, became warm personal friends. Geographically we are separated by many thousands of miles; politically we sat on opposite sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives, and yet I know I gained a great deal from working with him as a Member of this body. He was an able, conscientious, and hard-working Member of the House.

KEITH THOMSON was a distinguished soldier in time of war; KEITH THOMSON was an outstanding citizen and public servant in time of peace. I like to think that his native State of Wyoming is a better place because of the contributions he made during his lifetime. He was the kind of man who inspires the confidence of his fellows in this body. He was a devoted husband and father.

His State has lost a distinguished son. We have lost a fine and able colleague. Our Nation has lost a loyal and patriotic citizen.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending to Mrs. Thomson and her sons our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last November 9, when the election results were made known, I looked forward to rising in the House and paying tribute to a valued friend who, as the 87th Congress convened, would be taking his seat in the U.S. Senate. It still seems incredible that the tribute I make today is not one of heartfelt good wishes to a strong young soldier going forward in the cause of freedom.

During World War II KEITH THOMSON fought, with many honors, to preserve American liberty. Returning home, he recognized the need of fighting to assure an American future of freedom and vitality firmly anchored on the steadfast rock of our Constitution. With the vigor of his youth, the brilliance of his insight into historic truths, he was well armed to do battle for the living Constitution.

I never knew KEITH THOMSON to qualify, or apologize for, his faith in the continued ability of Americans to determine freely their own and their Nation's destinies. I never knew KEITH THOMSON to bow to political expediency. And I knew KEITH THOMSON well. We met as freshmen in the 84th Congress, were active members of the 84th club. At the beginning of the 86th Congress, both of us were named to the House Committee on Appropriations and sat next to one another in the Defense Department Subcommittee. KEITH THOMSON was a skilled and imaginative legislator, diligent in performing his duties. He was a warm and loyal friend.

No man is without his faults. KEITH THOMSON'S only fault was that he worked too hard. It cost our Nation a great leader.

KEITH THOMSON died in the triumph of knowing that the citizens of his State of Wyoming had given him an overwhelming mandate to carry the battle for freedom to the U.S. Senate. He died in the knowledge that his was a righteous and a live cause. He leaves a living memorial. In his brief 41 years, this remarkable young man wrote a noble record of courage and faith in the United States which will inspire men to carry his battleflag so long as American liberty is cherished.

To Thyra Thomson, his charming wife, who stood so closely at his side in all his endeavors, and to his three sons, Mrs. Minshall and I extend our deepest sympathies in a loss we deeply share.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when KEITH THOMSON became a member of the Committee on Appropriations we put him to work upon the most important measures that the Appropriations Committee has to handle, namely, the military establishments appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMSON took a very active part in the hearings that we held and I believe that his work did more than anything else to clear up the missile situation with which our country was and is faced.

He went along to other subjects that came before that committee, and did a magnificent job.

In my opinion, his was one of the most brilliant intellects I have ever seen. The energy and the foresights that KEITH THOMSON had made him an exceedingly valuable Member of the Congress. We lose too many Members of that kind.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our departed colleague, KEITH THOMSON. I was in my district when I learned of his untimely passing from a friend who said he heard the report over the radio. I thought it was a mistake, and I could not believe it was true.

I was greatly shocked and saddened over the passing of KEITH THOMSON. He had enjoyed a brilliant career. I enjoyed my association with KEITH THOMSON and was happy to have him as a friend. We had many visits together on matters of mutual interest to Colorado and Wyoming. KEITH did a tremendous job in looking after the interests of the people of his State. I have never seen a more devoted public servant.

I remember when KEITH came to Congress, and how anxious he was to be a good Congressman. He was diligent in all that he did, and I have never seen a harder worker.

I recall that KEITH was interested in oil and gas matters that particularly affected his State of Wyoming. I remember how thoroughly he prepared his statements on legislation which he presented, and which was passed by Congress. He spent a great deal of time and effort in making sure that he presented all of the facts to the committee and to the House. KEITH took great pride in his work, and was enthusiastic in all that he did.

KEITH was also interested in matters relating to agriculture, and I recall his concern over the extension of the Sugar Act in the closing days of the 86th Congress.

There can be no better proof of esteem in which he was held by his people than the splendid vote of confidence he received last November when he was elected to the U.S. Senate. I never saw KEITH after the election, but he must have been very proud over that vote.

KEITH THOMSON was a great American. He was fearless, and he was independent. He did what he thought was right regardless of what others might think. We need more men like KEITH THOMSON in public life today.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I served with KEITH THOMSON on the Committee on Appropriations. In my judgment he was indeed the perfect public servant. Wrapped up in his personality and character were all of the attributes that go to make up an outstanding legislator. He did his job thoroughly, with great ability, absolutely devoid of partisan blindness; his incisiveness was a delight to behold.

Wyoming can be proud, so very proud, of the magnificent, indelible impression he left on the minds and hearts of all those with whom he served in this House and all those he met in his lifetime. The Nation can be proud of the great public service he rendered during his years in the war, his years in the service of the State of Wyoming, and his all too short career here in Washington.

I am privileged to join in this eloquent and moving tribute to a very great and dedicated American. I express my deepest sympathy to his loving wife and devoted children.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of our colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, was indeed a shock to the Nation and particularly to us in the West. He had made his mark in the Halls of Congress. He was energetic, a hard worker, and was determined to represent the good people of the State of Wyoming. Wyoming and the rest of the Nation will miss him in the future. I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the family.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I was shocked to learn of the death of KEITH THOMSON. He was a young man, full of vigor and activity, and was esteemed most highly by all who knew him. His work here was of the highest quality. He was diligent, active, forthright; a great legislator. We were proud and happy when he was elected to the Senate of the United States and wished him a great career there. He will be missed here. He will be missed in Wyoming. He will be missed wherever people knew him.

Mrs. Adair and I express our most sincere sympathy to his wonderful family.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the expressions that have been made here today with

regard to our late friend, KEITH THOMSON. It was my privilege to serve with KEITH on the Committee on Appropriations and on the same subcommittee. While he was a loyal party man, he was first of all an American, and as an American he was interested always in his own ideas as to what was sound, and he had the courage to pursue those views to the end. It is not given to us mortals to understand why a man of his age should be taken, but in comfort, perhaps, we can recall the words that have been said before: It is given to some men to do far greater work in a short period of years than it is to others who may live twice as long. Truly it can be said that KEITH THOMSON accomplished more and set as fine an example for the rest of us in the Congress and in these United States in 41 years than many people have in 82. To his beloved family we extend our deepest sympathy. To his boys we say that no father could have left a finer example, and all can take comfort in the good deeds that KEITH THOMSON did. Truly, in a short period, he set a high standard for those that might live twice as long.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to come to the Congress in the same year that KEITH THOMSON came here. I soon found that he was one of the men that I automatically wanted to know better, because he was that kind of person. We had the opportunity to begin to learn the ropes; to learn the operations of Congress together. I came to respect KEITH THOMSON very greatly because of the fact he was the type of man that he was. In the 6 years he served here in the House he demonstrated to all the Members what an effective job a person can do to represent the people of his State and of the Nation. He never worried about time, because time was no object except to serve the people of his district and the people of the Nation. I think all of us came to respect him for his devoted feeling toward his country. Mrs. Baldwin joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and her children in their great loss.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be remiss in my duties as a Member of this great legislative body if I did not join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great, late resident of the State of Wyoming. On his arrival in Washington 6 years ago, and on his appearance on the floor of the House, he immediately alined himself with a large group of the Congress interested in making some basic changes in our trade policies. He was sincere and devoted to this idea during his entire service in the House. The fact that the good people of his State placed their confidence in him in the recent election in electing him to membership in the other body is proof of the greatness of this man. I want to join my other colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and the children.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in tribute to KEITH THOMSON. During his three terms in the House of Representatives he gave us ample opportunity to know that both on account of legislative ability and qualities of mind he was destined for a successful and useful future political career.

We admired his talents; we respected his personal character and we held him dear as a friend. Everything about KEITH, his steadfastness in support of his convictions, his unwavering determination in behalf of those ideas and ideals in which he believed, seemed to single him out for successful public service to a degree seldom given to younger men in political life.

Especially I recall my association with KEITH on the House Republican policy committee. There so often he expressed his views and forcefully upheld his always strong convictions. There, I remember it was I first heard him confirm his intention to seek a seat in the U.S. Senate. Nor have I forgotton my immediate reaction. It was that if elected no one of the younger Members of the House could more capably serve in that high office. I thought at once of what a splendid contribution KEITH would make there to the national welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Members of the House, whenever they listened to KEITH as he spoke in this Chamber, must have felt, as I did, his force and vigor and logic in discussing a cause close to his heart. That I generally agreed with him in controversial issues may have added to my high opinion, but truly I believe those not sharing his views respected him equally for his high intellectual integrity and the obvious sincerity of his argument. Also, even in a sometimes fierce moment of a debate, he never failed to reveal a friendly glint in his eye. He let his opponents feel his respect and understanding of their opposing viewpoint.

At a time like this, Mr. Speaker, when the 87th Congress is in process of organization one feels especially how sad and unfortunate it was that KEITH THOMSON never lived to enjoy the fruit of his hard earned final political victory. Only those elected to high public office can fully appreciate the misfortune of his not being able to take his oath of office and feel with due pride the full honor accorded him by the people of the great State of Wyoming.

Yet, sad as that is, the real misfortune, it seems to me, is the loss to the Nation—the loss of KEITH'S future service to our beloved country. KEITH THOMSON'S sudden death, indeed, has deprived the United States of a devoted and dedicated patriot. In the silencing of his voice and the stilling of his mind and body lies the real tragedy, for he had important work to do. The Nation can ill afford his death.

We, KEITH'S friends and associates, Mr. Speaker, feel a personal sense of grief, and yet we have happy memories and much to be thankful for. In this latter respect, I am sure that in our association with KEITH THOMSON in this House we gained inspiration in such total measure that our resultant higher ideals and efforts for better government individually and collectively will compensate somewhat and help to fill the great individual void left by his absence. I am sure, too, such is what our departed friend and colleague would want as a memorial to his public service.

Meanwhile, to his widow, Mrs. Thomson, and his family of loved ones, I express for myself and my wife our deep sympathy. May the memory of a fine husband and devoted father serve to comfort them in their present adversity and at length sustain them with due pride in the years ahead.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the news that the Grim Reaper had struck down KEITH THOMSON at the moment of his greatest political triumph came as a profound shock to all of us who had worked so closely with him in Congress.

Among the able men with whom I have had the privilege of working in the House of Representatives, KEITH THOMSON will always take high rank. He was a gentleman and a scholar. Whenever he chose to take the floor for a discussion of legislative proposals, he received close attention because all of his colleagues knew that he would have something important and constructive to say.

KEITH THOMSON was one of the hardest working members of the House Committee on Appropriations and brought to his service thereon a fine, legal mind which enabled him to separate the wheat from the chaff and cut through the underbrush to the essentials.

The sadness of his passing is dampened somewhat by the realization that he has left legacies more valuable than material things—to his district, his State, and his Nation, a record of service in war and in peace, which time will never erase, and to his sons a good name—"a monument more lasting than brass."

I join KEITH THOMSON'S many friends in expressing profound sorrow over his untimely death and to his dear wife and fine sons my sincere sympathy over the great loss they have suffered. It is my hope and prayer that time will deal gently with them and that they will find the faith and strength to face the inevitable without bitterness, in the realization that a host of friends and admirers mourn with them over the passing of this great American.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as with other Members of the House I was shocked and saddened by the sudden death of our colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, on December 9, 1960. Not only had the Nation lost a valuable public servant but I personally had lost a good and valued friend.

I felt particularly close to KEITH THOMSON because he and I entered the

Congress on the same day and had, throughout our three terms in the House, served on the same committees. In addition we had a community of interest in that his great State of Wyoming borders on my own State of Nebraska and we share many mutual problems.

All of these ties bound KEITH THOMSON and me close together during our terms in Congress.

KEITH was a product of our times. He was young, vigorous, and capable. He represented ably the viewpoint of his constituents and his State. He fought vigorously for principles and ideals.

KEITH was born in Lancaster, Wyo., in 1919. He graduated from the Wyoming Law School in 1941 and almost immediately entered the Army to fight bravely and with distinction during World War II. He was decorated for valor in Italy and won the Purple Heart. He was noted as the youngest battalion commander in the Army by the time the war came to an end. He rose rapidly to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

After leaving the service he entered private law practice in Cheyenne and became active in civic affairs and politics. He ran for and was elected to the Wyoming Legislature in 1950 and served in that body for two terms. In 1954 he ran for Congress on the Republican ticket and was elected.

Mr. Speaker, all of us here know of his record from that point on. He showed keen interest and insight into the problems of the veterans of our Nation. He showed interest and a great deal of knowledge about the water and natural resource development problems of the Middle and Far West.

His capabilities came to the attention of the leadership on our side of the aisle and Mr. THOMSON was appointed to the House Committee on Appropriations. There he served faithfully and well and brought to that committee a broad knowledge and great commonsense.

His record in the Congress so impressed the people of his home State of Wyoming that KEITH THOMSON was this past fall elected to the U.S. Senate. He is the first man in history in the State of Wyoming to have moved from the House of Representatives to the U.S. Senate, another noteworthy achievement for one so young.

I would, at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to extend to his wife and fine family my own condolences and those of Mrs. Weaver. Although we have lost a good friend and the Nation a fine public servant, they have lost a devoted and loving husband and father.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks before returning to Washington a news bulletin flashed on the television screen in my home. It brought to me the sad and saddening news of the passing of a dear friend, KEITH THOMSON. I had known KEITH THOMSON during the 4 years I worked with him here in the Congress, and I had come to appreciate him not only as a capable legislator and as a man with a great military background, but, most of all, as a true gentleman in every sense of the word.

I think it was particularly shocking that one who had just earned the victory that had come to him at the polls in his State should have his life taken in the very midst of the joy that so many felt for the great victory that he had earned at the polls. But, those of us who knew him and appreciated him and loved him can really take comfort in the fact that even though he was denied the earthly joys of this great victory at the polls, through his life, service, and his Christian character he has earned the even greater victory to which mortal man should aspire.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in expressing to Mrs. Thomson and their fine sons our deep sense of sorrow we felt and still continue to feel by reason of the passing of this great and good man.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many, many times in the last 6 years that I have risen on the floor of the House and in personal conversation to pay tribute to KEITH THOMSON. It is certainly with profound sorrow that I find myself paying tribute today and that he is not among us to hear it or to hear of it. Like several others of my colleagues who have preceded me here today, I came to the House in the 84th Congress, the same year as KEITH THOMSON. Irrespective of the social circles, Mr. Speaker, that we find ourselves joining—irrespective, I think, of our committee assignments, or irrespective of almost anything else, we naturally find ourselves just a little closer to those Members who join this body in the same year that we did. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I have had a continuing and a very pleasant relationship with KEITH THOMSON. I visited his home both in Washington and in Cheyenne, Wyo. I think on the basis of my privilege of being a guest in his home on numerous occasions and on the basis of the experience I have had of serving with him, perhaps in this short time after his passing I can put into perspective some of the outstanding characteristics of our departed colleague from Wyoming. I think, further, they may have been touched upon already, but I would just like to recite them again for you. One of the most outstanding characteristics of KEITH THOMSON was his fearlessness. That was demonstrated on the field of battle as well as in the area of legislative debate right here in the well of this House. Never once did KEITH retract from a position that he thought was right, not only to vote for it, but to stand here in the well of the House and fight for it. If there is one important characteristic of a statesman, that would be it. On some occasions, I might add, it probably was not politically expedient for him to take that very firm position.

Another outstanding characteristic of KEITH THOMSON was his great capacity for work. I think that has already been pretty well covered here today.

I would like to point out one unique aspect of his dedication to his work. As I recall, there are only three Members of this House who represent States having only one Member in this particular body. So on that basis those three Members have more work to do than anybody else. Not only do they usually have a larger geographical area to represent, but they have all the problems affecting that State, and it becomes their responsibility to represent them, not only in this Chamber but with the agencies and committees as well. I would say in that particular respect whereas most of us have one or more associates in this House, there are two Members in the other body. In the case of the Congressman from Wyoming, he has all the responsibility in this body as compared with other Members representing a portion of their States in this body.

The third characteristic I want to mention is the deep love and affection which KEITH THOMSON felt for his family. Despite his workload, for which we have already paid tribute, he never found himself so busy that he did not have all the time it required to accompany his boys or his wife to any function that he felt was of importance to their family circle. I think that is a symbol we like to see in every American family today.

KEITH THOMSON'S service to his country, both in war and in the Congress of the United States, and as a father and husband has become a symbol of our great American institution that we could call the ideal family man.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too share the sorrow of many of the Members of this House today on the passing of KEITH THOMSON. He was an outstanding young man, cut down in the very prime of his life. He rendered to the people of this great Nation of ours a service way beyond the call of duty. Wyoming and the Nation have lost a man who showed great promise of rising to great heights in the councils of this Nation.

I knew KEITH THOMSON as many of you have. I visited in his home in his home State and here in Washington during his service in the Congress. I am sure that any person coming into contact with that fine man certainly must feel a sense of loss in his untimely passing.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, join with my colleagues today in paying my last respects to a man who I think above all things loved his family and his State. He also loved his Nation and he loved the institutions which have made us a great nation.

I join with the other Members in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his fine family in their great loss—a loss that is shared by all of us here in the Congress and by the whole Nation which he loved so well.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been said today about KEITH THOMSON, but considering his dedication, his Americanism, and his integrity, certainly not too much. Indeed,

not enough could be said in respect to the memory of this great man.

KEITH THOMSON was my friend, and I loved him. I was in his house as he was in mine. I campaigned with him in the State of Wyoming. I know of no man in the scope of my entire acquaintance who had more dedication, more integrity, more unselfishness, more principle than did KEITH THOMSON. This was demonstrated on the field of battle and in the Halls of this Congress. The State of Wyoming, this House of Representatives, indeed our country is better off today because KEITH THOMSON passed this way.

Mr. Speaker, my wife joins with me in extending to Mrs. Thomson and her family our sincerest, and, indeed, our profound sympathy.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of the day KEITH THOMSON passed away, I dictated a letter conveying an invitation for him to address an important gathering in the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia. The invitation was initiated by a group of men and women, none of whom had ever met the Senator-elect personally. However, all of them knew him by reputation and admired what they knew.

I knew him personally. I knew him intimately. I knew him fondly. KEITH was one of that select group of public servants who methodically, quietly, and without fanfare devote themselves to the painstaking detail and the careful, meticulous thought and deed which turn the wheels of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Not given to much talk, his words always carried the ring of conviction. He was a persuasive advocate.

As a soldier, a lawyer, a statesman, a husband, and a father, KEITH THOMSON left footprints on the sands of time. Upon his bereaved ones I invoke the blessing and comfort of the Creator.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, this was indeed a tremendous shock to all of us in the House of Representatives, but in particular it was a shock to those of us who came in with KEITH THOMSON as neophyte Congressmen at the beginning of the 84th Congress, and I would now like to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his three surviving sons in their hours of sorrow.

This is one of those young men who came out of the West to serve his Nation. He was firmly devoted to his country in time of war and completely dedicated to it in time of peace. This man was truly a prince among men. On one occasion, King David said to his servants upon the happening of the death of Abner: "Know ye not that there is fallen a prince and a great man this day in Israel." And so we ourselves now note that upon the death of KEITH THOMSON there fell a prince and a great man of our country, one who was high in intellectual attainments, totally dedicated to the service of his country in time of peace, and also zealously patriotic in time of war.

Life is quite a mystery and we do not understand it. The poet said:

Life, I know not what thou art, but know
that thou and I must part;
And when or where or how we met, I own
to me is a secret yet.
But this I know, when thou art fled, where
e'er they lay these limbs, this head,
No clod so valueless shall be as all that then
remains of me.
Life, we have been long together through
pleasant and through cloudy weather;
'Tis hard to part when friends are dear, perhaps 'twil cost a sigh, a tear;
Then steal away, give little warning, choose
thine own time;
Say not goodnight, but in some brighter
clime bid me good morning.

And so even though we have had to bid this young man of the West goodbye, we feel that in God's good hour we shall bid him good morning in a life immortal that shall know no end.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, some men have the ability to write and speak words at a time like this which are in proper tribute to the memory of a departed colleague. Lacking that ability I shall not attempt to do so now, lest my words fall short of what KEITH THOMSON'S memory deserves.

I shall say only this: We will never know a more honorable man nor a finer individual than was KEITH THOMSON.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, KEITH THOMSON was one of our outstanding young Republican leaders and he will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him and served with him.

It was my privilege to get to know KEITH soon after he was elected to the 84th Congress, and to quickly learn that he was an able, sincere, and dedicated legislator.

Having served with distinction in World War II as a commander of troops in the field, KEITH THOMSON displayed in his work in the House the reasons why he was chosen for such military leadership.

He was not a compromiser. He believed that nothing short of right was right. He was firm, tough, yet understanding of human problems.

KEITH was in his proper element in his most recent committee work in the House. Serving as he did on a Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, he was firm in the stand he took for a strong Defense Establishment. He was particularly interested in the ballistic missile program and his incisive questions in committee showed this keen and searching desire to improve our ICBM capability.

Most importantly, KEITH THOMSON was a true and steadfast personal friend. He was always willing and eager to help his colleagues in their problems.

KEITH will long be remembered in the House of Representatives. And, I am sure the people of Wyoming who honored him with such a resounding vote of confidence by electing him to the Senate of the United States will remember him, too.

To his widow, Thyra, and their three fine sons, my wife joins in extending sympathy and condolences.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was a profound shock to me, and it is still a shock, to contemplate the passing of my very good friend KEITH THOMSON. In his passing the U.S. Congress has been deprived of one of the most capable men ever to grace this Hall and one of the most able men who would ever have served in the other body across the Capitol.

All of the things which have been said by our colleagues concerning this fine man are true, and in a measure beyond belief. I do not have the eloquence to add to them, and I do not intend to try.

I merely want to say that my own personal feelings about KEITH THOMSON are those of one friend to another. The quality of friendship is, I suppose, a nebulous one in many ways, but when you analyze it you realize that to be a good friend you must be loyal, you must possess integrity, and over and above that you must possess the emotional ability to feel an affection toward your fellow man.

A person who has good friends must be a good friend. KEITH THOMSON had many good friends. He possessed all of the qualities of friendship which made it possible that he would have good friends. He had friends not only in the House of Representatives but also in his own home city and in his own home State. I do not think I have ever seen a group of people so profoundly affected by the passing of one man as was the group of people who attended the funeral of our departed colleague in Cheyenne, Wyo. I do not think I have ever known as many people who have expressed to me regret at the passing of any individual as have expressed that regret at the passing of KEITH, and during his lifetime I do not know of anyone who held the approbation and good will of as many people not only at home but in all parts of the country as he did. He was my friend, and his wife and his sons certainly will fall heir to the friendship which I felt toward KEITH.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in wishing them all the best in the future and in assuring them that anything which they desire or need which is within our power to give, they will possess.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I mourn with the lovely widow and with the family of the late Congressman KEITH THOMSON. I also mourn with his own great State of Wyoming. The people of this wonderful State, his beautiful, smiling homeland, have lost a tremendous fighter, a man who believed in fairness, who tried to do right, who fought for justice and hated intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that have been so eloquently stated by those who have preceded me in eulogizing our beloved late colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, of Cheyenne, are in-

deed deserved tributes to a great American and I believe demonstrates in part at least the extent to which he will be sorely missed by those of us who remain to carry on the responsibilities of government affairs. I have been privileged to know and to serve with KEITH THOMSON since the day he came to Congress. During this period I have valued his friendship and admired his professional ability as a legislator and as a leader. You may be assured that the rich memories of those years will always be cherished by Mrs. Belcher and myself.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our departed colleague, KEITH THOMSON, was an extremely close personal friend who made in many fields a tremendous record of public service. During his 6 years as an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives I learned to know KEITH THOMSON intimately and I can say without hesitation or qualification he was a legislator of great skill and competence. He was conscientious, yes too dedicated, because he worked unbelievably long hours and I feel this effort contributed to his premature passing. No Member of Congress ever worked longer hours. It seems tragic that this fine effort to do a better job should perhaps be a factor in the early termination of a great career.

In 1959 and 1960 it was my privilege to serve on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations with KEITH THOMSON. During this 2-year period I was ranking minority member of this group and can say KEITH was a bulwark of strength in strongly defending the sound defense policies of President Eisenhower. He was diligent, consecutive, and experienced in this committee responsibility. He will be badly missed by the members of the Defense subcommittee, both Democrats and Republicans alike, and I have lost a committee colleague whose counsel and support was invaluable.

In 1959 I was invited by KEITH to address a Lincoln Day dinner in Cheyenne, Wyo. It was a wonderful experience to be in KEITH'S home State to see the esteem that came his way from his multitude of friends. He was respected, truly admired by his constituents and this attitude is best evidenced by his successes as a candidate for the House of Representatives and the recent victory as a candidate for the Senate.

KEITH THOMSON'S career was just beginning, but in the years previous he had accomplished much. His military career was beyond comparison. His legislative career was an inspiration for others. In addition he was a man of highest character and reputation.

I will badly miss KEITH because he was one of my best friends. To his wonderful wife and fine three sons, Mrs. Ford and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest shocks I have ever received was as Mrs. Berry and I were returning to Washington. We were driving down the highway when the news was flashed over the radio of the death of KEITH THOMSON. The news struck me as it would had it been my own brother. We almost had to pull off to the side of the road until we could recover.

I have known KEITH since he was in college. My brother and KEITH were very good friends at Black Hills Teachers College in western South Dakota. His family lived in western South Dakota. We became close friends through our service in Congress, primarily because the problems of his State and of my district are so very similar.

Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to what has already been said so very eloquently many, many times here this afternoon. I would simply say that perhaps one of the things that contributed to his untimely death was the fact that in all of his work and in all of his efforts, KEITH had never learned to relax.

Mr. Speaker, KEITH was not only a great legislator, as all of us know who served with him here on the floor of this House, but he was also a loving husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Berry joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and to the boys on this sad occasion.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our beloved colleague and friend, KEITH THOMSON, brought sorrow to all of us who knew him and served with him here in the House of Representatives. I had the opportunity to serve with him not only as a Member of the House but also as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and in particular as a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee.

I admired KEITH THOMSON as a man, as a legislator, and as a friend.

There are many tributes that could be paid to KEITH. We have heard many here on the floor of the House today. There is one tribute, though, that I think KEITH truly deserves. It is a tribute that really expresses how great an American KEITH was. KEITH was genuine. He was genuine in all his thinking and in all his doings. He was a man of genuine convictions, with great courage to express and stand by those convictions.

I wish to join my colleagues in these tributes to KEITH THOMSON, and to express again my sympathy and the sympathy of my wife and family to his beloved wife, Thyra, and to their three fine sons.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there are times when words are futile and when one feels inadequate to the challenge when situations like this present themselves, but commonsense and decency dictate that we must say or do something even though what we say or do is inadequate.

I, like many, came here with KEITH THOMSON in 1955. In our daily and intimate associations I learned early to respect him and honor him and love him. His sudden and untimely passing was indeed a shock to me and to all who knew him.

I am glad to join my colleagues today in paying tribute, and I might say well deserved tribute, to KEITH THOMSON, to a friend, to a fine public servant, to a great American who in 6 years here in the Congress earned for himself and his State and the country the exalted title of a statesman. He was respected and loved by all who knew him.

In this Congress as a legislator he always considered what was best for the country first, what was best for his State second, and what was best for his party third. This is the order in which all of us I think should consider the issues and problems that come before this body.

In his presentations he was always able and intelligent, always precise and logical. He served his State and his Nation very, very well.

Somehow a quotation from Thomas Jefferson comes to mind just now that I think is appropriate. Mr. Jefferson was asked one time about the things that are most important to observe in life. He said, after a few preliminary remarks to this friend of his:

> Few words will be necessary with good disposition on your part. Adore God, reverence and cherish your parents, love your neighbor as yourself and your country more than yourself.

I believe KEITH THOMSON'S life and his work was a testimony to the fact that he loved his country more than himself.

Probably because of my interest in Abraham Lincoln and because I know of his interest in this great American and his part in bringing into being a great and appropriate memorial to Abraham Lincoln in his State, the lines of a great American poet of that era come to mind, and they apply also. They are:

> Here is a man who posed against the world, a man to match the mountains and the sea.

I know no greater tribute that can be given to a man than to say that he will be missed, and most surely KEITH THOMSON will be missed. Mrs. Schwengel and I want to express our extreme sorrow and regret in his passing, and to extend our sincere and deep sympathy to the people he represented so well and to his beloved and fine family.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this body knows that KEITH THOMSON was a capable, honest, and sincere legislator, representing his district and his country well. There is but little I can add to the tributes that have already been paid to KEITH THOMSON, but there is one thing which to me was always outstanding about him. I have never known a man who was more courageous and a harder fighter for the things that he believed were right. But I have never seen a kinder man in public life. Even on the floor of the House when debate might get rather vigorous and heated, KEITH, while forceful and articulate in voicing his

views, there was never a barb or any indication of bitterness toward anyone in any statement made by him. I never heard KEITH THOMSON say an unkind, mean, or vicious thing about anyone. He was in every respect a capable legislator and a gentleman. I deeply appreciate my 6 years of association with him. He will be greatly missed on Capitol Hill. I want to express my deep sympathy to his lovely family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, having consumed the time allotted to me, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of KEITH THOMSON was a tremendous shock to me. Although my association with KEITH was not intimate, seldom did a day pass while Congress was in session that I did not chat with him on the floor of the House or in the cloakroom, where we very often had lunch. His deep and sincere interest in all legislative matters was always evident. The thorough manner in which he carried out his committee assignments was a challenge to all of us. His desire to become a U.S. Senator was one of his great ambitions, and we had discussed it several times. With this ambition achieved, the good Lord saw fit to remove him from our midst before he had an opportunity to serve his country in that capacity. Although he will not be with us in person, the imprint of his association with us as a man of great character, courage, and friendly spirit will remain. I shall always cherish having known him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family. May the good Lord give them supporting strength in their hour of great loss.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to our late colleague, KEITH THOMSON, and in expressing heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

I was aware of the extraordinary energy, determination, and zeal KEITH devoted to his work as Representative from the State of Wyoming and to his successful campaign for the Senate. The abrupt and untimely end to his brilliant career in public service gives us all pause and rudely reminds us of the tenuousness of the thread of existence.

I share the grief of his family, his friends, and his constituents in Wyoming who chose KEITH to be their spokesman in the U.S. Senate and join in testifying to the high character of one whose service, though abbreviated, was outstanding.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress who were privileged to serve with KEITH THOMSON are saddened by his recent passing. He was a young man of great promise. That he delivered in large measure on that promise in his 6 years as a Member of the House of Representatives was attested to by the voters of Wyoming in electing him on November 8, 1960, to the Senate of the United States.

It can be said of KEITH THOMSON that in all his endeavors he was a standout. Seldom does the electorate send to the Congress a Representative as well qualified by experience in such a variety of important fields. He was a lawyer, a university instructor, one recognized by the junior chamber of commerce as the outstanding young man in his community, a respected member of the Wyoming Legislature, and also a highly decorated hero of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, in extending to the members of KEITH THOMSON'S family my deepest sympathy, I want them to know that KEITH was held in the highest respect and affection by his colleagues. The tragedy of his untimely loss is felt by us all. We will always cherish the memory of his friendship.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the richly merited tributes which my colleagues have already paid to KEITH THOMSON other than to record my own profound sorrow and sense of loss at his most untimely passing and to proffer the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Johansen and myself to his loved ones.

Mr. THOMSON first became a Member of this House the same day that I did, on January 3, 1955. He was an exceptionally able Member and a devoted adherent to fundamental constitutional principles.

The poignancy of his death is, of course, greatly heightened by his comparative youth and by the fact that he was on the threshold of a new and immensely promising career as a Member of the other body.

We can only accept with humble faith the dispensations of Providence, grateful that we have had the privilege of his friendship and association and determined to carry on in the performance of our own duties with the same high purpose and dedication KEITH THOMSON exemplified so splendidly.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our good colleague, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON grieves me deeply.

I had learned early in his membership here in the House of his dedication to duty as a Representative of the good people of Wyoming and the Nation.

I urged that he be made a member of the Appropriations Committee and then as a member of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations of which I am ranking Republican, because he was a stanch conservative, and would fight with all his power against wasteful spending of the people's tax dollar and because of his unlimited knowledge of the problems which affected the Great Plains area which he loved with an abiding faith.

KEITH proved to be a most valuable member of that committee—able, honest, and attentive to duty.

Like his multitude of friends and admirers in and out of Congress, I shall miss this great and good statesman, KEITH THOMSON. My heart goes out to his devoted loving wife and family.

God rest his soul.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Colorado, which I represent, borders on our friendly neighboring State of Wyoming and long prior to my entrance into this congressional campaign, I had the opportunity and honor of meeting and admiring KEITH THOMSON.

As has been said here so eloquently by others, he was a dedicated American who not only defended his country and our ideals in World War II in active combat, but carried his enthusiasm and drive to preserve our American form of government into his political life.

On one occasion I approached him on a matter which concerned many Colorado residents and a small Wyoming company. He knew immediately of the company, grasped an extremely complex problem in a very few minutes and assisted us in taking necessary steps to solve the problem. All of this occurred near adjournment of a session when tremendous pressure was being faced by all Members, but he was unfailingly courteous, determined to prevent unnecessary Government interference and available for conferences at all hours of several very difficult days for counsel and advice.

The toll on his strength which such dedication took has created an irreparable loss to his State, to the West, and to the country. On behalf of good government, on behalf of the residents of Colorado, and on behalf of all the citizens to whom he had been a Representative, a friend, a counselor, I wish to add my thanks and to extend my deepest sympathies to his family.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on this day when we pay tribute to our colleague, KEITH THOMSON, whose untimely death has brought such sadness to all of us, I am thinking, too, of the fine family he leaves behind him. I wish most of all that I could find some words of comfort and inspiration for them. The Nation, the State of Wyoming, and we, the Members of Congress, have lost a dedicated public servant with the passing of KEITH, but Thyra has lost a beloved husband, and those three fine boys have lost a wonderful father. When a man has given so many years of his life to the service of his country in both military service and public office, surely the inspiration he leaves behind him for family and friends and colleagues can temper the bitterness of that loss. God entrusts to all of us a role to play in protecting our freedom, and, as an unusually able Member of Congress, KEITH THOMSON played his role with skill and honor. To me, he was typical of the western area of America which he so well represented. He was outspoken and vigorous, courageous, and he was as uncompromising with himself as he was with the truth. Perhaps his life stands to teach us all to be more concerned with how well we live, rather than how long. And this is a very proud heritage to leave to that beloved and fine family of his.

I should like to include in this eulogy something that those three young sons of KEITH'S might read one of these days, and find the comfort in it that I did when I lost my own father some years ago. It is a letter written by Abraham

Lincoln—a man whom KEITH greatly admired—to a young girl on the death of her father back in 1862:

DEAR FANNY: It is with deep regret that I learn of the death of your kind and brave father; and, especially, that it is affecting your young heart beyond what is common in such cases. In this sad world of ours sorrow comes to all; and, to the young, it comes with bitterest agony, because it takes them unawares. The older have learned ever to expect it. I am axious to afford some alleviation of your present distress. Perfect relief is not possible, except with time. You cannot now realize that you will ever feel better. Is not this so? And yet it is a mistake. You are sure to be happy again. To know this, which is certainly true, will make you some less miserable now. I have had experience enough to know what I say, and you need only to believe it, to feel better at once. The memory of your dear father, instead of an agony, will yet be a sad sweet feeling in your heart, of a purer, and holier sort than you have known before.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, KEITH THOMSOM'S untimely passing is a sad blow to individual liberty and constitutional government. KEITH THOMSON was dedicated to the principles and ideals that made this Nation great. He was devoted to the free-enterprise system, to a minimum of bureaucracy and big government.

He always placed the welfare of the United States before any political consideration. He had courage. He was a statesman, a great American, and warm personal friend.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson, his children, the State of Wyoming, and freedom-loving Americans everywhere.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have known KEITH THOMPSON well during all the time he has been a Member of this body.

It is rare that one so young in years should be so wise in action. KEITH THOMSON not only knew where he was going, but knew how to get there. The intensity of his drive and the sincerity of his belief led him many places where others would fear to tread.

For his constituents, nothing was too small if he believed it ought to be done. He was never afraid to oppose popular opinions or projects if he believed they were unwise in the public interest.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he vigorously opposed matters that he believed were not in the long-term interest of his State or his Nation.

Personally, KEITH THOMSON was vigorous and physically active. He liked the outdoors. The great State of Wyoming was his happy hunting ground. He loved that State and its people.

It is perhaps unfortunate, and a great loss to the country, that in the prime of his life he should be called by his Maker. His future was one of great promise built on the solid ground of effort which he had made in the years that he had been a Member of this body. We, in the Congress, both in this and the other body, will miss his kind words and his good advice.

To his wife and sons, Mrs. Springer and I extend our deepest sympathy upon a loss so great.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying my most sincere respects to the memory of KEITH THOMSON. KEITH was a dedicated man and his devotion to duty, his clear analysis of every situation, and his love of country were certainly outstanding. Mrs. Horan and I wish to join the others in extending our deep sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and their fine family.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, our Nation lost a great American when our colleague, KEITH THOMSON, was called by his Maker. To me it was also a great personal loss because through our close association I had come to cherish his friendship.

The State of Wyoming recognized the abilities of our late colleague when it saw fit to elect him to the U.S. Senate shortly before his death. His career was studded with public service, and each time he received a new assignment he applied himself to the task before him with all the ability and wisdom at his command. Whether in his country's military service, his legal profession, or the State and Federal legislatures, KEITH THOMSON made it a point to conscientiously devote himself to duty. Little wonder that people of his State admired him so greatly and repeatedly gave him recognition.

I wish to extend my sympathies to the family of our departed colleague.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues at this time to pay my deepest respect to our distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives, the late Senator-elect KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming. All of us I know were shocked and saddened by his untimely death on December 9, 1960.

It was a very distinct privilege to me to have been closely associated with KEITH during his service in the House from the 84th through the 86th Congresses, and to know him as a warm personal friend. During the last Congress we were colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee.

KEITH was a hard working and conscientious Representative, a credit to the State of Wyoming and the Nation. He approached his work with the zeal and dedication of purpose characteristic of outstanding men, which he was.

Tragically, KEITH was taken from us a short month after having been chosen by the people of Wyoming to serve in the U.S. Senate. Had he been granted the privilege of serving in that body, most assuredly he would have done so with great distinction.

My heartfelt sympathies go out to Mrs. Thomson and their three young sons. In their time of grief, I sincerely hope they are able to find some measure of consolation in the fact that the outstanding record of public service of their husband and father will stand to his and their credit always.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of KEITH THOMSON removed from our midst an able and distinguished public servant who served with honor in peace and war.

I had the privilege of meeting KEITH shortly after he entered Congress. He was a dedicated Congressman and it was no surprise to me when I learned of his victorious campaign for the U.S. Senate. I was, however, deeply shocked when I was informed that death had claimed him shortly after this tremendous victory. I shall miss him greatly and I join my colleagues in conveying my sympathy to his family.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, sadness strikes deeply at my heart as I join in paying tribute to our beloved late colleague, KEITH THOMSON of Wyoming.

Those of us who were privileged to know this man admired his brilliance of mind, his fighting spirit, his devotion to people and service, and his steadfastness for the right, as God gave him remarkable vision to see the right.

While I did not serve on any committee with KEITH, I do know that his work and interests were directed toward a great breadth of subject matter. He was, for instance, vitally interested in the problems that came before the House Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, and I valued his counsel on such items as wool and sheep, and on the cattle industry and the domestic beet sugar industry, just to mention a few.

The people of Wyoming held KEITH THOMSON in high regard, as was evidenced by his election in 1960 to the U.S. Senate. I learned of this esteem firsthand when I accepted KEITH'S invitation to speak in Riverton and Torrington, Wyo., in 1959. This turned out to be a very pleasant trip, and it was indeed an exciting and pleasing experience to observe right up close the fine support with which KEITH was honored in his State.

It so happened that last summer I was once again in Torrington. While there I purchased a local newspaper, which contained an exciting report that was written by Mrs. Thomson and told Wyoming folks about some interesting happenings in Washington. I derived considerable pleasure from this article, feeling that here again was more proof that KEITH and Thyra Thomson were indeed a splendid team, one that worked effectively to serve the best interests of the State of Wyoming and the Nation.

It is certainly sad to see a young man taken in the prime of his life, but we who are but mere mortals can never question the wisdom and dictates of our God on high. We can, however, be thankful for the constructive life that was KEITH THOMSON'S, and we will always be grateful for the great gift that is ours—the cherished memory of our friendship.

In concluding my comments, I would like to say that Mrs. McIntire joins me in extending to Thyra and the boys our deepest sympathy.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, The untimely death of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON, again challenges man in his Godly percepts of religious understanding and faith. This noble man loved life and was dedicated to God's purposes on earth—to serve others with a sense of humility and understanding. He labored with an absolute tenseness of courageous action.

He loved human beings and never wavered in defense on their behalf. Whether on the battlefield, in the legislature, the courts, or the Congress, KEITH

THOMSON enjoyed the respect and honor of his fellow citizens.

We suffer from a deeper sadness of heart that, after being victorious in his senatorial campaign, he lost to the omnipotent wisdom of the giver of all victories—the good Lord, "who giveth and taketh away."

His whole ambition was centered on service in the U.S. Senate. This was denied. And so we say, with great regret, that a great man has fallen to his destiny. It is the only answer that we know.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife and family. And may they take strength in the memory of his rich accomplishments and gentle love for his family. The Nation, the State of Wyoming, and the Congress have lost a dedicated statesman and patriot of distinction and honor.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, during my 8 years in the House I have not heard such an outpouring of deserving and sincere testimony as to the character, ability, talent, and capacity of any of our deceased Members as I have heard today from both sides of the aisle concerning the passing of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON.

This spontaneous expression of national, personal, and family loss is an impressive memorial to which I can add nothing, but I can wholeheartedly and with all candor approve everything which has been said. The most difficult prayer to offer is "Thy will, not mine, be done" and it is the one we have the most trouble comprehending.

Mrs. Younger joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Keith Thomson and the sons who have a truly precious birthright.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of KEITH THOMSON, I lost more than a respected and honored colleague. I lost a personal friend for whom I had deep affection.

KEITH and I served together from the day we first came to Congress. We shared many intimate thoughts and discussions of our role here and our attitudes toward the responsibility of the service which the people entrusted to us. In this manner I came to know KEITH THOMSON as one of those rare individuals with a devotion to duty which was almost a fault. He drove himself hard in giving his best to the job in hand.

From combat experience in time of war which we also shared, although in different theaters, we often talked of the sacrifice of those who put love of country and service to mankind above their own self-interest, and many times we wondered at the turn of fate which seemed too soon to take the best, the noblest from us.

That KEITH THOMSON had to leave this life so young in years, cannot help but be a loss to the land he loved and to the people he served so well. But that land and those people are the better, I am sure, because KEITH passed this way. In a way he had a full life. He put so much into it.

To his devoted wife and sons, I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy.

Perhaps the creed which guided KEITH THOMSON could be found in the following lines. written some time ago by a friend of mine:

Calvary, the shadows hastened the end of day,
And those near the Master heard Him say,
"It is finished," He bowed His head,
The soldiers muttered, "He is dead."

Now I, trying to follow in the Master's way,
Lift up my eyes and to my Father say,
My life is thine, take it, Oh God,
That another's path may be less hard to trod.

If I can stoop to lift or ease one single pain,
Or utter one word of beauty that may live again,
Then I may say, when at last I stand alone,
It is finished, Father, I am coming home.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to KEITH THOMSON. We were both elected as freshmen to the 84th Congress, and in the past 6 years I came to regard him as one of the ablest and most respected Members of the House, as well as a close personal friend. When someone like this with a great future before him dies still young, it is indeed tragic. Mrs. Bass joins me in sending Thyra and his three fine boys our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to put words together to express my sorrow over the passing of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON. It would be difficult and repetitious for me to recite all the achievements of this outstanding young man who such a short time ago was one of us here in the House of Representatives. Loving husband and father, patriot, statesman, are attributes that truly belonged to KEITH. That he was a brilliant young man with an enviable record of accomplishment and a great future, no one can deny. It is particularly regrettable that he was not permitted to enjoy serving in the U.S. Senate after his strenuous and successful efforts to become elected.

Because we grew up in the same area of the Great Plains, KEITH and I had much in common. Because we represented people who were livestock producers, our interest in legislation before Congress was almost identical. Because of our background of association with cattle ranching, we perhaps had a feeling of understanding for each other. Whatever may have been the reason, I was drawn to KEITH when I came to Washington as a new Member in the 86th Congress. He did all of those little helpful things for me that an older Member can do for a freshman. Because of his willingness to help others, as well as his dedication to his job as a Representative of the people of Wyoming, I believe it is apparent now that he just tried to do more than the human body can endure.

My wife and I extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and her three boys. Their loss of a husband and father is perhaps tempered in a slight degree by the knowledge of the high esteem in which KEITH was held by those who knew him best.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, along with all other Members who had the good fortune to know him well, I was saddened by the sudden and unexpected death of our colleague, the Honorable E. KEITH THOMSON, who had been elected as a Member of the U.S. Senate beginning with the 87th Congress.

I first came to know KEITH THOMSON when he was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He worked closely with me during his service there and had a real and abiding interest in the welfare of our veterans. He was a hard-working member of our committee and we were all sorry to lose him when he was reassigned to the Committee on Appropriations.

He had a distinguished war record when he commanded the 2d Battalion, 362d Infantry Regiment of the 91st Division during World War II. In addition to winning the Combat Infantryman's Badge, he was awarded the Purple Heart, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star for heroic achievement in action, and the Italian Cross of Valor.

To his lovely wife and his three sons I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss and feel that all of us who were privileged to know him share in this loss as well.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to speak of the passing of our colleague, KEITH THOMSON. We first came to Congress together back in the 84th Congress. I worked with him on many matters, and was deeply appreciative of his profound knowledge of happenings in Congress. He had a deep and sincere interest in the welfare of his country as well as his great State of Wyoming. He had a magnificent dedication to service, as was evidenced by the many hours of overtime he worked at his duties in Congress.

The country and his State have lost a great, dedicated public servant, and I was shocked at the news of his untimely passing just as he was reaching another high rung in the ladder of his success.

I join his many friends and colleagues in extending deep sympathy to his wife and family. Their loss is shared by all who knew and worked with him.

IMMEDIATE APPROVAL OF H.R. 581 WILL CURB RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS AND PROVIDE A "QUICK AND EFFECTIVE REMEDY" FOR UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE COAL AND RAILROAD INDUSTRIES

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, particular attention is directed to H.R. 581, which I have introduced again this year because I still live in hope that the Congress of the United States will come to realize that—in this legislative body and here alone—lies the one definite and dependable source of security for the American worker whose job is taken away or threatened by imports.

My bill would limit residual oil imports to 10 percent of domestic demand for the corresponding quarter of the preceding year. I recognize that this figure might have to be adjusted upward before it would become acceptable to the majority of our membership. Whatever the final decision, the study necessary for Congress to reach an agreement will produce information that cannot help but arouse demand for immediate action on this problem.

I mention a willingness to permit a moderate boost in the percentage prescribed because I am well aware that the purveyors of alien fuel have become so arrogant and confident about their position in our east coast markets that they have convinced a number of customers that their product will always be available. As a consequence, some consumers have been credulous enough to install oil-burning equipment exclusively in their plants, factories, and apartment houses. What would happen in these instances in the event of a cutoff of ocean-shipped supplies is a subject that international oil discreetly avoids in contacts with new construction.

Unfortunately, victims of this selling policy failed to engage themselves in the simple research that would produce glaring examples of the folly of depending upon ocean-shipped oil. From the time that I undertook this crusade against excessive residual oil imports more than a decade ago, I have emphasized that there was severe hardship and suffering—particularly in New England—when ocean transportation was interrupted in early 1942. Factories, office buildings, and schools had to be closed until railroad facilities were expanded and coal came to the rescue.

Many of the plants that have risen on the Atlantic seaboard in recent years are not equipped to burn anything but oil. The source of their supplies is Venezuela. Though we have persistently protested Government policies that permit oil shipers to capture American markets at the expense of domestic suppliers, the deluge from abroad has continued almost unabated. Not until the President of the United States, on the advice of Cabinet members involved in defense planning, created a mandatory oil import control program in 1959 was there any semblance of protection for the U.S. independent oil and coal industries. The President's order was a step in the right direction, but its implementation has fallen short of expectations and emphasizes the urgent need for legislation to meet security standards and at the same time to provide an opportunity for distressed coal regions to reenter markets captured by alien oil.

If there is any doubt that a medium in addition to the Executive order is required to place an effective check on shipments from foreign refineries, import figures since the order went into effect will provide the answer. On March 10, 1959, the White House issued the proclamation adjusting and regulating imports of crude oil and products into the United States. Incoming shipments of residual oil were not to exceed the level reached in 1957, during which year, incidentally, a record 173 million barrels were imported. The importer's reaction to the proclamation is now notorious. For the year 1959, 223 million barrels of residual oil—or 50 million barrels over the 1957 mark—were imported into the United States. For 1960, the figure reached an all-time high of 230 million barrels.

For the information of Members of Congress who may not yet be aware of the impact of residual oil imports on the domestic economy, I point out that last year's incoming shipments of residual oil were equivalent in energy value to 55 million tons of bituminous coal. To anyone familiar with the poverty and misery that persists in areas of chronic surplus labor, the policy of permitting seriously distressed areas to be unnecessarily deprived of such a substantial volume of business is a mystifying paradox. For a number of years many Government officials and Members of Congress have demanded legislation to stimulate the economy of chronic labor areas, of which coal communities are a prominent part. The fact is that a reasonable restriction on imported residual oil could constitute the most sudden and most effective economic remedy possible under peacetime conditions.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress will enact a 10 percent quota on residual oil imports, you will see an unprecedented business comeback in many, many mining communities of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States that serve the Atlantic Seaboard. Had H.R. 581, setting the quota at 10 percent, been in effect in 1960, it would have limited residual oil imports to about 56 million barrels. Approximately the same amount entered this country in 1948, the third year of the postwar invasion of America's fuel markets. What foreign residual oil has done to my part of the country since that time is reflected in any number of statistical analyses, including the Department of Labor's surveys on surplus labor areas. The same story is detected in reports of coal-carrying railroads.

The total coal freight originated on the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1948 amounted to 49,776,000 tons. In 1958, the last full year for which this record is available, the figure amounted to 24,359,000 tons. Here, then, is a drop of 25 million tons of coal—or just about a 50 percent business decline. That loss in tonnage to the Pennsylvania Railroad is easy to understand. Throughout central and western Pennsylvania over the last 12 years one mine after another has fallen prey to the inequitable competition of residual oil imports. A mine closes and its employees become surplus labor. Additional surplus labor is occasioned by the drop in railroad freight tonnage. Timbering firms, equipment manufacturers, and miscellaneous suppliers to the coal industry add their share to the surplus labor category. From then on, the incidence of unemployment increases unchecked.

Residual oil imports were responsible for the early economic deterioration of mining and railroad communities. As they increased in intensity—from more than 56 million barrels in 1948 to 230 million barrels last year—they extended economic havoc throughout wide regions of Pennsylvania and many other States throughout the Appalachian area.

Let us look once more at the 10-percent quota limitation which I have proposed. I have conceded that Congress may find it necessary to revise the percentage after a careful study of the importers' practices, and of the present consequences of their handiwork. What must be determined is how much—if any—residual oil imports are actually necessary. Like the coal industry, independent domestic oil producers and refiners have lost considerable business to foreign oil. They certainly merit an opportunity to regain some of the business which has been taken away by the international oil crowd. In addition, heavy volumes of residual oil are refined in this country from foreign crude. The total impingement upon the markets that would normally have been served by domestic oil and coal holds the key to considerable joblessness in this country.

At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD the following excerpt from a paper presented recently to an international labor organization meeting in Geneva by Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, representing the U.S. bituminous coal and anthracite industries:

> The first definite official limitations on crude and products, including residual oil, took effect in April 1959 on orders of the President of the United States after U.S. Cabinet officials reported that national security required a limitation on foreign oil imports. The subsequent cutbacks have provided a modicum of help to the coal industry, but incoming shipments are still far too high to permit us to recapture any of the seaboard markets preempted by international oil shippers over the past 12 or 15 years. Many of the countries represented here may by experience understand the difficulties that can come from an excess in the world oil supply. In our country, foreign residual oil has been offered to domestic consumers at whatever price is necessary to undersell coal. Because it is difficult to determine the actual cost of producing this residue of higher grade products of crude, residual oil can actually be offered as low as the marketer finds it necessary to go.

Why legislative action alone will cut back residual oil imports has been evidenced in the shipper's response to the mandatory oil import control program. Here are further interesting data:

From 1946 through 1950 residual oil imports amounted to 347 million barrels. The next 5-year period—1951–55—shows a total of 660 million barrels. And a total of 971 million barrels appears on the 1956–60 scoreboard. The increase of the past 5 years over the first 5 postwar years amounts to 180 percent.

One more figure which I should like to insert in the RECORD at this time refers to 1948, in which year residual oil imports amounted to approximately the level at which H.R. 581 would set current shipments. The increase of residual oil imports for 1960 over 1948 amounts to 326 percent. I leave that figure with you. Perhaps it will startle this Congress into quick action on this issue.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the national histories of east European peoples are full of miseries and misfortunes, and the history of the Ukrainian people is no exception. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for the brief 2-year period of 1918–20, to enjoy the benefits of free and independent life in their historic homeland. Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, more than 40 million Ukrainians have not been permitted to be masters of their fate. For more than 300 years they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to abandon their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes, held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918. That day has become a landmark in the history of Ukraine, and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately the new-born Republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened even before the joy of jubiliation had ceased. Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foes, the Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country. Soon the whole country was overrun and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Then in the fall of that year Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for more than 40 years, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet Empire, and the Ukrainian people suffered grievously under Soviet totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. Neither the people of Ukraine are allowed to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, to go to Ukraine. Thus the country has become a large prison house for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every devise to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Communist totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stout-hearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they live. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physique, and their tenancious nature have served them well. Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always given excellent account of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my congressional district, and have seen them at work. In certain parts of this State they constitute the core of sturdy and stout-hearted laborers who perform heavy but necessary tasks with distinction. These people of stolid character have contributed their full measure to the free and democratic way of life in this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions. Today on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to bring to the attention of our Members that this observance of the 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is taking place in the Shevchenko Centennial Year. Last year the 86th Congress passed a resolution honoring Taras Shevchenko. That resolution, now Public Law 86–749 authorizes the erection of a monument in his honor on public grounds in our Capital. Moreover, this body authorized the publication of a documentary biography of Schevchenko under the title "Europe's Freedom Fighter." This brochure, Document No. 445, is being read today not only in this country but also abroad, including the capitals in Moscow's colonial empire.

As was predicted by those who furthered this farsighted action, a wrench was thrown into Moscow's propaganda machine. Recently, Moscow and its puppets have attacked our action in the bitterest terms. Articles in Sovietskaya Kultura, Radianska Kultura, and Literaturna Gazeta, clearly indicates that the initiative taken by us has blunted Moscow's propaganda appeal to the captive 40 million Ukrainians who in their hearts and minds honor Shevchenko as their freedom fighter, as their eternal inspiration for genuine national independence and freedom.

Those who furthered this action in the 86th Congress deserve our highest esteem. The story of this has been written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. I request that his article, which appeared in the autumn issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, under the title "Public Law 86–749 and the Shevchenko Centennial" be included as part of my remarks at this point:

PUBLIC LAW 86–749 AND THE SHEVCHENKO CENTENNIAL

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

As reported by the national press, on September 13, 1960, President Eisenhower signed a resolution passed by Congress authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in Washington, D.C.[1] The resolution was sponsored by the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan, and progressed through Congress as House Joint Resolution 311. It is now known as Public Law 86–749. This far-seeing action prepared an official groundwork for the celebration of a significant centennial in 1961, the observance of the death of Taras Shevchenko on March 10, 1861. Shevchenko is widely revered as Ukraine's poet laureate and one of Europe's outstanding freedom fighters.

The law, as passed and approved, reads as follows:

"86TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 311, 74 STAT. 884, SEPTEMBER 13, 1960, JOINT RESOLUTION

"Whereas throughout Eastern Europe, in the last century and this the name and works of Taras Shevchenko brilliantly reflected the aspirations of man for personal liberty and national independence; and

"Whereas Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine, was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land; and

"Whereas in many parts of the free world observances of the Shevchenko centennial will be held during 1961 in honor of this immortal champion of liberty; and

"Whereas in our moral capacity as freemen in an independent Nation it behooves us to symbolize tangibly the inseparable spiritual ties bound in the writings of Shevchenko between our country and the forty million Ukrainian nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) any association or committee organized for such purpose within two years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution is hereby authorized to place on land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia a statue of the Ukrainian poet and national leader, Taras Shevchenko.

"(b) The authority granted by subsection (a) of this section shall cease to exist, unless within 5 years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution (1) the erection of the statue is begun, and (2) the association or committee certifies to the Secretary of the Interior the amount of funds available for the purpose of the completion of the statue and the Secretary determines that such funds are adequate for such purpose.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select an appropriate site upon which to erect the statue authorized in the first section. The choice of the site and the design and plans for such statue shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission. Such statue shall be erected without expense to the United States."

A close reading of the whereas clauses shows immediately the meaningful framework in which the resolution is cast. Without this framework the measure would have met with a stillbirth. It was within this framework that reasons and arguments for the passage of the resolution were formu-

[1] E.g., the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1960, p. A–12.

lated. Anyone familiar with the processes involved in the consideration of such measures can readily appreciate the almost insurmountable difficulties and obstacles that lie in the path of their successful passage. Hundreds of such bills fall by the wayside each session. The author sensed from the start that the justification for a Shevchenko memorial in the Nation's Capital must be couched in essence in the measure submitted. Congress responded favorably to this introduction of Shevchenko. But this, of course, constitutes not even a tenth of the story.

THE ASCENT TO PASSAGE

The background to the passage of House Joint Resolution 311 actually discloses a number of important truths. First, it reveals the vital meaning of the Shevchenko Centennial to the United States and, by implication, to the nontotalitarian free world in the present mortal conflict with Russian totalitarian imperialism. Second, it shows the foresight and clear vision of the many who quickly perceived this meaning and with cooperative dispatch took a hand in the passage of the resolution through many difficult stages. Third, the vigorous support of groups and individuals throughout the country for the success of this undertaking forms an indispensable part of this background. And lastly, the long ascent to the passage of House Joint Resolution 311 is suggestive not only of the splendid opportunity that has been presented for demonstrating to the world the real colonial nature of the Soviet Union but also of the heavy responsibility that has been placed on the shoulders of those guiding the centennial.

As indicated in the history of bills enacted into public law, House Joint Resolution 311 was introduced on March 17, 1959.[2] The House Administration Committee reported it out on June 2, 1960, and the House passed the bill on June 24. Subsequently, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee reported it out on August 29 and 2 days later, on August 31, the Senate passed it. Two weeks later, on September 13, the President signed it and the measure became Public Law 86–749. Needless to say, this chronology of the successive progress of the resolution scarcely describes the real history of it.

The substantive history of the Shevchenko bill actually does not commence until February 1960. Soon after its introduction in March 1959 Congressman OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, the chairman of the House Administration Committee, indicated the desirability of holding hearings on the measure and referred it to the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials. However, the hearings, which were planned for June of that year, were made contingent on the early receipt of recommendations and reports on the bill from the Commission of Fine Arts and the Department of the Interior. The bill circulated among a number of executive agencies for almost a year and, as a result, the hearings did not take place until March 1960.

Considering the vast amount of bills of this type which are introduced annually, the Department of Interior quite logically assumed an initial negative position toward the Shevchenko proposal. It cannot be denied that a cemetery of statues would be the blight of the Nation's Capital if an easy policy were pursued in this respect. Members of Congress recognize this as well as responsible private citizens. This writer was fully aware of this consideration at the time he formulated the resolution and, rationally, could not disagree with the Department's decision on these grounds. As it turned out, these were not the only grounds of careful consideration. Thanks to the insight and quick perception of the Honorable Roger Ernst, the Assistant Secretary of Interior, and his knowledgeable associates, the meaning and significance of Shevchenko in the context of the current struggle was almost instinctively grasped, and the Department finally withdrew any opposition or criticism to the measure. Its representatives were particularly impressed by the argument that in the forthcoming centennial we couldn't allow the Russians and their colonial puppets to exploit the name and honor of Shevchenko who rightfully belongs to us. Only recently a meeting of the Government Republic Committee for Preparation and Carrying Out of the T. H. Shevchenko Jubilee was held in Kiev under the chairmanship of Academician M. P. Bazhan to hear progress reports on their observance.[3]

The next significant stage of development was the hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials under the astute chairmanship of Congressman JONES of Missouri. The hearing took place on March 31, at which time consideration was also given to the important Theodore Roosevelt memorial project.[4] Participating in the Shevchenko hearing were the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan; Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University and president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; Mr. Dmytro Halychyn, president of the Ukrainian National Association; Mr. George Wolynetz, Jr., commander of the Ukrainian American War Veterans; and the writer, representing the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. In addition, excellent statements in support of House Joint Resolution 311 were submitted by the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS of New York and Mr. Mykola Lebed, president of Prolog. All the statements are available in the offices of the House Administration Committee.

Following the hearing, some unfavorable reports appeared in the press. One paper ran a story under the caption "Graveyard" of Statuary Here Scored and stressed that "Interior Department officials fear that Washington is becoming an overcrowded graveyard of statuary."[5] It quoted Assistant Secretary Ernst as saying, "We have nothing against Shevchenko, but we thought it good time to bring the subject of statues to the attention of Congress." In reality, as we noted above, Mr. Ernst was emphasizing what is already generally known in Washington and recommending a more formal procedure of disposition of such bills. The Department had previously recognized the value of erecting a statue in honor of Shevchenko. And in this first lap in Congress a similar recognition was emerging.

By the beginning of May the members of the subcommittee approved the resolution and presented it favorably to the full Committee on Administration, chaired by Congressman BURLESON. The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman JONES, and its members deserve the highest praise for their critical evaluation of the resolution and their patient inquiry into all of its aspects. As indicted earlier, Congressman BURLESON perceived the possible value of the measure at its very inception. Moreover, the salutary impressions created at the March hearing were evidently so forceful that an authorization for the publication of a biographical documentary on Taras Shevchenko was introduced by Congressman JOHN LESINSKI of Michigan. The vital role played by this distinguished legislator is discussed at greater length below.

On June 1 the Committee on House Administration met in executive session and ordered favorably reported to the House both House Joint Resolution 311, authorizing the erection of the statue, and House Resolution 524, authorizing the printing, as a House document, the biography of Shevchenko.[6] The following day Congressman LESINSKI submitted the reports on both measures in the House. Report No. 1741 covered the Shevchenko statue. Because of certain unexpected developments concerning the House calendar, the memorial bill was not considered for a vote until later in the month. This seriously complicated the project as concerns the Senate. The authorization for the biography was passed earlier. The complication led to an intensive effort via very conceivable means to apprise the members of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee of the forthcoming passage of the bill in the House.

It was on June 24 that the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without objection.[7] A fine statement on the event was made by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI who declared among other things that such "an idealistic undertaking should understandably be endorsed by the Congress as a very important factor during this cold war of ideologies between the United States and the Kremlin."[8] The success realized at this stage in the passage of the bill would surely not have been possible without the cooperative and understanding efforts of all those mentioned above and also of Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the House majority leader.

The next stage was, of course, the Senate. With talk of adjournment rife in the air, the mentioned complication could now be well appreciated. A further embarrassing difficulty arose from the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 54, a parallel but bare and undescriptive measure sponsored by Senator JAVITS in hasty and unfortunate circumstances, failed to be reported out favorably by the Rules Committee. When House Joint Resolution 311 reached the committee on June 27, it was clearly evident that in this complicated situation only the most concentrated action could reap full success for the bill.[9] Every means was seized to expedite the measure. There aren't words adequate enough to express public gratitude for the superb cooperation and efficient understanding displayed by Mr. Gordon F. Harrison, chief clerk and counsel of the Rules Committee, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, and their respective staffs. In this phase and the subsequent one, their efforts were indispensable and most praiseworthy.

Once it was decided that a recess would take effect, prudence dicta' d that this action be postponed until August, during which period of time a more expanded base of familiarity with Shevchenko's works and significance could be formed. In the month of July this writer edited and prepared the House biographical document on the poet. This definitely provided a broader foundation of understanding concerning the man and his contributions. Advance copies were sent to every member of the Rules Committee prior to the reconvening of the Senate. Moreover, letters from groups and individuals continued to pour into the Senate in support of the resolution. These and other preparations were made to assure the successful passage of House Joint Resolution 311 in the final days of the 86th Congress.

Thus, on August 29, the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 16, p. D513.

[3] Pravda Ukrainy, Aug. 12, 1960.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 16, p. D163.

[5] The Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1960.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, p. 12050.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 14237.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 14397.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 14413.

Joint Resolution 311 in its Report 1930.[10] Two days later, on August 31, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, who played an instrumental role in the expedition of the bill, moved that it be considered for a vote, and the resolution was passed.[11] On that occasion Senator JAVITS addressed the Senate with a concise statement containing all the essentials about Shevchenko. In addition to the sustaining support given by the popular Senator of New York, the wholehearted efforts and aid of Senator Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut and their staffs, as well as of Mr. Harry Burke, will long be remembered and appreciated. As in the House, many other legislators in the Senate were properly informed about the bill and expressed their willingness to support it. Their valuable backing led to a speedy affirmative vote on the bill which then was quickly cleared for the President's signature.[12] On September 13 the President signed it.

EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

It was pointed out above that one of the most significant developments in this entire undertaking was the publication of House Document No. 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–1861." This was made possible by the action taken by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI who introduced House Resolution 524 on May 11. The measure was agreed to on June 7. Congressman LESINSKI made a solid contribution in this regard since many Americans are totally unfamiliar with this champion of liberty. In preparing the 45-page pamphlet this writer received the finest possible cooperation from Mr. John Haley and other staff members of the House Administration Committee.

This valuable documentary biography of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero is so arranged that any reader can quickly appreciate the greatness of Shevchenko. The articles incorporated in it deal with the major facets of his life and work. The pamphlet consists of the resolution sponsored by Congressman LESINSKI, a foreword, the text of Public Law 86–749, an impressive illustration of Shevchenko, seven select chapters, an appendix, a short bibliography, and a useful index. It makes for easy reading and should prove to be informative to countless citizens during the period of the centennial.

Early newspaper reactions to both the statue and the pamphlet were exceedingly favorable. Featured on the first page of the Washington Evening Star was an article titled "Free Man or Slave? Cold War Warming Up Over Obscure Poet," with a picture of Shevchenko.[13] In it the writer accurately stresses that "As far as the West is concerned, Shevchenko's poetry reflects man's aspirations for liberty and national independence." Shortly thereafter another extensive account appeared on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune.[14] The writer of this article also points out the cold war significance of the Shevchenko project. As he starts out to say, "Next year will see a new twist in the East-West cold war. * * *" There can be no doubt that a mounting reaction will result from the nationwide distribution of the Shevchenko pamphlet. Most of it doubtlessly will be favorable once the meaning and value of the Shevchenko Centennial is understood in terms of U.S. national interests. This is the end the pamphlet is designed to serve.

THE SHEVCHENKO CENTENNIAL

The House document on Shevchenko's biography represents the first official Western governmental publication in honor of any Ukrainian national hero. For those familiar with this East European figure, this is a new and encouraging development. But the legislation for a statue in honor of the poet has precedents elsewhere, for example, in Canada. As a matter of fact, the idea for such a statue in the Nation's Capital is an old one. This aspiration has been expressed for years and in the experience of this writer, strong pressure for such a project was exerted by Dr. Smal-Stocki, the president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, some 5 years ago.

With the necessary foundation laid, it is now the task of the Shevchenko Centennial Committee to resolve the many problems connected with the success of the centennial in 1961. First and foremost is the problem of familiarizing numerous sectors of the American populace with the man and his works. The excellent medium for this, of course, is the House document which should be distributed throughout all spheres of our society. Second, the problem of financing heavy orders of his novel pamphlet and the statue itself should not be difficult if the administration is both vigorous and efficient. The response to the financial problem will surely not be restricted to only American circles of Ukrainian background. As concerns this and their participation in the centennial, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that many other American circles of East European and other origins are vitally interested in this centennial. Indeed, Shevchenko's appeal was cosmopolitan and humanist. In its informational activity the committee has the task of establishing the cold war significance of the Shevchenko project.

A third major problem is the efficient coordination of effort with interested executive agencies. The smoothness and proficiency of the applied project depend on this. And, finally, the fourth problem concerns the magnificent opportunity the centennial affords to feature and highlight the colonial makeup of the synthetic Soviet Union and the captive and occupied status of Ukraine and all other non-Russian nations in this basic empire. The fulfillment of this crowning task is obviously contingent on the successful resolution of the three preceding problems. A heavy responsibility is involved in all of this; the challenge is formidable: but the opportunity is historic. With good sense, a vigorous drive, and in the firm knowledge that America's interests are being vitally served, those charged with this responsibility will meet the challenge for we cannot afford to muff the opportunity and its far-reaching consequences.

Mr. Speaker, the reaction of our own press to the action taken by Congress in this matter was generally good. Many saw the importance and significance of the Shevchenko measure despite the fact that certain highlights of East European history still escape popular notice. I believe that many of us will find the contents of the following representative articles of considerable interest. I include as part of my remarks the articles which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Chicago Sunday Tribune:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1960]

FREE MAN OR SLAVE? COLD WAR WARMING UP OVER OBSCURE POET

(By John McKelway)

The United States and the Soviet Union next year will engage in a tug of cold war over the memory of a dead poet.

Both countries want to honor him. The United States has sanctioned a statue in his memory in the District of Columbia. It is possible another memorial may go up in Moscow.

To be remembered on the centennial of his death in 1861 is one Taras Schevchenko, a Ukrainian poet who died at the age of 47. He is buried on the banks of the Dnieper near the town of Kaniv in the Ukraine.

As far as the West is concerned Shevchenko's poetry reflects man's aspirations for liberty and national independence.

However, Soviet Russia, after several readings of Shevchenko's works, has interpreted the material to be that of a Bolshevik who died before his time.

The obscure skirmish between the East and West over the poet is an attempt by both countries to impress 42 million Ukrainians who consider Shevchenko something of a saint.

While the Capital of the United States may wind up with a statue to a man hardly known to every American schoolboy, there are those who feel its presence will promote discontent behind the Iron Curtain.

One of these is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a chunky, talkative professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University.

Since coming to town in 1948, the professor has undertaken to discomfit Soviet Premier Khrushchev in a variety of ways. For the last 2 years, for example, he has authored resolutions declaring a Captive Nations Week and succeeded in guiding them through Congress.

His point is that most Americans do not realize that Russia is made up of a number of nations which were once independent entities and that the Soviet is actually an empire guilty of colonialism.

Dr. Dobriansky's latest effort to get the psychological jump on Mr. Khrushchev is a resolution passed in the closing days of the last session of Congress.

Passed first by the House, and later by the Senate on August 31, was a joint resolution authorizing a statue to Shevchenko in the District but without expense to the United States. President Eisenhower signed the resolution September 13.

The professor had done his work well. No one, in either the House or Senate, asked who Shevchenko was as the authorization for the memorial sailed through Congress. Yet it came at a time when Members balked at allowing a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt.

Two years ago, Dr. Dobriansky has since explained, he heard that Russia was preparing to honor Shevchenko in some way. Already, he said, the Communists had distorted the work of the poet, twisting and rewriting his efforts so that he appeared to be a revolutionist of the Marxist school. They had to reckon with the poet's tremendous popularity among the Ukrainians as well as other nationalities.

But Dr. Dobriansky has written: "A reading of Shevchenko will convince any objective person that he belongs to us, not to tyrannical Moscow."

CENTENNIAL IN 1961

Dr. Dobriansky worked up a resolution pointing out that there would be world ob-

---

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 18102.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 18529.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 14, p. 19110.

[13] McKelway, John, "Free Man or Slave?" the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1960, pp. AI, 7.

[14] Wingenbach, Charles E., "A New Twist in the Cold War," New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 15, 1960.

servances of the Shevchenko centennial in 1961 and authorizing the statue.

He needed the approval of the Interior Department. At one point, a spokesman said the Department could not go along with the statue idea because of the feeling that Washington was being turned into a cemetery of statues to great men.

But when the professor explained what was behind the move—the attempt to offset Moscow's manner of remembering Shevchenko—he got the needed approval.

In the House, Representatives Bentley, Republican, and Lesinski, Democrat, of Michigan, and Representative Jones, Democrat, of Missouri, worked for the bill. In the Senate, groundwork was handled by the two Republican Senators from New York, Javits and Keating, and Senator Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

During the adjournment for the two conventions, Dr. Dobriansky worked up some material on Shevchenko for members of the Senate Rules Committee, who at one point voted down the resolution. By the time the Senate was back at work, the bill had been reported out and sent to the Senate floor for action.

MONEY ANGLE STUDIED

Today, Dr. Dobriansky reports, a committee of the Ukrainian Congress of America is planning the centennial observance of the poet and studying ways to raise the money for his statue. He says it is entirely possible Russia may also build one in Moscow. Locally, the site and design have not been selected.

"In the incessant cold war," Dr. Dobriansky has written, "it is vitally important for us, in favor of our own American interests, to symbolize in every respect our friendship and spiritual affinity with the large Ukrainian nation."

FROM SERFDOM

The Ukraine, according to Dr. Dobriansky, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain and the second largest nation within the U.S.S.R. itself.

Shevchenko rose out of serfdom to become the greatest of Ukrainian poets. He dreamed of a Ukrainian language and literature separate from Russian and of his country's independence and freedom from the rule of the czars.

And in one of his poems, influenced by the American Revolution, he asked:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday!"

[From New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 15, 1960]

A NEW TWIST IN THE COLD WAR

(By Charles E. Wingenbach)

WASHINGTON.—Next year will see a new twist in the East-West cold war—that is, if a long-dead Slavic poet few Americans ever heard of and a host of very-much-alive Congressmen and college professors have their way.

If this sounds as macabre as opening Grant's Tomb, it isn't. But the same kind of controversy and confusion are involved.

Prodded by a persuasive Georgetown University professor, the President and Congress recently approved a project to build a statue in honor of Taras Schevchenko, the poet-laureate of now-Soviet Ukraine who died in 1861. Reports that Soviet Russia planned a mammoth centennial celebration next year spurred American officials to try to beat the Reds at their own propaganda game.

Here Schevchenko is regarded as a bard of freedom—Western style. Once the Soviets condemned him as a "bourgeois nationalist," but continuing Ukrainian adulation caused the party to relent and the official word now is that after all he was a good Bolshevik, who died before his time.

Amazing is the only word for the American project's progress. After more than a year of wandering through a maze of congressional committees and hurdling the formidable opposition to the Interior Department and the Fine Arts Commission, the resolution was suddenly whisked through the politics-ridden "bobtail" session of the 86th Congress, then signed by President Eisenhower. Last week the office of Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, released a 45-page brochure on Schevchenko's life and times.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, author of the bill, disclaims any intention to bamboozle the honorable gentlemen of Congress. No novice in politics nor stranger to international controversy, he has been fighting battles for this or that cause for years. A native New Yorker and a Republican Party aid, he was succeeded in lining up support for his project in a bipartisan way that has confounded admirers and critics alike. His successful Captive Nations Week resolution sparked Ukrainian-born Nikita Khrushchev's now-famous "kitchen debate" with Vice President Nixon last year in Moscow. His activities as head of the large Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents most Ukrainians in the free world, have earned him a dubious position as perennial Soviet target.

Asked, in view of his works in behalf of the captive nations, whether he had ever been behind the Iron Curtain, he replied with a smile: "For reasons of health, I'm afraid not."

Dr. Dobriansky's overriding concern is what he terms the West's ignorance of the Soviet Union's "prison of nations." This, he says, is the issue involved in the Schevchenko bill. The poet rose from serfdom to become Ukraine's national hero, and was free from czarist Russian jails or slavery only 9 out of his 47 years. In one of his poems, inspired by our Revolution in 1776, Schevchenko cries:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday."

In constituent-minded Congressmen's eyes, not the least of the Schevchenko bill's virtues was its stipulation that no public funds be used in the project. This, combined with a sudden understanding of the cold war issues at stake, assured the project smooth sailing.

Success, however, is not without its headaches. Right now, a harassed and balding Dr. Dobriansky is wondering whether, in view of local complaints that the Nation's Capital has become a graveyard for famous men's statues, the proposed statue would really be worth while.

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune, Nov. 6, 1960]

DEAD POET NOW A LIVE ISSUE—UNITED STATES, RUSSIA VIE IN HONORS TO UKRAINIAN—DIFFER ON POLITICS OF SHEVCHENKO

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, November 5.—Ever hear of Taras Shevchenko?

If you haven't, you have plenty of company. Those who haven't the faintest notion of whether Taras Shevchenko might be the name of the Soviet Union's delegate to the United Nations or a fancy Russian dish akin to beef Stroganoff run into the millions.

It is likely, however, that next year Taras Shevchenko will become another issue, albeit a minor one, in the cold war between the United States and Russia.

Taras Shevchenko was a Ukrainian poet who has been dead nearly a century. He was born in 1814 and died at the age of 47 in 1861. He is buried on the banks of the Dnieper River near the town of Kaniv in the Ukraine.

STATUE AUTHORIZED

Both the United States and Russia are planning to honor the memory of Shevchenko in 1961, the centennial of his death. At the moment, the United States seems to have taken the lead in doing the honors because it already has authorized a statue of Shevchenko in the District of Columbia. In all probability, Russia will match this with a memorial of some kind in Moscow.

As might be expected, the United States and Russia have different reasons for honoring Shevchenko's memory. In this country, the poet is regarded by those heading the memorial movement as a fighter for freedom, a patriot whose writings reflect man's aspirations for liberty and national independence.

BOLSHEVIK COLORING

Russia, on the other hand, sees Shevchenko as a Bolshevik who died before his time, a revolutionary whose poetry voiced the hopes and protests of downtrodden Ukrainians struggling to throw off the tyrannical rule of the czars.

Be that as it may, until a couple of years ago the name Shevchenko meant nothing to anyone in the United States except a relative handful of historians, literature scholars and Ukrainian Nationalists, including Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Russian economics at Georgetown University in Washington.

Dobriansky, an energetic and articulate educator born in New York City of Ukrainian parents, has devoted considerable time in recent years to attacking communism and making things as uncomfortable as possible for the Kremlin.

RUSSIAN COLONIALISM

He has drafted congressional resolutions proclaiming Captive Nations Week, an annual project which has provoked irritated outbursts from Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and other Russian leaders.

Dobriansky makes the point that most Americans do not realize that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is made up of several nations which once were free and independent and that by taking in and holding these nations by force, Russia is guilty of the very tyranny and colonialism that it so vociferously lays at the doorsteps of Western countries.

The professor seeks through his Captive Nations Week proclamations to underscore the fact that in addition to the recognized satellites of Russia, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia, there are captive nations within the Soviet Union such as the Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Armenia, and Turkestan.

CASE OF THE UKRAINE

The Ukraine, he contends, is a separate, non-Russian entity, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and the second largest nation in the Soviet Union.

A couple of years ago, Dobriansky learned that Russia was planning to honor the memory of Shevchenko. Dobriansky already knew that the Communists had distorted the poet's writings in an effort to make him appear a Marxist revolutionary. Dobriansky knew also that the Kremlin was well aware of Shevchenko's important place in Ukrainian history and literature.

Dobriansky recalls that his task as he saw it was to convince the American people that Shevchenko might be an obscure, virtually unknown 19th century poet in the United States, but to 42 million freedom hungry

Ukrainians, Shevchenko is a national hero. The professor declares that it is in the best interests of the United States to symbolize in every way the friendship and spiritual ties between this country and the Ukraine.

NO TAX CASH INVOLVED

Dobriansky drafted a congressional resolution authorizing a centennial commemoration in 1961 and a statue in Washington honoring Shevchenko. He obtained the approval of the Interior Department for the statue, despite the feeling within the Department that the Nation's Capital already is cluttered with statues and monuments.

Finally, sympathetic Senators and Representatives introduced the Shevchenko resolution last summer and President Eisenhower signed it September 13. The joint resolution authorizes a statue to the poet, but specifies "without expense to the United States."

Dobriansky reports that a committee of the Ukrainian Congress of America is planning a centennial observance of Shevchenko's death next year and is working out ways to raise money for the statue.

SEPARATE LITERATURE

Shevchenko doesn't rate a separate biography in the Encyclopedia Britannica, but he does figure importantly in an article on Ukrainian literature, which the encyclopedia recognizes as emerging separate and distinct from Russian literature in the 16th century.

The encyclopedia relates that Shevchenko, born a peasant and a serf, introduced a new and essentially democratic spirit into what had become modern Ukrainian literature. The poet is described as a romantic nationalist in his early writings, a revolutionary internationalist in his later work, who has become the symbol of Ukrainian nationality.

LINKED TO AMERICA

Dobriansky says that Shevchenko dreamed of a Ukrainian language and literature separate from Russian and of his country's independence from the rule of the Russian czars. Emphasizing his belief that there are close spiritual links between the American and Ukrainian people, Dobriansky points out that some of Shevchenko's writings were influenced by the American revolution.

In one of his poems, Shevchenko asked:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday."

Mr. Speaker, on this 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, which we observe in this significant Shevchenko Centennial Year, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is, indeed, the new frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. It is a frontier which we must assiduously explore and cultivate; it is a frontier which colonial Moscow seeks to hide from us and the free world. And on this occasion I believe it is necessary to stress the importance of becoming more and more familiar with the basic facts of the many captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Toward this end, with reference to Ukraine—the largest captive non-Russian nation both within the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. I take this opportunity to append to my statement the text of an informative lecture on "Basic Facts on Ukraine and the Ukrainian People" delivered at Fordham University by Walter Dushnyck, the editor of the Ukrainian Bulletin:

BASIC FACTS ON UKRAINE AND THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

At the outset of my talk I should like to take the opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to Father McBrearty for inviting me here and providing me with this opportunity to try to give an informal talk on Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

I believe that you who are studying the Russian language and history as well as the political system of the Soviet Union can only gain in knowledge and information by learning a few new facts on Ukraine and the Ukrainian people who, although against their own will and interest, are an integral part of the Soviet totalitarian structure.

1. UKRAINE—A HISTORICAL UNITY

Historically speaking, Ukraine constitutes a compact national political and economic unity. Ukrainians are the second largest Slavic people, being ranked numerically only by the Russians. The history of Ukraine began in the 10th century with the formation of the powerful State of Kiev, known as Rus. Such famed names as Prince Volodymyr the Great, Yaroslav the Wise, Volodymyr Monomakh and others are the first rulers of Ukraine-Rus, atlhough the Russian historical school maintains that the period of Kievan Rus was common to both the Russians and Ukrainians. On the other hand, the Ukrainian historical school, supported by the Polish and other historical schools, contends that Kiev was the original nucleus of the Ukrainian state, while the history of Russia began in Moscow and Suzdal after one of the Muscovite princes, Prince Andrei Bogolubsky, sacked and destroyed Kiev in 1169. The Ukrainian state existed on the Dnieper River and in the Galicia-Volhynia provinces until the 14th century, at what time it became part of the Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian federation.

The second period of Ukrainian statehood is known as the Kozak State which existed from the middle of the 16th century until the beginning of the 18th century, specifically the battle of Poltava of 1709, after which the sovereignty of Ukraine was gradually liquidated until it was finally suppressed by Empress Catherine of Russia. Such famed Ukrainian Hetmans as Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Petro Doroshenko, Ivan Vyhovsky, Ivan Mazepa, and Pylyp Orlyk were actual chiefs of the Ukrainian state who maintained their own military forces, maintained diplomatic relations with other nations, had their own monetary units, administrative and judicial systems, and were treated as the sovereigns of the Ukrainian people.

The third phase of Ukrainian national statehood began in recent times, in March 1917, when with the fall of Russian czardom the Ukrainians first proclaimed their autonomy and, subsequently, full independence. The Ukrainian Central Rada or Council issued its Fourth Universal, or manifesto, on January 22, 1918, whereby Ukraine became a separate and independent state known as the Ukrainian National Republic. This republic, headed by such prominent Ukrainian leaders as Michael Hrushevsky, Ukraine's foremost historian, Simon Petlura, Volodymyr Vynnychenko, and others, was promptly recognized de facto and de jure by several European states, such as Germany, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Brazil; and also by France and Great Britain, which granted de facto recognition to Ukraine. The Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Socialist Federative Republic, in a note signed by Lenin and Trotsky, recognized the sovereignty and independence of Ukraine as well. This, of course, did not prevent them from sending an ultimatum to the Ukrainian Central Rada demanding that the Ukrainian Government stop disarming Bolshevik bands in Ukraine. Moscow followed up its ultimatum by sending two great armies under the command of Muraviev and Antonov-Ovsienko. For almost 2 years the Ukrainians waged a desperate defensive war against the Communists, and having received no support from the Western Powers, were finally subdued in 1920.

Since 1920 Ukraine has been in the Soviet orbit; since 1923 it has been an unwilling member of the Soviet Union. Theoretically, the Ukrainian S.S.R. is an "independent and sovereign state," with the right of secession provided by both the Soviet and Ukrainian constitutions. But in reality Ukraine is one of the first colonies of imperial Moscow with all its attendant features: national and religious persecution, economic exploitation, deportations and executions, cultural oppression and Russification—all of which works toward state-directed genocide of the Ukrainian people.

2. UKRAINE IN THE MYTHICAL MONOLITH OF THE U.S.S.R.

Contrary to the popular conception entertained here and in other parts of the free world, the Soviet Union is by no means a unified and homogeneous nation, but a conglomeration of many non-Russian nations and peoples. There are 16 Union Republics which have their national government with ministries and other divisions of power. Only such matters as foreign policy, defense and finances fall into the jurisdiction of the Central Soviet Government. Ukraine and Byelorussia are even charter members of the United Nations, and Ukraine maintains its permanent mission at the United Nations and has its own Foreign Ministry.

You will recall that in July 1959 the U.S. Congress unanimously passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, which was subsequently signed by President Eisenhower and has become, in effect, Public Law 86–96. It was against this resolution that Mr. Khrushchev remonstrated in most irritated manner in both his public speeches in Warsaw and Moscow and in his article on peaceful coexistence in the October 1959 issue of Foreign Affairs. The pertinent paragraph of the Captive Nations Week resolution, referring to the enslavement of the non-Russian nations, reads:

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and others."

This congressional resolution defined Ukraine as well as other non-Russian nations inside the U.S.S.R. as captive nations, a fact which is borne out by indisputable proof of enslavement by Moscow.

The Ukrainian always resisted the Communist rule. They staged many uprisings and bloody rebellions through the twenties, and suffered harsh punishment, such as mass executions, deportations, and a manmade famine in 1932–33. In 1941, when the German troops invaded the Soviet Union, millions of Ukrainians, both civilians and soldiers, welcomed the Germans as liberators rather than as invaders, because such was their hatred and animosity toward Moscow and its oppressive regime imposed upon them.

3. TERRITORY, POPULATION, RESOURCES, AND INDUSTRY OF UKRAINE

The territory inhabited by ethnic Ukrainians is about 328,000 square miles, with nearly 50 million Ukrainians. The Ukrainian S.S.R. has an area of 232,493 square miles and a population of 41 million. The latest Soviet population census disclosed that there were 37 million people in the U.S.S.R. who declared themselves Ukrainian and their mother tongue Ukrainian. It is our assumption that at least 10 million other Ukrainians either were afraid to declare themselves Ukrainians or simply preferred to assume the safe appellation of Soviet citizen.

Ukraine exceeds in territory such European countries as England, Austria, Belgium,

Holland, Denmark, Portugal, and Switzerland put together.

In per capita production of pig iron Ukraine surpasses England, France, Italy and West Germany; in steel production Ukraine surpasses France, England, and Italy; in mining of iron ore Ukraine is ahead of all major countries, including the United States. In 1956 Ukraine accounted for 48 percent of the Soviet Union's total production of pig iron, 38 percent of the steel, 56 percent of the iron ore, nearly one-third of the hard coal, 53 percent of the coke, nearly 30 percent of the natural gas. Ukrainian factories produced 80 percent of the U.S.S.R.'s locomotives, nearly 50 percent of the beet-harvesting combines, nearly 40 percent of the tractors, 60 percent of the traction plows, 48 percent of the freight cars, 44 percent of the tractor sowers, and 72 percent of the Soviet Union's sugar.

The primary industrial area of Ukraine is the Donets Basin. In 1956 the gross output of the large machine-building and metal-working industry exceeded the output for 1913 more than 130 times. A variety of machine tools is made in Ukraine, also tractors, locomotives, turbines, ballbearings, precision instruments, aircraft, and automobiles.

The actual industrial potential of Ukraine is much greater than the figures indicate, since under the present imperialistic policy of Moscow, the development of Asiatic areas is favored for strategic reasons to the detriment of the industrial development of Ukraine. Ukraine is also the breadbasket and sugarbowl of the farflung Communist empire.

4. HIGHLIGHTS OF MODERN UKRAINIAN HISTORY AND POLITICAL LIFE

After the fall of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1920 the bulk of the Ukrainian people lived in the nominally independent Ukrainian S.S.R. Some 7,500,000 lived under the domination of reborn Poland, 1 million in Bukovina and Bessarabia under Rumanian authority, and about 650,000 in Carpatho-Ukraine under Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet rule, over 32 million Ukrainians was harsh and inhuman. There were attempts of sincere Ukrainian Communists, like M. Skrypnyk, P. Lubchenko, M. Khvylovy, M. Shumsky, and others, to wrest as much autonomy from Moscow as possible. In the middle of the twenties they succeeded in introducing Ukrainization, and adopted several political measures which favored the development of the Ukrainian culture and language. These Ukrainian Communists were predecessors of the present-day "national Communists" of the Tito-Gomulka type.

But Stalin and his henchmen in Ukraine, such as Kaganovich, Postyshev, Molotov, and Khrushchev, could not tolerate any deviation and proceeded with the ruthless liquidation of Ukrainian intellectuals, writers, cultural leaders, professors, and even party members; Ukrainian organizations, such as the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Ukrainian cooperatives, and above all, the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, were liquidated and their members arrested, exiled, or executed as "bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists" and "enemies of the people." In this action of liquidating Ukrainian patriots the present Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Nikita S. Khrushchev, was Stalin's most loyal executioner. He was appointed First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine in January 1938, and during his tenure of power in Ukraine he ordered the slaughter of Ukrainians on a tremendous scale. Only in the city of Vynnytsia alone were massacred 10,000 Ukranian men, women, and children in 1937–38. Previously, during the enforced collectivization of agriculture, over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation, while hundreds of thousands of other Ukrainians were deported to Siberia, Kazakhstan, the Arctic area, and the Far East, whence many never returned.

The Ukrainians who lived under Polish, Czechoslovak, and Rumanian rule between 1920–39, were predominantly Catholics of the Byzantine Rite. They had a better opportunity to develop their national culture, schools, and institutions, such as cooperatives, banks, sports and cultural associations, and the press. But they, too, were treated harshly because they never renounced their ideal of complete freedom and unity in one Ukrainian independent state, as they had enjoyed in 1918–20.

5. WORLD WAR II AND UKRAINIAN TRAGEDY

The Ukrainian people met the outbreak of World War II with the expectation that war would bring them an occasion to throw off the Soviet yoke and to regain Ukrainian independence. These same ideals were cherished and shared by the Ukrainians, highly dissatisfied with the nationalistic oppression they had experienced, in Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. They were encouraged by the establishment of the independence of Carpatho-Ukraine in March 1939. Other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., such as Byelorussians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkestanis, Azerbaijanians, not mentioning the Baltic peoples, entertained the same hopes and expectations.

But the German Nazis, while paying lip-service to their fight for "liberation" of all oppressed peoples, failed to grasp the great opportunities which the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. presented to them in their struggle against the Kremlin. The initial jubilation of the Ukrainians was soon turned into hatred and opposition, when the Ukrainians recognized the true intention of the Nazis to turn their country into a colony and themselves into inferior slaves. As early as 1942 the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) came into being and declared implacable war against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. Concomitantly with the armed struggle of the UPA, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) conducted a mass propaganda and political warfare against Hitler and Stalin.

This struggle did not cease after the defeat of Germany and the end of World War II. Under the leadership of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, active armed warfare in which tens of thousands of UPA freedom fighters participated, continued until 1950, the year of the assassination by the Soviet MVD forces of Gen. Taras Chuprynka-Shukhevych, the UPA leader. The anti-Communist struggle was waged not only in Ukraine, but extended to neighboring Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. Regrettably, the West did not understand or properly evaluate the significance of this struggle of the Ukrainian underground, and never gave it any support whatsoever.

The first 5 years of Communist rule over Ukraine after the war, and even until the death of Stalin in 1953, the Ukrainians were persecuted at random and with unbridled barbarity. In 1946 the Kremlin physically liquidated the Ukrainian Catholic Church by arresting 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops, and ordering some 3,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests to embrace the spurious Russian Orthodoxy or face exile or execution; hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were deported to Kazakhstan and Siberia for real or imaginary collaboration with the Germans, while other thousands of Ukrainians, especially members of the UPA and their families, were on capture summarily executed on the spot. It was Khrushchev himself who admitted at the 20th congress of the Communist Party in February 1956, that Stalin had wanted to deport all Ukrainians for their disloyalty and opposition to the Communist regime, but there had been no place to which to deport them all.

6. UKRAINE UNDER KHRUSHCHEV

Upon the death of Stalin the Kremlin under the "collective leadership" thought it important to "liberalize" the regime lest it have to face the constant threat of rebellion, armed warfare and passive resistance. In addition to decentralization on all-Union scale, amnesty for political prisoners as well as improvement in their treatment was ordered. This came about after violent and bloody strikes and rebellions in concentration camps in Vorkuta, Kolyma, Kingir, Karaganda, Mordovia, Pechora and other places where the Ukrainians had succeeded in organizing powerful opposition groups to challenge the Communist guards. Many prisoners, were released, but in the case of the Ukrainians, they were not allowed to return to Ukraine, but compelled to stay in Asia as "voluntary settlers."

Moscow began stressing special interest in Ukrainians, and a number of Ukrainian writers were partially rehabilitated, and the number of Ukrainian schools increased. Along with this policy of "liberalization" the course of Russification in Ukraine and in other non-Russian republics continues in somewhat modified form. Attacks against "bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism" is systematically being pressed by Moscow. Ukrainian patriots are now depicted as "agents of Wall Street and of the Vatican."

The rule of Khrushchev over the Ukrainian people at present time is characterized by the following features:

1. The Kremlin is continuing the anti-Ukrainian course, seeing in Ukrainian nationalism its greatest enemy within the U.S.S.R.; the anti-Ukrainian policies of Khrushchev include:

(a) trials and executions of members of the UPA and OUN, which have been going on throughout 1959;

(b) assassination of Stepan Bandera, leader of the OUN, on October 15, 1959, in Munich;

(c) persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, as exemplified by the third consecutive condemnation of the 76-year-old Metropolitan Joseph Slipy to 7 years of hard labor;

(d) deportation of hundreds of Ukrainian families from Western Ukraine to Kazakhstan and Siberia for the purpose of implementation of Khrushchev's pet project—settlement and cultivation of virgin lands of Asia.

2. Moscow is endeavoring, through the Ukrainian members of the Communist Party, to give the impression to the world that the Ukrainians are now partners—and hence equally culpable—in the administration and rule of the Soviet Empire.

3. While the all-out anti-Ukrainian drive is relentlessly pursued by the Kremlin, Moscow insists that all the non-Russian Republics, especially Ukraine, are not captive nations but equal independent and sovereign states and can freely secede from the U.S.S.R., if they so desire. Needless to say, any such attempt on the part of Ukraine would be ruthlessly suppressed, as it was in the twenties and early thirties in the case of the Ukrainian national Communists.

7. UKRAINIANS IN DIASPORA

While Ukrainians in enslaved Ukraine cannot openly voice their desire and aspiration to complete freedom and independence, this task is entrusted to some 2,500,000 Ukrainians and their descendants who live throughout the free world.

Ukrainian emigration is concentrated in the United States (some 1,500,000), Canada (500,000), South America (400,000), and some 100,000 in Australia, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and West Germany. The Ukrainians in overseas countries have their roots deeply imbedded in the soil of their settlement. In Canada they are recognized officially as one of the most dynamic ethnic groups: they have flourishing Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches,

schools, banks, cooperatives, political, cultural, and social organizations and societies. They have a Minister in the Dominion Government, two senators, a number of Members of the House of Commons, as well as in provincial parliaments.

In the United States, too, the Ukrainians have succeeded in developing their Catholic and Orthodox Churches; they have flourishing fraternal benevolent associations with assets of $40 million; they possess a well developed Ukrainian-language press (two dailies), as well as publications in English; a number of American nuclear scientists are of Ukrainian origin (Dr. George Kistiakovsky, Dr. Michael Kasha); they have many Ukrainian cultural associations—dance ensembles, choruses, orchestras and a number of soccer teams which are among the best in the country. This year the U.S. Census Bureau for the first time in American history recognized the Ukrainian language and Ukraine as a separate entity that could be entered in the U.S. population census of 1960. Such professional Ukrainian American organizations as the Ukrainian American Medical Association (with 1,200 members), Association of Ukranian Engineers, denists, and the like—number several thousands of highly specialized Ukranian men and women.

In the United States the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA), as in Canada the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, is the overall Ukrainian political representation striving to achieve recognition and support for the Ukrainian people in their struggle for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainians in the free world possess some 100 newspapers, one Ukrainian Free University in Munich, a Ukrainian Technological Institute in New York, the Shevchenko Scientific Society with branches in the United States, Canada, and Europe, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A., and many other organizations and societies.

The Western Powers, regrettably, still do not fully realize the power and potentialities that the Ukrainians and other peoples from behind the Iron Curtain represent in the West-East political and ideological contest. It is true that our "Voice of America," "Radio Liberty" broadcast in the Ukrainian language to the Ukrainians in their homeland, but these efforts are feeble in comparison with the powerful Soviet propaganda designed to lure Ukrainians in the free world to the cause of communism. There are also Ukrainian-language broadcasts from "Radio Madrid," "Radio Rome" and the Vatican Radio, which are much superior in effectiveness than our American broadcasts.

In conclusion, Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. It is a country with a compact homogeneous population, imbued with a fervent desire for freedom and independence. It is decidedly Western-oriented, due to its centuries-long cultural relationship with Western Europe.

For the Western Powers Ukraine, like other captive countries of the Soviet Empire, is a true ally, because it has always aspired to freedom and independence, and would not become reconciled to the alien rule of Moscow.

Whatever the future of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people may be the Ukrainian community abroad is far more unified and consolidated than it has ever been before. It can be counted upon to play a major part in the undying movement to restore the freedom and independence of Ukraine, as a vital and indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world.

A PROTEST AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF RELIGION IN UKRAINE AND A REQUEST TO FREE HIS EXCELLENCY METROPOLITAN JOSEPH SLIPY

1. More than 15 years ago, on March 11, 1945, an unprecedented persecution of the Catholic Church in Ukraine began. On that very day five bishops were arrested together with the metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop Joseph Slipy. Thereupon six other bishops and one apostolic administrator were imprisoned, so that by 1950, Ukraine was deprived of every single representative of the hierarchy.

Out of these 12 bishops, 2 were assassinated by the Bolsheviks, 6 died in prison camps or in exile, 2 died from complete exhaustion immediately after their release from prison, and the fate of 2 others remains unknown. The 68-year-old Metropolitan Joseph Slipy was sentenced in 1959 for the third time for his unrelenting attempts to govern the flock entrusted to him from behind the prison walls.

Yet, despite the persecution, not one single member of the Ukrainian hierarchy wavered in his convictions nor severed unity with the Holy See.

2. After imprisoning the hierarchy, the Communists liquidated all 5 Ukrainian Catholic dioceses and 2 apostolic administrations; disestablished 3,040 parishes with 4,440 churches, filling in the rest with Russian orthodox priests. Fifty percent of the 2,950 secular priests and the 520 religious were imprisoned, 20 percent fled the country or had to perform their sacerdotal duties in the underground, and 30 percent were coerced to accept Russian orthodoxy. All Catholic schools, elementary, secondary, and higher, altogether over 1,000 were transformed into atheistic educational centers; 41 lay Catholic organizations together with their suborganizations were dissolved; all Catholic printing shops and all Catholic publishing houses were confiscated. The most active ones of the 4,283,000 faithful were deported, and many of them gave their lives for their faith. Today the Catholic Church in Ukraine has been officially liquidated. Yet, she continues her work in the underground.

3. Although after Stalin's death the persecution of religion in other satellite countries somewhat subsided, in Ukraine the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite remains outlawed and those who claim to belong to her are severely punished. This is the consequence of the fact that the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in Ukraine was a natural link between East and West—between the Roman church with whom she has comomn dogmas, and the Oriental church with whom she has a common rite.

4. In those Ukrainian territories which were occupied by the Russians immediately after the First World War, the persecution of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church began in 1930. In that year, this church was officially outlawed and all her dignitaries deported. This subjection of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church to the Moscow hierarchy, which is fully dependent upon the political regime, shows that the Russian church policy is a means of the regime's imperialist policy which uses religious institutions to achieve a spiritual subjugation of its conquered territories.

In view of the facts presented, the undersigned does herewith:

(a) Most emphatically protest against the persecution of the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in Ukraine and indignantly rejects the deceiving assertions made by Moscow about religious tolerance in the U.S.S.R.

(b) Demand an immediate reinstatement of the freedom of conscience in the U.S.S.R. according to the basic principles of democracy.

(c) Demand an immediate release of the unjustifiably imprisoned metropolitan, His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipy, especially in the time when it is falsely asserted that Russian prisons hold no political prisoners. The undersigned demands of the metropolitan the right to return to Ukraine and the permission to exercise the functions of his archpastoral office.

(d) Demand information about the Ukrainian Bishop Basil Hopko, in the territories of Czechoslovakia, and in case of his imprisonment, his immediate release and permission to exercise the functions of his office.

Signature ----------

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain publications and newspaper articles, and particularly a petition which is called "A Protest Against the Persecution of Religion in the Ukraine."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his very able presentation today on the anniversary of the liberation and independence of Ukraine.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Ukraine. Tragically, this freedom to which these great people had aspired so long, was short lived. It may seem strange for us to consider the Ukraine in terms of independence, yet this is the manner in which it should be considered. Despite the maps which show this great area as part of the U.S.S.R., the Ukraine, in customs, traditions, and language, has always maintained its rights to nationhood. The masters in the Kremlin have realized this fact of history and, of all the present areas of greater Russia, the Ukraine has suffered specific persecutions to stamp out this fire of freedom.

It is a well-known fact that the Ukrainian people have manifested this desire for independence in 1918 and again in 1941 when the invading Germans held forth the possibility of it becoming a reality only to have their ideal shattered amidst the savagery of the Nazis. When the Ukraine was seized by the Reds again, they resuffered the same persecutions under Stalin. Yet, these brave people have consistently kept alive their firm belief and faith in their eventual independence. When we think of oppressed peoples and captive nations, let us never forget the Ukraine. Here are a noble people, a part of Eastern Europe known as the cradle of Christianity in Russia and whose capital city of Kiev is recognized among Eastern Christians as holy.

It is tragic, indeed, that the present condition of the Ukraine should be a horrible example of the duplicity and brutal application of power by the Communists. The Communists would have us believe that the Ukraine has voluntarily and of its own free will, exercising the prerogatives of liberty—the freedom to vote—joined the so-called Soviet Union. While on the surface this union would seem a peaceful cohesion of var-

ious states, it is, in fact, a union troubled by dissension and sometimes open rebellion. Revolts throughout the years have been a constant source of trouble for the Red masters. The present ruler of Russia is well known for his notorious and bloody role as the man who was sent to crush, without quarter, a Ukrainian attempt to self-assertion and independence.

So, while we contemplate those who are enslaved by the Russian masters, let us never forget that the Ukraine is one of these peoples—it is a captive and oppressed nation.

Let us hope that someday these brave and noble people who have carried in their hearts and minds the ideal of freedom against overwhelming odds, that they will be allowed to have that right to nationhood which is theirs.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. I would like to join in commending Congressman FLOOD for the very fine address he has made in connection with Ukrainian independence. I also call his attention to the fact that the Ukrainians are outstanding athletes. As a matter of fact, the Ukrainian Nationals are the soccer champions of the United States. I had the pleasure of helping several of the players participate in the championship game and in helping them get here for that purpose; also, in attending a banquet held in my district at which awards were made.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, independence and freedom have been the most cherished and noblest of desires for all peoples throughout the ages. Happy is the lot of those who can boast of their national independence for an unbroken length of time, and happier are those who have taken their independence for granted, free to enjoy it to the full, and did not have to struggle against insuperable odds for its attainment. The Ukrainians, one of the largest ethnic groups in Eastern Europe, and one of the most sturdy and stouthearted fighters for liberty and freedom, have not been fortunate in this respect. Centuries ago they lost their national independence. They regained it in 1918, only to lose it again in 1920.

For the 40 million Ukrainians who have been suffering for almost four decades under Soviet totalitarian dictatorship and who still yearn for their freedom, the 2-year happy interlude counts for everything, for the 1918–20 period of national independence was their most memorable and unforgettable years. They, as well as their more fortunate kinsmen who are living in the free world, enjoyed their freedom for a short time in their homeland, and they all venerate the beginning of that period, the day of the proclamation of their independence, the January 22 of 43 years ago. Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent celebrate that memorable day as the Ukrainian Independence Day. I am glad to join these Americans in the celebration of this historic anniversary, the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might remark, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] never appears in the well of this House unless he has a message that is deeply imbedded in his conscience, his convictions and the challenge within him to battle for the rights of freedom to which all peoples are entitled. Today he has spoken on a subject with which his heart and his mind are filled. His eloquent remarks, framed in the sincerity so evident by the emotion with which they were spoken, and on the spiritual pattern of the inspiring and heartening prayer of the acting chaplain, the Very Reverend Leo Wesolowsky, of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, truly reflects the universal sentiment of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I commend him for this latest of his many services to the cause of freedom, and wish to be joined in his remarks.

Yesterday, January 22, 43 years ago the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence. As a result of the Russian revolution, the czarist autocracy was shattered and the Ukrainians, the largest non-Russian ethnic element of that empire, asserted their freedom and declared their independence. Little more than 2½ years later, however, Ukrainian independence fell before the deadly onslaught of invading Russian Communists. Thus the first and original Iron Curtain was lowered on the Ukraine.

The institution of the Iron Curtain which has served to perpetuate the centuries-old oppression of the great majority of the Russian people, itself is a proven necessity for the Russian Communist policy of effectuating systematic genocide, political terrorism, and continuous aggression against the many non-Russian nations already brought into the captivity of the Red colonial empire on the one hand, and of spreading the propaganda of the workers paradise. The Iron Curtain thrown about the Ukraine and other non-Russian nations has proved effective in keeping many Western nations unaware if not uninformed of the struggle for freedom going on behind it.

For 40 years the Communists have ruled the Ukraine with an iron hand. They have turned a fair land into a prison house. Since 1920 there has been no semblance of freedom in that land.

Fortunately, however, neither the tyrants of Moscow nor their minions in the Ukraine can extinguish the spirit of freedom and of independence which all liberty-loving Ukrainians claim as their birthright. As long as that noble spirit lives, as long as the ideal of national freedom is cherished by the Ukrainians, no dictatorship or tyranny can rob them of the independence of their hearts and souls.

For more than 250 years, the Ukrainians have cherished the spirit of freedom and independence. Today, as we celebrate the 43d anniversary of the Ukrainian declaration of independence let us call upon Moscow as a test of their sincerity in calling for peace, to abolish the Iron Curtain and recognize in fact the independence of the Republic of the Ukraine.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so have 5 legislative days in which to file a statement on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. The proclaiming of independence on January 22, 1918, in the city of Kiev, was the culmination of the desires, the aspirations, and the cherished dreams of the Ukrainian people. But, despite the gallant efforts of the Ukrainian people, within 2 years their freedom had been treacherously and ruthlessly suppressed by the forces of Communist Russia. They have since endured the yoke of Soviet tyranny, awaiting the day of their liberation. Although their freedoms have been exterminated, we know that the spiritual and moral fiber of the Ukrainian people cannot be suppressed. Nor can their desire for liberty.

The Ukrainian nation numbers over 42 million people and is a most important ally of the free world in the struggle against communism. During the past decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have continued to demonstrate their devotion to freedom and the ideals of independence by maintaining a relentless opposition to Communist rule.

It is with great sympathy and understanding for our Ukrainian friends everywhere, and with steadfast hope for the future, that I join my colleagues today in reaffirming the goal of eventual liberation for all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 there was celebrated the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence. Many people throughout the free world were able to openly and happily enjoy this celebration, but there were also too many behind the Iron Curtain who could only celebrate with heavy hearts and hope that the time may soon come when they too may happily enjoy this day and freedom. As this day is celebrated and one of the great Europe's freedom fighters Shevchenko, remembered, we also must remember our duty to work for the continued freedom of the free world and all people and the removal of the Iron Curtain so that people throughout the world can enjoy this great civilization we are a part of and take their place on the stage of life without bondage.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is an occasion which deserves special attention here in the Congress of the United States.

As the legislative forum through which the people of the greatest free nation in the world govern themselves, it is fitting that we commemorate the efforts and struggles of other nations to secure and to maintain their own freedom and national independence.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Well over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have brought to this country their love of freedom, their individual self-reliance, their deep spiritual values and the riches of a distinctive culture. I have seen the great importance of these contributions in my own congressional district and, as a result, I feel I have a closer, more personal understanding of the deep dedication which Ukrainians everywhere have for the goal of personal liberty and national independence in their homeland.

The heritage of Ukrainian freedom is an ancient one. The oppression of Ukrainians under the Russian czars could not kill this heritage. And despite the incredible sufferings borne by Ukrainians during the 41 years of Soviet Communist domination, the spirit of freedom still burns as intensively as ever in the hearts of these brave people.

We owe it to Ukrainians everywhere, as to freedom-loving people throughout the world, to speak up on their behalf, to reiterate our sense of kinship, to condemn dictatorship and oppression, to share with them their heavy burdens, to assure them of our understanding and support, and to rededicate ourselves to the greatest work on earth—the struggle for true peace, the peace that is the fruit of freedom and justice.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago yesterday the Ukrainian National Republic declared her independence after centuries of subjugation under the yoke of the Mongols and the Russian czars. The independence and liberty of the freedom-loving Ukrainians was almost immediately stamped out by the Soviet Communist dictatorship, but the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people survives despite the purges, repressions, and cruelties of the Communist dictators. The flame of liberty still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of the Ukrainian people.

It is eminently fitting that we pay tribute today to these liberty-loving people who comprise the largest captive non-Russian nation both within the U.S.S.R. and behind the Soviet Iron Curtain. It seems fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we offer tribute as well on this occasion to all Ukrainian-Americans and to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., whose moral support and assistance in so many ways help the people of the captive Ukraine to keep alive the spark of freedom and to maintain faith in their ultimate liberation. With these thoughts in mind, I join my colleagues in honoring the freedom-loving Ukraine for her inspiring example in continuing the unabated struggle for recovery of the liberty which is rightfully hers.

A year and a half ago, in observing Captive Nations Week, we took due cognizance of the struggle for liberty of the peoples who for the present live under oppressive Communist tyranny. As counseled by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, we must continue to remind the people of the Ukraine that we have not and will not forget them in their struggle for liberty, while stripping the mask of hyprocisy from the Kremlin leaders and exposing them as the arch-imperialists of our time. It is the sincere hope of America and the entire free world that soon the Ukraine will join them in the family of free nations.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 22, millions of Ukrainians, both here and abroad, observed the 43d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic, a nation which was established in the latter part of World War I. For the brief period of about 2½ years they enjoyed freedom. But the forces of oppression and destruction were gathering, and the Red army was on the march.

Late in 1920, the Russians invaded the Ukraine, occupied it, and put an end to all forms of freedom there. Since that time some 42 million Ukrainians have been oppressed and enslaved under Communist totalitarian tyranny. They have been subject to Soviet control longer than any other minority in the Soviet Union. Their people have died by the millions in slave labor camps, in prisons and in the vast expanses of the Siberian wilderness.

Even under unheard-of hardships and privations, and under untold misery, these dauntless and freedom-loving people have not ceased fighting their oppressors. They still carry on their struggle, ceaselessly and systematically, with all the means at their disposal, in the hope that eventually their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence, will win out.

I am honored to join in saluting these courageous people, and I join in their fervent prayer that one day soon, they will indeed be able to celebrate their national independence day in their own free country.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, as a culmination of national desires and aspiration of the Ukrainian people.

Although the young Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of states, including the Soviet Russian Government, it was subjected to treacherous attack and assault by Communist Russia which through devious ways, including overt military aggression and subversion from within, endeavored to destroy the independence of the Ukrainian people and turn the Ukraine into a colony of Moscow. For almost 4 years, beginning with establishment of the Ukrainian Central Rada in March 1917, the Ukrainian people fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence, but deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic support by the West, they could not sustain the pressure of Moscow and by the end of 1920 the Ukraine was overrun by the Communist troops of Moscow.

But the freedom-loving people of Ukraine have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to fight for their liberation. During the past four decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have amply demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence of their country by waging relentless wars and opposition to the Communist rule of Moscow.

Both the U.S. Congress and President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia. During the debate at the U.N. General Assembly session in the fall of 1960, a number of Western statesmen, including the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, the representative of the Republic of China and others, raised their voices in protest against the persecution and enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

We are all fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. At this moment, when the Communist world, headed by Communist Russia, is marshaling its forces against the free world, as announced in the Communist manifesto in Moscow on December 6, 1960, we here in the United States, enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom, should demonstrate our sympathy to and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence comes at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under a new leadership. Let us hope it will be an era of peace and freedom for all peace-loving nations.

I trust that in the near future we shall once again see the United States and the free world regain the initiative in world affairs and that we shall play a leading role in the determination of such affairs. It is important that in the concept of the New Frontier we should not forget or omit the captive nations of Eastern Europe which have been suffering under the yoke of communism for many years.

The Ukraine, a nation of more than 40 million people, still remains enslaved under the ruthless rule of the Kremlin. Nevertheless, the people of the Ukraine have not given up their hopes for freedom and independence. They are waiting and hoping patiently, silently, and grimly.

On this anniversary of their national independence, we must extend a hand of friendship to the Ukrainian people and our moral support of their aspirations. We must also join them in prayer that their just cause will soon be realized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the proclamation declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent Republic was observed this week. Unfortunately, the freedom of the Ukraine was short lived as the new Republic was brought under the tyranny of

Soviet Russia in 1920. However, the flame of and desire for freedom has never been extinguished. Today, the spirit of January 22, 1918, remains alive in the hearts of over 40 million Ukrainians.

The devotion of the United States to the cause of liberty serves as an unseverable bond between the American people and the oppressed Ukrainians. The American people and our way of life must continue to shine as a beacon of hope to all peoples everywhere who have been deprived of their independence by tyrannical oppressors. It is our obligation and our privilege to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere so that all people might one day enjoy the blessings and joys of real and lasting freedom.

Today, the hope of freedom and the opposition to tyranny is strengthened by the knowledge that Ukrainians have not forgotten their experience with freedom and continue to strive for the restoration of liberty to their land.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, again this year, Americans of all faiths and of all national origins, pause to commemorate the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. January 22 marks the 43d anniversary of that proclamation, which was a culmination of the legitimate national desires and political aspirations of the Ukrainian people. Despite initial diplomatic recognition, the Soviet Union, in a pattern now so frequent that it is the rule rather than the exception, violated the sovereignty of the Ukrainian State and after 4 years of war, brought it under the physical control of Moscow.

The spirit of the Ukrainians is such, however, that they have never accepted Soviet domination, and political independence and freedom continues to burn in their hearts.

All freedom loving Americans join with Ukrainians, and with Americans of Ukrainian origin and parentage, in marking their continued protest against Soviet imperialism.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the observance of the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic which was marked on January 22.

The meaning of this observance has been eloquently stated by Mr. Wasil Dombrowsky, president, and Mr. Mykola Derbush, secretary, of the Minnesota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excerpt of their forthright statement:

January 22, 1961, will mark the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of the Ukraine, Kiev, as a culmination of national desires and aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

Although the young Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of states, including the Soviet Russian Government, it was subjected to treacherous attack and assault by Communist Russia which through devious ways, including overt military aggression and subversion from within, endeavored to destroy the independence of the Ukrainian people and turn Ukraine into a colony of Moscow. For almost 4 years, beginning with the establishment of the Ukrainian Central Rada in March 1917, the Ukrainian people fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence, but deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic support by the West, they could not sustain the pressure of Moscow and by the end of 1920 Ukraine was overrun by the Communist troops of Moscow.

But the freedom-loving people of Ukraine have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to fight for their liberation. During the past four decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have amply demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence of their country by waging relentless wars and opposition to the Communist rule of Moscow.

Both the U.S. Congress and President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia. During the debate at the U.N. General Assembly session in the fall of 1960, a number of Western statesmen, including the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, the representative of the Republic of China and others, raised their voices in protest against the persecution and enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in this city are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1961, in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. We, therefore, respectfully ask you to make an appropriate statement on the floor of the House of Representative on January 22, 1961, in commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

At this moment, when the Communist world, headed by Communist Russia, is marshalling its forces against the free world, as announced in the Communist manifesto in Moscow on December 6, 1960, we here in the United States, enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom, should demonstrate our sympathy to and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the spirit that moves men to freedom was aflame in Russia just under a half century ago. One tyranny had been thrown off, and the nationalities that made up the mighty czarist empire asserted themselves. They formed republics of their own volition and set forth on the path of independence.

But, like humans, these republics and new states are most vulnerable in the weeks and years after birth. And the republics that formed in the aftermath of the Russian revolution perished when a new tyranny swept across the land. One such republic was the Ukrainian National Republic, which marked the 43d anniversary of its birth on January 22.

Words sound empty when it is the anniversary of freedom that died. But the men and women of Ukrainian descent who keep alive the memory of independence have turned their eyes to the future. They have and they support a program that would bring freedom again, they are convinced, to their beloved land. Some of that program has been proposed and considered in this Congress. Much of it has merit, but most of all we should be aware of the spirit that asserts the need to seize the initiative from the Soviet menace.

The Hartford Courant marked this anniversary with an editorial which I believe is worth noting. I offer it for the RECORD:

UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE DAY—WITH A LESSON FOR ALL

Today, Americans of Ukrainian descent are marking the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the Ukraine National Republic. It is hardly an occasion for unalloyed celebration, for in one sense Ukrainians are people without a country. Although the independence of the Ukraine was declared on January 22, 1918, and at that time recognized by Soviet Russia, it was only 3 years later that Communist troops overran the new nation, enslaved it, and in a variety of ways brought about the deaths of untold numbers of Ukrainians who refused to submit to Red rule.

On the other hand, the Ukrainians are very much a people with a country—even though at the moment it can only exist in their hearts. Under Communist rule, or around the world, they fight with every determination and in whatever ways large or small they can, for the eventual freeing of their nation and the return of independence.

But the occasion of the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day is certainly not for Ukrainians alone. Now more than ever, it has meaning for free countries everywhere. The Ukraine National Republic was the first victim of Soviet aggression. Since then a host of other nations have been grabbed by Soviet imperialism, on some pretext or another, or none at all. A few days ago, Premier Khrushchev confidently announced that communism is on the verge of taking over the world altogether. But even though this was a familiar boast, it is plain that international communism intends to continue to seize what it can.

What happens to its victims, the commemoration of Ukraine Independence Day bitterly attests. In the face of the increasing Communist threat, the cause of the Ukraine and of the rest of the free world is welded in one. All the democracies, the older ones, the newer ones, the conquered ones, and the many about to be born, have no recourse but to unite against the implacable totalitarianism intent upon making freedom something that exists only in the minds of those who lose it.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this month the Ukrainian people will celebrate the 43d anniversary of their independence.

It is particularly ironic that a freedom for which so many fought so long was so short lived, and that the observance this year must be held while the Ukrainian people are gripped in the most merciless form of slavery ever known. But it is heartening to realize that despite the years of suffering Ukraine has endured, its spirit of independence still lives.

In the past I have paid tribute to the great Ukrainian people for their devotion to liberty and I think it is well at this time to reiterate that behind the Iron Curtain, in the most oppressed of all lands, there glows the spark that someday may set the world ablaze with a newer and nobler freedom, because the love of freedom and the devotion to human liberty of so great a people well could provide the inspiration for all free peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I join all America in saluting the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which speaks for them in this country.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, as we reach the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, this January 22, it creates anew a desire on the part of our Nation to seek an extension of freedom's frontier.

The 86th Congress was militant in its pointed legislative action toward this end—the sincerity of its attitude toward captive nations and their leaders was reflected in the passage of the Captive Week resolution, Public Law 86–749, authorizing a Shevchenko statue and honoring this "Europe's freedom fighter," House Document No. 445.

The reaction was a God-sent message of hope to those behind the Iron Curtain and counteracted Moscow's distortions of our materialistic and conservative nationalism.

It is of monumental importance that the United States impress further the peoples within the immediate control of the Soviet nation that the false image of the capitalistic system and its leaders are but the mental figments of a clever propaganda—thus, to influence their loyalty and support of the Soviet Union.

We must, in our future actions, not only contrive to stop the spread of communism, but must, by every means, counteract false propaganda within the Soviet Union itself and its satellites to thus weaken our enemies from within.

The victory of this age of the cold war will speedily be ours when the internal control of the Soviet states will be weakened.

It can be best accomplished by destroying the Russian image of power and falsity of purpose.

The freedom loving patriots within these captive nations, armed with the truth and realistic proof, can cause such a measure of unrest and confusion that enormous military forces will be needed for security surveillance.

This aroused populace, flexing its muscles of freedom, will in itself weaken and destroy the stability of the controls at Moscow. It will hasten the end of the cold war and result in independence and freedom among all nations at the new, extended frontier of peace.

We must persevere to this end.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

On this memorable occasion I would like to join with my esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to those peoples of the Ukraine who have labored and suffered under the yoke of communism since the brutal suppression of their rights and freedoms by the Communists in 1920.

History has demonstrated that the undaunted human spirit cannot be suppressed. The Ukrainian people and Americans of Ukrainian ancestry can take great courage in the fact that the free mind of man has always conquered the tyranny of a powerful aggressor. Above all else, this basic truth must be recognized and nurtured, for it is our basic weapon in the struggle with communism.

The Ukraine in particular has been a source of constant fear to the rulers of the Communist empire. The sympathies and hopes of the free world are with the Ukrainian people in their fight for freedom and independence. We must pledge ourselves to the goal of a better world where all peoples must live in peace, freedom, and justice.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 43d anniversary of the Ukraine's independence. Ukraine was the first victim of Russian Communist aggression, therefore, her tragic fate should serve as a warning for the free nations throughout the world, especially now, in these crucial times.

Although the Ukrainian people are no longer free, they still cherish freedom and liberty and they work and dream of the day when they will again be a free and independent nation. History has shown that the United States has always been on the side of those who value liberty and freedom.

Last year, the Congress recognized the plight of those unfortunate people who are still under the heel of Communist domination by enacting resolutions designating a Captive Nations Week and authorizing the erection of a statue to Shevchenko. However, these actions are not enough. Much more can and should be done by the United States to help these less fortunate people in their fight for freedom.

An even greater enemy than Communist tyranny is the indifference of free men to the suffering and enslavement of others and the complacency which accepts an injustice, however monstrous, as legitimate and lawful if only it is continued long enough. We must let the world know that we will not stand idly by while our fellow human beings are deprived of their rights to freedom and independence.

In this day of missiles and nuclear weapons, it is well to take time to remember this: The power of the human spirit and its eternal craving for freedom is a greater force against tyranny than our most destructive hydrogen bomb. To those in bondage behind the Iron Curtain, we must give our continued assurance that their resistance is not in vain and that theirs is not a forgotten front but a goal in freedom's fight for new frontiers. Let us do everything we can to spread the idea of freedom throughout the world so that all peoples now suffering under Communist domination may one day govern themselves in a world at peace.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence we express our solidarity with them in their struggle, and we pray that their wishes and hopes for freedom may soon be realized.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 42 million Ukrainians constitute one of the largest ethnic groups in Eastern Europe, and their country is among the largest in that crossroad between East and West. These hardy and peasant folk of the fertile steppe land, the solid core of East European peasantry, have tilled their farmlands for centuries, not only for their own well-being but also for all their neighbors and their overlords. The fact that their country has almost limitless riches in natural resources seems to have been a prime cause of their misery and misfortune. Its wealth and its geographic position has aroused the envy and anger of its powerful neighbors, and has brought about its conquest by alien tyrants.

For more than 300 years the Ukraine has been submerged in the Russian Empire, and during all that time autocratic czars and tyrannical Communists have done their utmost to suppress and eradicate what we in the West regard as the best Ukrainian traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, and their undying yearning for political independence. Only once in the course of three centuries they had the chance of attaining their goal. That was in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the Russian Revolution in 1917, the Ukrainian leaders seized upon the golden occasion and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. On that day the Ukrainian Republic came into being, and a new day was ushered in for the Ukrainians.

But the Ukrainian Republic thus born in the midst of misery and destruction did not last long. Two years after its birth, in the spring of 1920, it was attacked by Communist Russia's Red army, overrun and then the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Unfortunately for the unhappy Ukrainians, to this day their historic homeland remains under the totalitarian dictatorship of Russian Communists. Under Communist dictatorship they have suffered more than they did under the autocratic czars. Having regained their hard-won and richly deserved freedom in 1918, they were fated to lose it in 1920. But these liberty-loving people have not lost their hope, and they have not abandoned their longing for independence. In joining loyal and patriotic Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day I share their genuine sympathy for the oppressed Ukrainian people in their historic homeland.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Ukrainian people on this the 43d anniversary of their independence. Suffering under the brutal heel of Soviet tyranny, many millions of our Ukrainian friends are free to commemorate this day only in their hearts and memories; it is hoped that they can derive some comfort from knowing that understanding friends in the United States join with them in remembering a happier day 43 years ago.

The Ukrainians are culturally an independent people. They have their own language, their own customs, their own traditions, and their own history. Yet they have been forcefully submerged within a foreign empire for over three centuries. The rulers of that empire have changed, but its oppressive policies remain unaltered. As equally unalterable as Russian domination has been the Ukrainian people's desire for independence.

The record of the Ukrainian people demonstrates that the love of liberty and the desire of a people for self-determination are among the most durable of human aspirations. Decades and even centuries of brutal oppression have frustrated the hope of Ukrainian freedom, but the heavy hand of tyranny has been unable to kill such hope; it lives today as it did 43 years ago.

Around us each day are constant reminders of the contribution to America made by the Ukrainian people who came to our shores. Today let us pay particular tribute to the Ukrainian's contribution to the traditions of freemen the world over. They are a people who while tyrannized refuse to capitulate; they are a people who while enslaved continue to maintain human dignity; they are a people who while subjected to barbarianism seeks a measure of decency and justice which is the right of all men.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the long and turbulent history of the Ukrainian people is saddened by misery and misfortune. Their modern history records, for the most part, their subjugation to alien regimes in their homeland. Though they have been numerous enough and determined enough to fight for their freedom and independence, yet in the almost unending struggles against their foes they were outnumbered and overpowered. That has been the fate of the Ukrainian people for more than three centuries. Only for a very brief period for about 2 years—in 1918–20—they regained their freedom, and against fearful odds, managed to safeguard their independence. But in the end they were engulfed in the Soviet sea of serfdom and servitude.

The overthrow of the autocratic Russian regime in 1917 gave the Ukrainian leaders the opportunity they had been seeking; on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed Ukraine's independence and established the Ukrainian Republic. But from the moment of its birth to the time of its eventual death in the hands of its ferocious foes the fledgling state was faced with insurmountable internal and external difficulties. And before it was able to cope with these, the Republic found itself at war with Communist Russia. Early in the spring of 1920 the Red Army attacked the almost helpless Ukrainian Republic, overran it, and by summer that Republic had ceased to exist. Then the country was made part of the Soviet Union, and the fate of the Ukrainian people placed in the unrelenting hands of Communist tyrants in the Kremlin.

Since then, for more than 40 years Ukrainians have been held down by their oppressors and, of course, they have known no freedom in their homeland. But the spirit of freedom and independence in them is very much alive, and they naturally look forward to the realization of their aspirations. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their Independence Day I join all loyal Americans of Ukrainian origin and echo their genuine sentiments, and with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the south side branch located in Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1961, marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, and this is an event commemorated by Ukrainians throughout the world who are joined by all people everywhere who cherish the spirit of freedom and independence, and pray that those nations which have been enslaved by Communist tyranny and domination may be liberated from the rule of Soviet Russia.

Ukraine, after centuries of fierce and valiant struggle by the Ukrainian people for liberty, finally achieved freedom as a nation on January 22, 1918. But Ukraine independence was of short duration, and the Ukrainian people were again subjected to enslavement by the Russian Communists by 1920.

The Ukrainian people have remained free in spirit in spite of all the efforts of the Communist oppressors to destroy the Ukrainian national identity, and wherever the Ukrainian people are found, the words of their historic national anthem will ring out, "Ukraine will never die."

The people of the United States believe in the right of liberty and freedom for all people everywhere, and join with the Ukrainian people in the fervent hope that the yoke of Communist dictators will be thrown off, and that the Ukrainian nation will again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, a highly significant anniversary was observed—the 43d anniversary of the declaration by the Ukrainian people of their independence.

It was on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, that the Ukrainian Central Rada, assembled to represent the people of the Ukraine, proclaimed the establishment of the Ukraine's independence. The Ukrainian National Republic, created during the following year, was not allowed to exist for more than a few years before it fell victim to powerful tyranny. Yet the spirit of freedom still burns in the Ukraine, and in the hearts of those of Ukrainian descent all over the world.

I think that as we note this anniversary, it is appropriate that we also pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an organization which has done so much to keep alive the spirit of Ukrainian liberty. I am proud that in my State of Connecticut we have many dedicated members of this organization.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22, which has just passed, is a significant date for those who are lovers of democracy and who are believers in the rights of all peoples throughout the world to have the power to determine their own destinies in their own ways. January 22 marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

The history of these freedom-loving people is well known. In 1918 during the chaos of the closing days of World War I and the turmoil that swept all of Europe the Uranian Republic was established. It was dedicated to the same principles of freedom that are the cornerstone of our Government. It was established with high hopes and with a feeling that these peoples of the Ukraine could contribute their share to the development of mankind and to the better world we all seek. The life of this Republic was all too short-lived for in 1920 the Red hordes of communism engulfed the Ukraine, and to this day these people are like prisoners behind the Iron Curtain that has engulfed better than half the world. It would be redundant to say the usual things here again today and yet possibly the only thing we can say is that these peoples who have suffered so long under the heel of tyranny have never throughout the long years lost their enthusiasm for liberty and freedom and for the right to live their own lives in their own way. Their example and their actions even though half hidden behind the fog of communistic propaganda and lies are a lesson to all of us. They serve at all times as a beacon of liberty and as a warning that we must be ever vigilant to protect our own precious heritage from those who would destroy it.

On the 43d anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian Republic I salute it with the fervent prayer that in the not too distant future and in God's time when all of mankind are free to once again control their own destiny the people of the Ukraine and the Ukrainian Republic will take their rightful place beside the free nations of the world.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, I join in the expressions of tribute which are being made this week in observance of the 43d anniversary of the establishment of independence of the people of the Ukraine. We are solemnly and deeply aware of our common bonds with this noble people whose national ideology, aspirations, and desires are being tested in the dreadful trial of alien enslavement. We whose lives are mutually staked in the tenets of liberty and individual freedom are braced and heartened that in this trial the people of Ukraine are not found wanting. They continue an unflagging, valiant resistance to the rule and opposing faith of Communist tyranny. And their endurance gives brightened hope and a firmed strength to us and the peoples of the world who are engaged in this cause. We mark this anniversary together with Ukrainians everywhere with a true sense of deepened commitment to the pursuit of freedom from oppression and want and to the pursuit of peace for all peoples of the world.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the first day of this week marked the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. As we recall that January day 43 years ago when the citizens of the Ukraine declared their sovereign integrity as a free people, I should like to join in the common hope and prayer that that declaration will soon again be reechoed, and that Ukraine may take her rightful place among her sovereign sister nations of the world.

Freedom and independence are man's most cherished possessions. Individuals as well as peoples aim for their attainment but, even after centuries of ceaseless effort and untold sacrifice, all are

not successful. And, often those who are fortunate enough to attain their goal are suddenly reduced once more to subjugation by their heartless enemies. However, these people at least have the consolation of knowing that they have tried and won—and with this in mind they are armed with the strength and courage to win again. That is the Ukrainian case.

For nearly three centuries Ukrainian people lived under the oppressive czarist regime of Russia, and for about half that time part of them were ruled by the Hapsburg monarchy of Vienna. During all that time they tried to regain their freedom. The opportunity came toward the end of the First World War. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and created the Ukrainian National Republic. The great Ukrainian patriot, Professor Hrushevsky, was elected first President. They hardly had time to rebuild their war-torn country when they were attacked by the resurgent Red army early in 1920. By June the country had been completely overrun, and was subsequently incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then some 42 million unhappy Ukrainians have been suffering under the Soviet totalitarian dictatorship. Neither their own efforts, nor wartime conditions, nor postwar international developments have introduced any perceptible change in their sad lot of suppression, subjugation, and human bondage. What the future has in store for them is difficult to predict or foresee, but as long as they cling to their ideals of freedom and independence, they can be sure that their sufferings and sacrifices have not been in vain. I am glad to echo the sentiments of thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent in the celebration of this anniversary, Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, more than 300 years ago the Ukrainian people lived happily in their historic homeland and enjoyed the fruits of their labor in freedom. At that time they were the masters of their own fate and destiny. Then in the mid-17th century a compact signed between the czar of Russia and the Ukrainian leaders, and the failure of the czar to abide by the terms of that compact, placed the Ukrainians under Russia's autocracy. Following the bad faith of the Russian czar, the history of the Ukrainian people is one of misfortune and woe.

For three centuries, except for the brief period of 1918–20, Ukrainians have been subjected to oppressive alien regimes. But the First World War offered them the opportunity to free themselves. The Russian autocracy was shattered in 1917, and the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence in January of 1918. That date, the 22d of January 1918, marked the rebirth of the Ukrainian Republic.

For the next 2 years the Ukrainians worked hard to rebuild their war-torn country and did their utmost to safeguard their hard-won freedom. However, before they had sufficient time to accomplish these goals, they were overwhelmed by their inveterate foes, the Russians. By the middle of 1920 the country was overrun by the Red Army, Ukraine's independence vanished, and the country was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, for more than four decades, some 42 million Ukrainians have been living under the oppressive regime of Communist totalitarian dictatorship. During that time they have endured all the hardships of totalitarianism, but they have not given up their national ideals or their devotion to freedom. On this 43d anniversary observance of their independence day, let us hope that they will again attain their national goal, freedom in their homeland.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. It was an anniversary of both courage and hope; courage against the tyranny of today, and hope for the liberty of tomorrow. In places like Amsterdam, N.Y., and elsewhere throughout the free world, this anniversary has been celebrated in the light of freedom. But the celebration is dimmed by the plight of those courageous Ukrainian people who are unable to celebrate their own independence because they live behind the Iron Curtain.

These people, who fought so valiantly for their freedom in 1918 only to have it taken away by a large, powerful, and greedy Soviet state just 2 years later, are an example to all of us who enjoy freedom today. As President Kennedy said just 2 days before the anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic in his brilliant inaugural address:

> Let every nation know * * * that we shall pay any price * * * to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

Until the Ukrainian Republic, whose people have fought continually against the yoke of their Communist oppressors, can again be secure in the liberty they so justly deserve, the freedom of all of us is to that extent incomplete and impaired.

January 22 is a day that reminds us that the desire for liberty cannot easily be stamped out in the hearts of a people as strong and valiant as the Ukrainian people. But at the same time this anniversary day squarely places the burden of leadership. Let us who are free rededicate ourselves, as our great new President has called on us to do, to the continuing struggle for "liberty and justice for all."

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the story of the unquenchable will of the Ukrainian people for independence is one that should be told and retold. Although the independent republic which was established on January 22, 1918, was short lived and the country by 1920 was subjugated by Soviet Russia, the fierce desire of the Ukrainian people for independence has remained a burning flame in a land wrapped in darkness and has been an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere.

In celebrating this 43d anniversary during the Shevchenko centennial year, I take pride in recalling the privilege and honor I enjoyed last year in working for enactment of Public Law 86–749 to authorize the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko in our Nation's Capital and in sponsoring the authorization of Shevchenko's documentary biography. This biography, known as House Document No. 445, and aptly entitled "Europe's Freedom Fighter," is being read in many quarters of the world today. The recent propaganda blasts from Moscow about our Shevchenko's observance and the Soviet reaction to our enactment of the captive nations' resolution are solid proof that our efforts to assure the enslaved peoples of our continuing interest and support are causing consternation in the Communist circles.

On this occasion let us renew our pledges of support in behalf of the cause of a liberated Ukraine and the freedom of all captive non-Russian nations from the alien totalitarian yoke. This support is in the primary interest of the security and independence of our own Nation. May our actions during the past year always symbolize the spirit of our united hope and efforts toward the freedom of all enslaved nations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is one of the largest countries in Eastern Europe, at the crossroad between east and west. For centuries it has been the meeting place of two opposing civilizations, and became an apple of discord between powerful forces contending for its possession. That is the principal reason for the inability of the Ukrainian people, gallant and courageous as they are, to cope with their envious adversaries in their struggle for freedom. National independence has eluded these people for some three centuries; it has been denied to them by their powerful neighbors on the east, the Russians.

Only at the time of the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917 they saw their chance, seized upon it, and declared their freedom. That was on the historic day of January 22, 1918. Then it seemed that the centuries-old Ukrainian dream of independence, thus attained, would last. Unfortunately the course of international events put the existence of independent Ukraine in jeopardy, and before the end of 1920, the Ukrainian Republic was swallowed by the Soviet Union. Today some 42 million Ukrainians live in their homeland under the oppressive Communist regime instituted there by the Kremlin. But even under the ruthless Soviet taskmaster the Ukrainian people have not relinquished their national ideals, their desire for freedom and independence. On the observance of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day we all hope that again they attain their goal, their freedom and independence in their historic homeland.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to those peoples of the Ukraine who have labored and suffered under the yoke of communism since the brutal suppression of their rights and freedoms by the Communists in 1920.

Although the Ukrainian people are no longer free, they still cherish freedom and liberty and work and dream of the

day when they will again be a free and independent nation. History has shown that the United States has always been on the side of those who value liberty and freedom and last year the Congress recognized the plight of those unfortunate people who are still under the heel of Communist domination by enacting resolutions designating a Captive Nations Week, and authorized the erection of a statue to Shevchenko.

The independence of Ukraine, proclaimed by the National Council at Kiev, in 1918, most tragically was a brief one, for in 1920 the Communists brutally subjugated the people of Ukraine, and have held them under their yoke since that time.

The foundation of the democratic Ukrainian Republic was the culmination of a long struggle that began in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were first brought under the autocratic Russian regime. But the joys of freedom were short lived in the new Republic. Late in 1920 Communist forces invaded that fair land. And for the last 41 years the heels of Communist tyranny has lain heavy over the freedom-loving peoples of the Ukraine.

Like other wonderful peoples in Europe and Asia under the domination of communism, the Ukraine people have lived under the blackest periods in the history of mankind, because of the brutalities and crimes committed against them. However, the oppressed Ukraine people have never given up hope and heart for the day when they may have complete freedom. It is this dream of freedom that places no limit to the number of forces which motivate and put into motion the human desire to move forward toward freedom. The Ukraine people have possessed many fine virtues through their long and turbulent history, and they have clung to them steadfastly.

Despite four decades of hardships and privations and of indescribable misery, the spirit of hope and freedom is not dead in the Ukraine. It is my fervent hope that the dreams of Ukrainians the world over can someday be realized. In memory of this anniversary of past independence and in sorrow and grief for the freedom that was only too brief, I offer this tribute to Ukrainians everywhere. On this 43d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, I extend my warm and wholehearted sympathy and my very best wishes to a fine and courageous people.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, each January 22, as it passes, gives the lie to the Soviet myth that Communist policies toward other peoples are peace loving and nonaggressive.

On January 22, 1918, the great and proud Ukrainian people declared their independence and proceeded to establish the Ukrainian National Republic in their sacred homeland. But since genuine liberty was intolerable to the Bolsheviks even in that day, the Red armies soon crushed the infant republic and by 1920 it existed only as another chapter in the long and tragic history of the Ukrainian nation.

Those who live in freedom have a solemn responsibility to encourage the spark of liberty wherever it yet flickers behind the Iron Curtain. We know that in spite of the ruthless suppressions of the Ukrainian people in the 1930's and the 1940's and the 1950's that their hope of freedom still exists to haunt the masters of the Kremlin.

Each January 22 as it dawns must ever be the occasion for us who enjoy national independence and individual freedom to commemorate the age-old struggle of this valiant people.

As long as freemen live, the heroic struggle of Ukrainians against Russian tyranny serves as an example of the human spirit's indomitable drive to secure liberty.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence have always been man's noblest, most cherished ideals, his ultimate goals. This has been no less true with peoples and nations. They all have fought for the attainment of their independence, and have been prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice in its defense. The Ukrainian people are no exception. After losing their freedom to the Russian czar more than 300 years ago they fought with all means at their disposal for its recovery, and in 1918 they had the chance. When the defunct autocracies in Russia and in Austria-Hungary were overthrown, the Ukrainians felt free and proclaimed their national independence. This was done on January 22, 1918. This memorable date then became a Ukrainian national holiday, even though the Republic founded on that day had ceased to exist more than 40 years ago.

In the middle of 1920 the Ukrainian Republic was put out of existence by the Red army, and then the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. But the Communists have been no more successful in their effort to uproot the ideas of freedom and independence among the Ukrainians than were the czarist agents in their day. And today the stout-hearted people of Ukraine cherish freedom as fervently as did their forefathers when oppressed by their ruthless overlords. These people, suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorship today, have proudly kept up their heads, and are looking forward to a better future. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day one can only hope that they attain their goal.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many peoples have suffered under Russia's oppressive regimes but none of them have suffered so long and unhappily as the Ukrainian people. These sturdy peasant folk of the fertile steppe country had lived under Russian czars for some 250 years when the First World War broke out. In the course of that war, when the Russian autocracy collapsed, the Ukrainians seized the opportunity to proclaim their independence. This was done on January 22, 1918.

For more than 2 years Ukrainian leaders did their utmost to stave off threats to their newly founded state, but in the end, in 1920, the Ukraine fell victim of Soviet aggression. By mid-1920 the country was overrun by the Red army, the Ukrainian Republic was robbed of its existence, and the country made part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than 40 years some 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the Communist totalitarian dictatorship of the Kremlin, with freedom denied to them. But the stout-hearted people of Ukraine still cherish their hope for freedom and independence.

On this 43d anniversary of their independence day we echo their sentiments and join the hope that they will regain their freedom soon again.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that for more than 300 years the liberty-loving Ukrainian people have known freedom for only the brief 2-year period, 1918–20. For four decades, some 42 million stout-hearted and gallant Ukrainians have suffered under their ruthless taskmasters, Communist totalitarian tyrants, as had done their forefathers under czarist Russians for 250 years. But these cruel facts do not tell the story of the Ukrainian people's struggle for freedom and independence. That struggle culminated in the birth of the Ukrainian Republic in January of 1918. The date of that event, the 22d of January, became a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and thus remains in their annals as a national holiday.

Since the birth of that Republic 43 years ago, and particularly since its destruction by the Red army in 1920, the people of Ukraine have suffered even more than their ancestors had under callous czarist agents. They have been dispossessed of their worldly possessions and reduced once again to the status of serfs. They have been denied all forms of freedom in their historic homeland, and driven to hard work for the benefit of their alien overlords.

However, in all this suffering and misfortune the Ukrainians have kept faith with their tradition. They still fervently cherish their ideals of freedom and independence in their homeland. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people during the last several decades this is the most encouraging fact. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their historic Independence Day we in the free world wish them more power in their struggle for their righteous cause—freedom, independence, peace, and happiness in their homeland.

FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanmous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Air Pollution Control Act by eliminating the time limitation and the $5 million ceiling on annual appropriations.

Present law authorizes appropriation of not more than $5 million annually for

9 fiscal years beginning with July 1955 and ending June 30, 1964.

There is no question that air pollution is going to be a continuing problem. It is a national problem, and one in which the Federal Government has a great interest and responsibility. Much of the work in the Federal program is of a long-term nature. Planning is difficult if those in charge cannot look for Federal aid with any certainty beyond June 30, 1964.

The $5 million annual ceiling on appropriations is neither realistic nor desirable. With this ceiling a sudden breakthrough in research requiring appropriations beyond the ceiling could not be followed up speedily. I am not passing judgment on how much can be spent wisely. That judgment should be left to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Public Health Service should not be blocked from requesting whatever sums may be needed.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 16, I introduced a farm bill. At that time I made some brief remarks on the farm problem and asked for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. Through some oversight or neglect those remarks never appeared in the RECORD. Under unanimous consent, I therefore include the following statement in the body of the RECORD:

ON THE FARM PROBLEM—CONSERVATION RESERVE I

Because I come from the best farming section in America—the great State of Iowa—and because I am keenly aware of some of the problems that exist in the areas that depend on agriculture and, more importantly, the problem of the farmer himself, and because the real problem that farmers have to contend with has not been effectively dealt with in the Congress, I am going to become more interested than ever in dealing with this question on a sound basis.

All of us are keenly aware of the fact that this is one of the most difficult domestic problems that we have and it will call for application of the best talents that we can find. This problem, in my opinion, must be looked at from a nonpartisan viewpoint, keeping in mind what is best for the country first and what is best for agriculture second, and creating and passing legislation that will be understood and be of inestimable value to the 88 percent of the people who do not live on the farms, but who have a direct interest in the farmer's welfare first of all because he wants and needs good and adequate food supply and second because he, as a fairminded citizen, is interested in the farmer having his fair share of the prosperity enjoyed by the rest of the people in the United States.

One of the greatest problems with which the farmer must contend is inflation. We who are Members of Congress and can have an influence on inflationary trends must contend with this problem for the benefit of all economic groups but especially for the farmer. Every legislator should be constantly aware of the fact that when he promotes programs that are inflationary, while it hurts all of us, it hurts the farmer a lot more because on a per capita basis, the farmer buys more than any other large economic group in America and; therefore, loses more from inflation. We cannot continue to be uninterested or get calloused about this grave national problem that has been plaguing us and will hurt us more in the future unless it is brought under control.

There can be some things accomplished by the Congress that could have a lasting and desirable effect on the farm economy and we ought to get on with the consideration of that business immediately. I shall be putting forth my best efforts to point up some of the important problems and answers to the problems that have been suggested to me by the farmers of the First Congressional District of Iowa whom I have the high honor and privilege to serve.

I will speak on a number of those subjects at some future date. They are:

1. Voluntary land retirement as a logical method of reducing agricultural production.

2. The popularity of the conservation reserve land retirement program.

3. Voluntary land retirement is effective in reducing agricultural production.

4. Rebuttal to some of the conservation reserve criticisms.

Today I am talking on the subject of voluntary land retirement as a logical method of reducing agricultural production.

Almost every agricultural census since 1880 has shown that American farms are becoming larger and larger. This increase in the size of our farms is caused by technology by new and more efficient machinery aided and abetted by a vast reservoir of land constantly becoming available through death, retirement, ill health, or transference to other occupations. Without effective intervention of any kind, this trend will continue indefinitely.

The record clearly shows that the soil bank's conservation reserve program has taken up much of the land which otherwise would have been placed on the market through the constant attrition of old age, ill health, and kindred factors. Thus this type of land did not continue in active production by becoming parts of larger and larger farming units. Instead, the Government rented the land, took it out of production, and assisted the owners in establishing soil, wildlife, or water conservation measures which preserve it for that day in the future when it will be badly needed by the growing population in America. It is my firm belief that this is the least painful, least irritating and most practical and most effective method of shrinking our national agricultural plant which almost everyone agrees is now much too large.

There are some who say that the agricultural plant should be shrunken through survival of the fittest in the jungle of economic competition. Perhaps this is a sound approach in the field of industrial economics although I doubt it, but when applied to the field of agricultural economics it has one, often overlooked, serious flaw. This flaw is that individual farmers may become bankrupt, but the land they operate continues in production under other hands until often times the soil, itself, is bankrupt. When this happens we have depleted the best natural resource we have. One may observe the result of this kind of economics and tragic neglect within 15 miles of the Capitol dome, where land that produced bountiful crops during colonial days now produces only thin stands of scrub trees and weeds. The loss or serious damage to a quarter of a billion acres of our remaining precious topsoil is far too high a price to pay for adjusting supplies to demand.

There are those who say that the only fair and equitable solution is to share the market pro rata among all active farmers. As a last resort, this may be justifiable. But in my opinion we have not reached this last extremity as long as there are many thousands of farmowners who are perfectly willing to completely retire their land from production.

Why should we demand contraction from those who want to expand, and at the same time force continued activity on the farms of those who are anxious to retire? Such a policy pleases no one. In all sincerity, I say this does not seem to me to be good politics, good economics, good psychology, nor good Americanism.

For these reasons I urge this Congress to immediately push forward toward the solution of agriculture's surplus problems with a vigorous, voluntary land retirement program. No one knows exactly how much land must be retired in order to catch up with our exploding capacity to produce. But surely everyone will agree that if enough land is retired, over production will be solved in the aggregate and those farmers who choose to continue in agriculture can make a decent living.

COMMENTS ON A BILL FOR EXTENSION AND AMENDMENTS TO THE AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1956

After an extended and concentrated study of the problems relative to the farm question, I have authored and am introducing today a bill which I believe ought to be considered immediately by the great Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives.

The bill provides for 10 major changes in the Agriculture Act of 1956. They are:

1. Extend the period during which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into conservation reserve contracts through 1969;

2. Change the authorized period of contracts for the establishment of tree cover from 15 to 20 years;

3. Provide for a limit of 80 million acres under the conservation reserve program in lieu of the monetary limit as now provided in the Soil Bank Act;

4. Make land owned by the State and Federal Government ineligible to be placed in the conservation reserve program;

5. Provide for a $10,000 annual payment limitation to any producer within any State;

6. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make annual payments in cash or by the issuance of certificates redeemable in wheat or feed grains;

7. Require the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce the conservation reserve program not later than March 1 of the year preceding the first year of the contract period;

8. Require producers who enter into conservation reserve contracts to agree to carry out farming operations on the entire farm in accordance with good farming practices;

9. Provide for a 100 percent civil penalty instead of the 50 percent as now provided in the Soil Bank Act; and

10. Provide that for a period of 5 years after such lands are first devoted to agricultural production, newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project of lands reclaimed by flood-control projects shall be ineligible for certain crop loans, soil bank payments, price support benefits, and other farm payments.

While I am sure that these may not be the only answers to the problem and, while in certain respects my bill may need some further study and possibly further refinements and, while an extended hearing on this whole problem might prove some additional amendments are necessary, I do contend that the bill I am introducing is a logical one and a good base to start from.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to mark this 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. I am pleased to be able to call attention to the constant battle fought by the Ukrainian people against the Russian rulers who hold the Ukraine and its people as a Red colony, while assailing colonialism in propaganda broadcasts and messages.

The myth of Soviet unity is exploded by the people of Ukraine and other captive nations. The violent reaction of Premier Khrushchev to the captive nations resolution passed by this Congress last year clearly shows the keen awareness on the part of the Kremlin rulers of the deep-seated desire for freedom by the people of the captive nations which are part of the Red bloc today.

The free people of the world are bound together in a desire to release those people of Ukraine who are forcibly held in bondage by the Russian overlords. Let us renew our pledge of friendship and support to the Ukrainian people. Let them know that we in freedom's citadel are with them in their quest for freedom with peace, independence with honor.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I have again introduced my resolution calling upon the President to proclaim as days of observance the historic national days of the Ukraine and 18 other captive nations.

I think it appropriate that Americans express in this way their spiritual kinship with all people who yearn for freedom and particularly with the people of those nations that, once free, are now enslaved by ruthless communism.

On this anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination to all who now suffer behind the Iron Curtain of Red tyranny.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHERER for January 26 and 27, on account of discussion of highway legislation at Kansas City, Mo., on January 26 and Committee on Un-American Activities matters at Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 27.

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. RHODES of Arizona and Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 1 hour each on January 25.

Mr. BAILEY, for 40 minutes, on January 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SLACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLLIER in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. DOYLE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia.

(At the request of Mr. CONTE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT in four instances.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. ALGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1961, 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:

412. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting part VI, "Studies of the Economic and Social Effects of Highway Improvement," which relates to the final report of the highway cost allocation study, pursuant to section 210 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 387), as amended by section 2 of the act approved August 28, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

413. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Lake Erie shoreline from the Michigan-Ohio State line to Marblehead, Ohio, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

414. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 22, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim report on Caseville Harbor, Mich., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 24, 1945, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

415. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 3, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Pascagoula Harbor, Miss., made in response to an item in Public Law 86-645, approved July 14, 1960, which calls for an immediate study to be made of the project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, House Document No. 98, 86th Congress, to determine if further modification is warranted (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

416. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 31, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on hurricane survey of Brunswick and St. Simons Island, Ga., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Public Works.

417. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report covering the rural electric and rural telephone programs of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Agriculture.

418. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill amending several laws administered by the Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

419. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

420. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for examples and appropriate assistance by the Federal Government in shelter construction"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

421. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report for the period ending December 31, 1960, relating to Federal contributions, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

422. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 17,500,000 pounds of cordage fibers now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

423. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 6(d) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(d)) to authorize certain persons who complete a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

424. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

425. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

426. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

427. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

428. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertising for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 86–149; to the Committee on Armed Services.

429. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

430. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Department of Labor's annual report for fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

431. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of information pertaining to extension of the act's protection to additional employees, and summarizes data concerning the minimum wage, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

432. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

434. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property in accordance with the provisions of title IV, section 404(d), Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, amended, covering the period January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 404(d), title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

436. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of leases exceeding 5 years entered into by the General Services Administration during the period July 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 85–493, approved June 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 294); to the Committee on Government Operations.

437. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

438. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to (1) assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, (2) provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and (3) clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

439. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

441. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 48th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

442. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

443. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

444. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries of the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site in North Carolina, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

445. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2 of the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended by the act of June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 239; 43 U.S.C., sec. 682b)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), relating to adult Indian vocational training"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

447. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to establish revolving-type funds in the Treasury for the Southeastern Power Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

448. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

449. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

450. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

451. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

452. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the classification, segregation, and disposal of public lands chiefly valuable for urban and business purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

453. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to regulate certain unscrupulous activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

455. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

456. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, to transfer responsibility for determining the suitability of the home of the adopting parents for such orphans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

457. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Gerardo P. Magcanam and Pedro F. Bantillo"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

458. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

459. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary material required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

460. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the es-

cape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

461. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

462. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to modernize and liberalize the quota system and provide for the admission of persecuted peoples, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

464. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

465. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

466. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

467. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone President, Panama Canal Company, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

468. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

469. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of scientific and professional positions established under the authority contained in 72 Stat. 213a, 5 U.S.C., 1161(e), pursuant to 72 Stat. 214, 5 U.S.C., 1163; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the status of construction, alteration or acquisition of public buildings, pursuant to section 11(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 610(a)); to the Committee on Public Works.

471. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the Bonneville Project Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Public Works.

473. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 in order to provide for the financing of forest highways and public lands highways from the highway trust fund"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to issue certain regulations concerning air traffic at LaGuardia and New York International (Idlewild) Airports in the State of New York, and Newark Airport in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3016. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 3017. A bill to provide that coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed farmers and ranchers shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3018. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 3019. A bill to provide for the construction of a fireproof annex building for uses of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3020. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3021. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3022. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to assist in the prevention of the interstate transmission of gambling information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3023. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3024. A bill to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3026. A bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3027. A bill to extend the benefits of the retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3028. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discrimination against female employees with nondependent husbands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 3029. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3030. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3031. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3032. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3034. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize the President, during periods of acute unemployment, to provide that all individuals otherwise eligible may retire with full benefits thereunder at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3035. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3036. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3037. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3038. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 3039. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3040. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis (for determining gain or loss) of property acquired from a decedent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3042. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed services to receive benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act without relinquishing their retirement pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3043. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 3044. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans with service-connected disabilities less

than total who have $5 per $1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies to obtain the new $10 per $1,000 total disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 3045. A bill to correct injustice by providing for back pay to certain officers as required by the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat 840, ch. 307); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3047. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 3048. A bill to extend the time for making application for compensation for unused leave accumulated on September 1, 1946, by members or former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3049. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3050. A bill to supplement and revise the criminal laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3051. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3052. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3053. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3054. A bill to authorize construction of the Ansonia-Derby local protection project, Naugatuck River, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3055. A bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3056. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3057. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Slidell, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3058. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the placement in grade 18 of the general schedule of 20 positions of hearing examiner in the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3059. A bill to amend section 2(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3060. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to permit employees to acquire an additional unit of insurance under such act by paying both the employee's and the Government's share of the cost of the premiums thereon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3061. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3062. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3063. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3064. A bill to permit the coverage under social security of certain policemen and policewomen in the city of Hammond, La.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of an individual's wages, salary, or other income shall be exempt from levy to enforce the payment of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3066. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special rule for the computation of net earnings from self-employment by ministers and members of religious orders under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code entitled "Highways" as revised, codified, and enacted by Public Law 85-767, so as to provide for effective competition in the construction of Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3068. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3069. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 3070. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3071. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Senior Citizens Service within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 3072. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3073. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal assistance, under the program of aid to dependent children, for children whose father is unemployed as well as for those whose father is dead, disabled, or absent from home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3074. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3075. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3076. A bill to provide that the President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, an item for not less than $2 billion to be applied toward reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3077. A bill to provide that an officer of the Army, Air Force, or Navy assigned to serve as Director of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology shall hold the rank of not less than brigadier general or rear admiral, as the case may be, while so serving; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3078. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3079. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3080. A bill to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3081. A bill to create an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3082. A bill providing for the rank of certain officers in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1955, relating to air pollution control, so as to authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out its provisions, without limitation as to fiscal years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3084. A bill to provide for the crediting to the civil service retirement and disability fund, at the option of employees, of accumulated and accrued annual leave for purposes of providing additional annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3085. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3086. A bill to amend the Clayton Act as amended, to strengthen our competitive enterprise system by providing for competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3087. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a 20-percent increase in rates of disability compensation for service-connected disabili-

ties incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3088. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3089. A bill to provide for the development of practical means of producing water suitable for domestic, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other beneficial uses from mineralized and chemically charged water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3090. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 3091. A bill to amend section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code so as to authorize the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of interstate highways to be constructed in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend section 1332(c) of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to diversity of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3093. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State's court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend section 3401 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3095. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3096. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3097. A bill to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, with respect to the recognition of organizations of employees in the Federal civil service and postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3099. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the establishment of National Zoo Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that a sound dollar is the basis for future growth and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution relative to captive nations days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. Res. 122. Resolution to create a Committee for Small Unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. Res. 123. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 124. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 125. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 126. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Hatridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 3101. A bill for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Emilia, Guido, and Carlo Borsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 3103. A bill for the relief of Mrs. P. Gabor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3104. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude F. Moorhead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3105. A bill for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3106. A bill for the relief of Kestutis Petras Mikaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3107. A bill for the relief of Alicia Kut Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3108. A bill for the relief of Sophie E. Cescolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrsena Nestorides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonore Sidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 3111. A bill for the relief of Kwan Suck Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 3112. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Perez Garcia de Covelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Carmine Vincenzo Mocciola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 3114. A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Maj. Gen. Howard McCrum Snyder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irith Ina Abileah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Sarah Laing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3117. A bill for the relief of Woo You Lyn, also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3118. A bill for the relief of Dimitraki and Aliki Efstatopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 3119. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Polifronio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 3120. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shing Mei Hui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 3121. A bill for the relief of D. L. Tedrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3122. A bill for the relief of C. B. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3123. A bill for the relief of A. V. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3124. A bill for the relief of F. W. Caddes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Joao de Freitas Ferreira de Vasconcelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Rajinder S. Bling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Amrik S. Warich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3128. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Maria Loncaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3131. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Lucille Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria A. Schmoldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Alvin Bardin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Kurt Sorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Louis M. Linxwiler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gen. Verne J. McCaul; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3138. A bill providing for the Administrator of General Services to convey certain real property to the Morgantown Community Association; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TABER:

H.R. 3139. A bill for the relief of Georg Puffal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3140. A bill for the relief of Najla Malti, Hanna Malti, Fadwa Malti, Constantin Malti, and Marie Malti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Domenico Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3142. A bill for the relief of Richard Pang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3143. A bill for the relief of Constanzo Manes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3144. A bill for the relief of Mui Kim Chen Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3145. A bill for the relief of Carlo Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3146. A bill for the relief of Jozef Gromada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 3147. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Holtzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3148. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3149. A bill for the relief of Basil Manioudakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and to Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz; and providing for the striking and presentation to General MacArthur and Fleet Admiral Nimitz of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission To Take Action Regarding Tragic Grade Crossing Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention again to grade-crossing accidents that result from what has been termed an inexcusable disregard of duty by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I want to emphasize the tragic developments which may very well be the result of the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to act.

On the morning of January 17 one of the crack trains of the Illinois Central Railroad—the City of New Orleans—on its northbound journey to Chicago struck a tank truck carrying petroleum products. Some say it was hauling a highly dangerous commodity—butane. The accident occurred within the limits of Magnolia, Miss., and resulted in the death by fire of at least nine people, including the engine crew and the truck driver, as well as others not directly involved in the collision. This collision was another one to add to a longer list of occurrences which are identical except as to detail. The accident has been scheduled by Division 3 of the Interstate Commerce Commission for an investigation January 31, 1961, at Robert E. Lee Hotel, Jackson, Miss.

Mr. Speaker, this accident was bad enough. The relatives and friends of those who met this painful death will never forget the shock and horror of its occurrence. But the circumstance which is appalling to me and which begins to engender righteous anger is the utter failure over many months of the Interstate Commerce Commission to take one step—to do any one special thing to prevent such happenings. I am also beginning to wonder about the attitude of the petroleum industry and of those trucking companies engaged in hauling petroleum products.

On September 1 of last year I extended my remarks regarding grade-crossing accidents which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following day. I complained about the action of the ICC in rejecting for the third time the request of the railway brotherhoods for a general investigation by the ICC to determine what could and should be done to prevent these rail-highway grade-crossing collisions with trucks hauling gasoline and other dangerous commodities.

In my remarks I reviewed briefly the developments. I described the collision on March 1, 1960, near Bakersfield, Calif., when a train hit a truck with 7,000 gallons of petroleum, killing 14 people—11 of whom were passengers on the train. I mentioned the incident which occurred a few days later near Chanute, Kans., where a father and son, engineer and fireman, were killed when an M-K-T locomotive hit a tank truck. I spoke of the two separate collisions in June of 1960 near Jacksonville, Fla., when five more men were cremated in the same way. In August of last year near Birmingham, Ala., three of the train crew and the truckdriver followed the same route.

I pointed out that the five brotherhoods of railroadmen who are engaged in operating trains had filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition pleading with that body to conduct a general investigation of such collisions to find out what the ICC could and should do to prevent them. I mentioned the fact that similar petitions previously filed by the same brotherhoods had been turned down by that Commission. Then I pointed out that the ICC on August 15 made a decision again turning down the petition. However, that decision was not announced until August 29, just a few days before Congress was to adjourn.

In the meantime the ICC had received objections to that petition from two presumably responsible bodies; namely, the Central Committee on Highway Transportation of the American Petroleum Institute and the National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc. The gist of these objections was the claim that the investigation would do no good and that the gasoline truckers and shippers were taking care of the situation themselves. This latest occurrence with nine more dead people proves how invalid those arguments were. At the same time various railroads had filed pleadings in support of the effort of their employees and joining in the request for a critical inquiry.

It is amazing that the Interstate Commerce Commission denied the petition of the railroad brotherhoods. Only 6 of the 11 Commissioners voted to take that action and 1 of that 6, only a few days ago, was reappointed by President Eisenhower. One other Commissioner voted to grant the petition and four Commissioners did not vote.

The brotherhoods promptly filed a request for the ICC to reconsider its action. That was filed in September and the whole proceeding is still pending now 4 months later on that petition for reconsideration.

It should be remembered that Congress has delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission—which is a so-called arm of Congress—responsibility for the safety of operation of motor vehicles in interstate commerce. Having acted on this subject we have probably deprived the States and local authorities of power to deal with such safety at least as far as interstate commerce is concerned. Whatever the truck was doing at Magnolia, Miss., January 17, it is certainly an indisputable fact that the train was engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. Speaker, a court in Portland, Oreg., has since ruled that there is no regulation over the safety of operation of trucks, by State or national authorities unless the operation is carried on for-hire. This is because some lawyer has discovered a new loophole in the already inadequate regulations of the ICC. In my book, gasoline or butane is just as dangerous whether or not it is hauled free of charge or for hire. However, the ICC has failed to do one single thing to close that alleged loophole or even to see whether or not it actually exists.

Despite the fact that I have had letters from the ICC and from the Petroleum Institute and the tank truckers, tragic deaths at grade crossings continue to go on.

I ask you, as Members of Congress, how would you feel if you were the wife of a locomotive engineer or fireman? Do you believe those men have a chance when their engines hit a tank full of gasoline or butane? Agony, pain, and flaming death are the only results. And how frequently does this occur? For that matter, would you not feel exactly the same way if you were the wife or the father or mother of a man driving one of these trucks? Would you not wonder every time he left on a trip whether or not he would come back? What organization representing men—either trainmen or truckmen—is worth its salt unless it displays some concern for the safety of its members under circumstances such as these?

In my closing remarks last fall I expressed my intention to ask Congress to authorize a full-dress investigation of grade-crossing accidents and what the ICC is doing to prevent them. I have refrained from taking that action as yet in the hope that the ICC would grant the petition of the brotherhoods for reconsideration. It is my belief that an investigation by the Commission, if promptly begun and carried forward, offers an opportunity for a more constructive and fruitful proceeding than one carried on by Congress in the white heat of publicity where accusations and recriminations are necessarily present. Unless the ICC acts at once, however, I will be obliged to ask Congress to authorize a comprehensive and vigorous investigation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to make part of my remarks the following articles appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, January 17, 1961, and the New York Daily News, January 18, 1961, concerning the tragic accident at a grade crossing in Magnolia, Miss., on January 17, 1961:

[From the New York Daily News, Jan. 18, 1961]

EIGHTY-MILE-PER-HOUR TRAIN SMASHES GAS TRUCK, KILLS SIX

MAGNOLIA, MISS., January 17.—The streamliner City of New Orleans, speeding toward Chicago at nearly 80 miles per hour with its whistle blowing like hell, smashed into a gasoline truck today, killing six and injuring six.

The 9-car express rammed the truck at a crossing in downtown Magnolia, a community of 2,200 in south Mississippi, about 100 miles north of New Orleans. Stores and offices line the streets on both sides of the track.

The truck exploded, spewing flames as high as the trees and the length of the train. The big diesel—bound from New Orleans to Chicago—skidded 300 yards along the track that divides the town, then came to a halt.

ENGINEER, FIREMAN DEAD

Among the dead were the train's engineer and fireman, J. A. (Jimmy) Livingston, of McComb, Miss., and John Collins, of Jackson; and the truckdriver, Morris Piggot, operator of a small store near McComb.

The others killed were identified as Bobby Gwin, a freight yard employee, and Hancey Johns and Charles Hughes, grain unloaders. All three were from Magnolia.

R. L. Williams, a Magnolia painter, was in a Main Street store when he heard the streamliner approaching, its whistle blowing like hell. He said the truckdriver apparently didn't hear the train and started slowly across the tracks.

ONLY A WARNING SIGN

There is a red and white sign warning motorists to stop at the crossing, but there are no flashing lights or crossbars.

Flaming gasoline rained on the workers, boxcars, and a nearby warehouse. The freight cars and warehouse were badly burned.

Dr. Claude Pettey, a dentist whose office is near the depot, saw Percy Nelson, a train yard laborer, staggering down the tracks with his clothes on fire. Pettey pulled the burning clothing from Nelson, who kept asking about the other boys.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 17, 1961]

NINE KILLED WHEN TRAIN HITS TRUCK

MAGNOLIA, MISS., January 17.—The passenger train City of New Orleans, speeding through Magnolia en route to Chicago at about 80 miles per hour, rammed into a gasoline truck at a whistlestop crossing today, killing nine persons and injuring six others.

The streamliner streaked 300 yards after smashing into the truck, with flames sweeping the length of its nine cars.

Illinois Central authorities said the train was not due to stop in Magnolia, about 100 miles north of New Orleans. The truckdriver, they said, apparently did not hear the train or realize it was approaching.

The dead were J. A. (Jimmy) Livingston, the engineer from McComb, Miss.; Fireman John Collins, Truckdriver Morris Piggott, Percy Nelson, Bob Gwin, Prentiss Jackson, Hans Johns, and Charles Hughes, all freight yard employees, and one other unidentified yard employee.

The Illinois Central track splits the downtown section of Magnolia, a community of about 2,200. Flaming gasoline from the explosion spewed over the workers unloading grain from three freight cars and onto one warehouse. The cars and the warehouse were bady burned.

Railroad spokesmen said there were no reports of passenger injuries.

There is a red and white sign at the crossing, witnesses said, making a stop at the crossing manadatory under State law. But there were no flashing lights or crossbars.

A Deserving Tribute to Gen. Elwood R. Quesada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in expressing my sincerest regrets over the resignation of Mr. Elwood R. Quesada as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency effective January 20, I take this occasion to compliment him for having shown many unusual qualities sorely needed in Government today. He has demonstrated, in his complicated task, a refreshing frankness, great strength of character, and forthrightness in facing and solving problems.

Mr. Quesada has shown a boldness not often found these days in Government administrators, as well as the trait of standing out against others for what he believed to be the best for the Nation in matters of aviation. In these days of multiple and sometimes unprecedented problems, these characteristics are indeed laudable. One can only wish that his successors and others in the Federal service will follow his lead.

In short, Mr. Quesada has clearly demonstrated that he was a public servant in the best sense of the word, and a truly dedicated one.

In planning and pursuing his course, it can only be said that his program will add greatly to the progress, growth, safety, and efficiency of air travel in this Nation. On this, I feel qualified to speak in view of my membership on the board of directors of the National Rocket Society, which has quickened my interest in, and knowledge of, the problems facing this new age of aviation.

As to his forthcoming role as president of the new Washington Senators' baseball club, and because of my longtime interest and participation in athletic pursuits, let me say that in my opinion, Mr. Quesada has earned the right to the wellwishes of everyone and also hopes for the greatest of success in whatever future endeavors he may undertake.

Louisiana's Only All-Girl Drum and Bugle Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive time a musical organization from Abbeville, La., in the congressional district I have the privilege of representing, has had the honor of being selected to participate in the Presidential inaugural parade. In 1957 the Abbeville High School band marched on Pennsylvania Avenue for President Eisenhower's second inauguration and this year the Mount Carmel High School Eaglettes, Louisiana's only all-girl drum and bugle corps, was chosen for the parade at the inauguration of President Kennedy.

Arriving in Washington Wednesday morning, members of the drum and bugle corps and the adults accompanying them from Louisiana took part that afternoon in a ceremony in which a wreath was laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by Lee Ardoin, corps captain of the Eaglettes, and Sharran Hebert, lieutenant in the color guard, whose father lost his life in action in World War II. I was pleased to have the opportunity to be present for this impressive occasion.

Thursday was devoted to a sightseeing tour by the group.

The Eaglettes were organized 3 years ago and are under the direction of Dr. S. J. LaBorde, assisted by Jackie Arceneaux and Steve Robicheaux. The drum

and bugle corps was formed with the main purpose of performing for school football games and halftime shows, and at area festivals and fairs, but the organization's ability and popularity led to invitations to participate in many other events including the New Orleans Mardi Gras and the national convention of the American Legion at Minneapolis in 1959. Prior to the Presidential inauguration the members had been in 32 parades, marched a distance of 59 miles, traveled 4,741 miles, and given 47 field performances.

A strict set of rules and regulations governs the corps, including a required scholastic average for membership.

The Eaglettes were invited to the inaugural by Frank B. Ellis, of New Orleans, who served as President Kennedy's campaign director in Louisiana.

Members of the Eaglettes on the Washington trip: Lynne Dauterive, Julia Breaux, Marilyn Hulin, Elizabeth Reinsch, Dolores Lejeune, Sonja Stout, Lee Ardoin, Pat Landry, Claire Villien, Judy Hebert, Eloise Stauffer, Catherine Karl, Cheryl Creswell, Suzanne Boudreaux, Karen Broussard, Rebecca Motty, Cathy Toups, Connie Simon, Cynthia Logan, Kay Landry, Anne Soulier, Judy Chiasson, Natasha Villien, Margaret Soulier, Sharran Hebert, Kay Piazza, Waldean Sellers, Donna Trahan, Anne Leonard, Brenda Broussard, Cheryl Theriot, Jane C. Trahan, Rita Gayle Toups, Sandra L. Broussard, Pat Donohue, Cheryl Broussard, Susan Summers, Denese Nunez, Becky Broussard, Pat Veazey, Elaine Robin, Betty Richmond, Karen Breaux, Marjorie Pierce, Gwen Mayard, Louise Minvielle, Jeanette Cormier, Catherine LaBorde.

The ladies serving as chaperones: Mesdames L. Stoute, Alphe Hebert, W. Creswell, E. Soulier, Harold Trahan, Charles Trahan, Justin Broussard, S. J. LaBorde.

In addition to Dr. LaBorde, the director, the following men made the trip to Washington: Floyd Toups, Walton Sellers, Emery Toups, George Veazey, Davey Meaux, Dr. Harold Trahan, Jackie Arceneaux.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of January 20, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

The inauguration, so long awaited and whose preparations have so long dominated the Washington scene, is finally a part of our Nation's history. It was not disappointing, as both end and beginning of administration's past events, and hopes for the future were joined. The entire ceremony spelled out the common bond and unity of all Americans.

It was a prayerful occasion. God-given human rights and the responsibilities which accompany them were repeatedly stressed. President Kennedy's speech was stirring and forceful. It was a masterful statement of high resolve and principle. I was impressed by his recognition and determined acceptance of the challenge ahead for us in this troubled world. There was no mistaking his confidence, no doubt about his willingness to wade into the tough job ahead. Equally certain to me was the good will and Godspeed in the hearts and minds of those present and Americans everywhere for the success of our newly elected leaders. Surely all Americans join now in prayerful hope that freedom and peace will advance under their administration.

The snow and cold, the discomfort, the political disappointments for some were forgotten as we united in our prayers and applause after John Kennedy's "So help me God." I know now I wouldn't have missed this historic and heart-quickening event for anything.

Loyal opposition is the oft-used description of a minority party, and now for Republicans has new meaning. At this post-inaugural moment it is well to understand this phrase. To me it means loyalty to country and to our Constitution, supporting always what in one's own judgment best serves our Nation and people, and opposition to policies, legislation, and actions that do not best serve our Nation in advancing the cause of freedom under God-given rights implicit in our Constitution. Protecting our Constitution, the oath of each elected official, to me is very constructive, certainly not negative, even though it means saying no to certain legislation. Any parent knows that saying no to his child is generally for very positive and constructive reasons. So it is with legislation. Legislation harmful to our Constitution and basic freedoms must be opposed. That means saying no on occasion.

President Eisenhower's farewell address restated our determination to preserve peace with justice and freedom. Interestingly enough, the companion article in the same newspaper reported Khrushchev's claim that communism's worldwide victory is almost at hand. "The policy of peaceful coexistence," he stated, "facilitates the activities of the Communist Party." His boast reminds us of the continuing problem of containing communism and preventing its spread. The fact is we must do more. We must win the world to our side. There is no peaceful coexistence.

The President's budget message and Economic Report were presented to Congress this week. The budget estimates of $80.9 billion expenditures and $82.3 billion receipts should be replaced by $101.8 billion and $103.1 billion, respectively, which represent the total or cash budget. The slim surplus of $1.5 billion is based on continuation of present taxes, the increase of the gas tax and raising of postal rates to a pay-as-we-use basis. Every budget has in it the built-in increase of Federal spending programs. So President Kennedy is faced with a dilemma, either he must abandon most, or all, of his new spending promises or he must raise taxes, or deficit finance with the accompanying inflation.

President Eisenhower said in his budget message we must apply the "test of necessity rather than desirability to the expenditures of government." He also pointed out that the cost of Federal Government today is less than in 1953 in terms of percentage of national income. Maurice Stans, outgoing Budget Director, said, "The budget of the U.S. Government affects all Americans. It is an annual financial plan, in which the President sets forth his proposals for meeting our national objectives and indicates the money needed to carry them out and how the money will be raised." How we raise money is the job of the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member. To have President Kennedy's program, or any part of it, we must raise taxes. I am opposed to this and so will oppose new spending schemes. On the contrary, I believe we should repeal the Korean war taxes and start a broadly based tax cut. But to do this we must reduce Federal spending to stay within a balanced budget.

The Economic Report spells out the increase of real income to every wage earner since 1953, the increased stock ownership, life insurance, and gross national income. Since 1952, disposable personal income has risen 30 percent and per capita income 15 percent. Nor can government take the credit as many seem to believe who think the Federal Government is responsible for us. As the President said, "Government action is not the principal, let alone the sole determinant of the rate of economic growth," and further, "in our free economy, economic growth and the improvement of living standards depend not primarily on what government does, but mainly on what is done by individuals and groups acting in their own private capacities." To this I must add my endorsement.

Defense Procurement in Distressed Areas Can Help To Solve the Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that we can no longer continue to ignore the grave problems of distressed areas. This is no longer a political issue. Both major parties have endorsed plans to aid distressed areas in their 1956 and 1960 platforms. Within the next few weeks the Senate and House are expected to take action on area redevelopment legislation.

In addition to many bills pending in Congress providing for area redevelopment, my bill H.R. 275 introduced on January 3 provides for the allocation of defense contracts to areas of substantial labor surplus. This legislation if enacted will help to bring jobs for the unemployed in the areas of the Nation suffering from chronic unemployment.

If H.R. 275 becomes a law, it will permit the Government to do its share in aiding depressed areas by using its vast purchasing powers for which billions of dollars are appropriated annually.

During the administration of President Eisenhower he tried to relieve unemployment in distressed areas by issuing defense manpower, No. 4. This Executive order sets forth specific procedures under which Federal procurement agencies are to give special preference awards to areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus.

Mr. Speaker, it was a source of great disappointment to me that the Defense Department did not fully implement this Presidential directive. For example, in fiscal 1960 only $6.7 million worth of orders have been placed in the distressed areas as a result of preferential treatment. This means that less than 1 per-

cent of the total Defense Department procurement was allocated to distressed areas.

I believe, therefore, that Congress should instruct the Defense Department to allocate a greater number of defense contracts in the distressed areas. To accomplish this purpose I have introduced H.R. 275 which will require the procurement agencies in the Defense Department to award contracts in the distressed areas whenever such action is compatible with the national defense.

My bill, H.R. 275, would not empower defense agencies to pay higher prices to firms locating in the distressed areas. It would, however, require the defense procurement officers to encourage firms in distressed areas to participate fully in defense procurement by making maximum use of competitive bids and set-asides. In plain words, it gives congressional approval to the policy which has been established by President Eisenhower through Executive Order No. 4. I am sure that the new administration will also support my bill. President Kennedy said during the course of last fall's campaign:

> Compassion for the suffering and struggles of persons in distressed areas is a compelling reason to give special consideration to such areas in the procurement of supplies by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we approve H.R. 275 which not only has the support of the Eisenhower administration but, in addition, based on campaign statements last fall by President Kennedy is in line with his thinking on the subject.

As already mentioned my bill H.R. 275 gives to the Federal Government an opportunity to use its vast purchasing powers to provide employment for persons living in the Nation's pockets of chronic unemployment.

The USO: A Home Away From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th anniversary of the United Service Organizations—February 4, 1961—it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Nation the powerful role played by the USO in America's relentless pursuit of peace throughout the world.

It is well for all of us to remember, I think, that the USO is representative of each of the major religious groups in the United States and is actually a federation of volunteer agencies through which all Americans can lend valuable assistance in serving not only the religious, but also the spiritual, recreational, social, welfare, and educational needs of all of our young people who are in uniform.

The USO, then, is truly a "home away from home" for millions of our lonesome military youths. It thus is a unifying force and carries out the American tradition of the family as the cornerstone of our society. As such, it serves as perhaps no other type of organization could, to convince these youths that they still are a very important part of this tradition, especially when they are serving in foreign lands far from home.

The vast majority of these 2½ million young men and women have shown their appreciation of the warm welcome extended to them by the USO, painfully mindful that they are far removed from the stabilizing and personal influences of their homes, their usual friends, their schools, and their customary religious affiliations, many for the first time in their lives.

As a "home away from home" the USO bridges the gap between the lonely American youngster in service and his accustomed way of life. This bridge also enables him to know that he can someday return to the way of life so dear to his heart.

Whatever we do for the USO cannot help but have a far-reaching effect on what our Armed Forces can accomplish as guardians of our peace and security.

Toward Equity in Taxation of Financial Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 2899, a bill to provide for increased Federal tax revenues and to remove the present discriminatory application of Federal income tax law among commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and mutual savings banks.

The bill is a very simple one. It would repeal that provision in the Internal Revenue Code which establishes a reserve for bad debts for savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. Such repeal would have the effect of making these institutions subject to the same statutory authority and regulatory procedures for the establishment of bad debt reserves as now are applicable to all other classes of taxpayers.

These procedures could take into account any indicated differences in the bases of tax equity for the associations and the mutual banks which might develop in an impartial evaluation of their financial structures and operating methods.

Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks are vital parts of our financial system, and I would not for a moment wish to hinder the effective conduct of their business operations, but the fact remains that they do enjoy a favored tax position which enables them to avoid paying a fair share of Federal income tax. The Treasury has been deprived of needed revenue through this loophole for 8 years, and the situation will continue unless the law is changed.

Let me give a little of the background for this bill. In 1951, the Congress decided that savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks should be subject to Federal income taxes, at the corporate tax rate. During consideration of the 1951 legislation, a proposal was made that a tax advantage for these institutions was needed in order that they might build up reserves against future losses. An amendment to this effect was adopted immediately prior to final passage. It established a special tax-free reserve for bad debts in a manner not afforded any other type of business operation. Each savings and loan association and each mutual savings bank was allowed to accumulate tax deductible transfers to reserves in any reasonable amount as long as the sum of its surplus, reserves, and undivided profits was less than 12 percent of its deposits or repurchasable shares.

How has this provision worked? In the years since 1951, it appears that protection to shareholders through retained earnings has not increased. The ratio of surplus, undivided profits, and reserves to deposits has declined for both savings and loan associations who are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and for insured mutual savings banks. After 8 years under the 1951 law, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks actually have a greater margin for deduction by transfers to reserves than they did when the law was first enacted. While these institutions are growing at a tremendous rate, the amount they pay in Federal income taxes shows hardly any increase from year to year. For example, in 1952 FHLB member savings and loan associations were reported to have had net profits before taxes of $194,404,000 on which they paid $3,176,000 in Federal income taxes, or 1.63 percent of net profits. In 1959 member savings and loan associations were reported as having net profits before taxes of $555,787,000 on which they paid $5,346,000 in Federal taxes, or less than 1 percent of net profits. At a time when the Government sorely needs tax dollars, these institutions should be required to pay their equitable share of taxes.

The bill only seeks to place savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks on an equal tax basis with other businesses so as to obtain the revenue which was anticipated when the original law was passed. They will still be able to supply mortgage funds needed for home financing, and also earn more than a sufficient return over expenses. All that is required to achieve this purpose is an amendment repealing section 593 of part II of subchapter H of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Transfers to bad debt reserves would then be based on an amount which the Treasury determined to be reasonable rather than on an arbitrary percentage figure. It is estimated that the new law would raise between $200 million and $250 million the first year after passage.

I am pleased to see that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has introduced an identical bill, H.R. 2900. Bipartisan support is always helpful, and

particularly important in tax matters. This proposed legislation has also been endorsed by five major bankers' organizations: The American Bankers Association, the Association of Reserve City Bankers, the Bankers Committee for Tax Equality, the Independent Bankers Association, and the Roth committee.

The Treasury's needs for funds are large and urgent. They can be partially met by eliminating unjustified tax advantages which accrue to savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. These advantages provide them with a substantially tax-free use of retained earnings. A more reasonable sharing of the tax burden on the part of these institutions would contribute significantly to greater fairness in the application of the Federal income tax.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, with respect to the taxation of banks, savings and loan associations, and other institutions.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subchapter H of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to banking institutions) is amended by adding a new section 585 as follows:

"SEC. 585. Additions to reserve for bad debts.

"(a) In the case of a bank as defined for certain tax purposes in section 581 the Secretary or his delegate in determining the deduction to be allowed for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts under section 166(c) shall take into account the total net transfers which have previously been made under section 166(c) of the internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 23(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1949 to such a reserve."

SEC. 2. Section 581 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by deleting the words "sections 582 and 584," and substituting therefor "sections 582, 584, and 585."

SEC. 3. Section 593 of subchapter H of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed and section 594 is renumbered 593.

SEC. 4. Section 166(g)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed.

SEC. 5. The amendments and repeals made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

H.R. 274 Promotes Industrial Development in Local Areas of Chronic Unemployment Through Granting the Rapid Tax Amortization Privilege to Manufacturers Locating Facilities in These Areas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a statement in Philadelphia October 31, 1960, President Kennedy said:

The country must stimulate plant modernization programs which are vital both to increased production and to building industrial facilities which can compete successfully with the modern plant of Europe and the Soviet Union.

He also said:

Where we are certain that tax revision—including accelerated depreciation—will stimulate investment in new plants and equipment without damage to our principles of equity, we will proceed with such revision.

Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced H.R. 274, a bill which amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants in depressed areas. In other words, through such a fast tax writeoff an incentive would be provided to locate industrial or commercial plants and facilities in economically depressed areas or areas of chronic unemployment. As will be noted, my bill, H.R. 274, would adopt the views of President Kennedy expressed at Philadelphia last October, but to initiate the tax amortization program it would be limited to areas having chronic unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of H.R. 274 on January 3 I have had a lot of mail from interested persons requesting background information on the rapid tax amortization program of recent years. To answer these inquiries, the following information has been compiled:

I. BACKGROUND OF THE RAPID TAX AMORTIZATION PROGRAM

What is rapid tax amortization?

Rapid tax amortization has been a device adopted by the Federal Government to give private manufacturers and other producers an incentive to build needed defense production facilities. Following Korea, production facilities representing an investment of $38 billion were built under this incentive. The incentive is no longer available to industry in general.

The effect of granting the privilege of rapid tax amortization to a specific company (through a certificate of necessity) is to speed up or shorten the time period within which depreciation deductions can be taken by that company. It entitles a manufacturer to amortize for tax purposes the cost of his new plant and equipment over a 5-year period rather than over the much longer period applicable to plants not qualifying under the tax amortization program. It does not give a manufacturer a greater deduction but only a more rapid recovery of his capital investment.

Example of rapid tax amortization

A manufacturer building a $100,000 factory normally would be permitted under internal revenue laws a deduction on his tax return of $4,000 or $5,000 each year for 20 or 25 years, as the case may be. This deduction for depreciation is considered a proper item of business expense.

If the same manufacturer had built a plant to produce an item required for mobilization programs, he could be granted through a necessity certificate the privilege of deducting $20,000 each year for five years.

Assuming for a particular year the company made a net profit of $25,000, over and above all expense except depreciation, it would pay taxes on only $5,000. Without the privilege, it would be required to pay taxes on $20,000 or $21,000.

Legislative authority

Tax amortization of the type described is provided for in section 124–A of the Internal Revenue Code (sec. 216 of the Revenue Act of 1950), enacted on September 23, 1950. A certificate issued under this statute has no value for tax purposes unless (1) the manufacturer makes a capital investment in plant or equipment, (2) the facility is completed and productive, and (3) a profit is earned.

The law contemplates the encouragement of expansion by private investment capital rather than public funds.

Korean experience

Early in the Korean conflict, the tax amortization program provided an incentive to eliminate critical deficiencies in defense production capacities and supplies.

Under the program, a total of 229 expansion goals were established for the purpose of measuring the deficit between estimated defense requirements under full mobilization and industry's capacity to meet such demands. From the beginning of the program through June 1958, over 22,000 certificates were issued, representing a capital investment of over $38 billion, of which $23 billion was eligible for the fast writeoffs.

Current status of program

Over the past 3 years most of the expansion goals have been closed as the required buildup of facilities was completed.

In August 1957 Congress enacted Public Law 85–165 which sharply limited the certifying authority—now extended only to facilities to produce new or specialized defense items or to provide research, development, or experimental services for the Defense Department or the Atomic Energy Commission.

The termination date of the entire tax amortization program was under the law December 31, 1959.

Application to surplus labor areas

Late in the program for encouraging the buildup of production facilities, it was linked by Executive action to the problem of areas of substantial labor surplus.

In the case of firms which expanded or located their new defense facilities in areas of substantial labor surplus, the percentage of total investment allowed rapid tax amortization was increased, usually from 10 to 25 percent. Hence, a company which ordinarily was permitted to write off 60 percent of its investment in a new facility was accorded a writeoff to as much as 85 percent if the facility was located in an area of substantial labor surplus.

Since the passage of Public Law 85–165 restricting the issuance of certificates of necessity, the rapid tax amortization program is no longer an effective aid to labor surplus areas.

II. PROPOSAL TO USE TAX DEDUCTIONS AS A DEVICE TO ASSIST LOCAL AREAS OF CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT

RAPID AMORTIZATION DIRECT TO MANUFACTURERS

The first method would use the rapid amortization privilege as a locational attraction for companies planning new facilities expansions. This method would allow the manufacturer to amortize, in a period of 5 years, a substantial part of all of his investment in such a facility, provided he located the facility in an area of chronic unemployment.

A bill incorporating this idea was pending in the 86th Congress and a similar measure has been introduced in this Congress as evidenced by the Van Zandt bill, H.R. 274, which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Van Zandt bill proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities in areas of substantial surplus. The deduction would be available to "any person who constructs, reconstructs, or erects a substantial unemployment area facility" as defined in the bill.

As it stands, the bill applies to all areas of substantial labor surplus whether this condition is temporary or chronic. New employment-creating facilities are peculiarly appropriate to areas suffering from a chronic unemployment problem.

The solution to areas of temporary unemployment lies in additional contracts, public works, and the like. If the bill were confined to areas with a history of persistent unemployment, a considerable number of areas of temporary unemployment would be eliminated (such as Philadelphia and Baltimore), and the effectiveness of the bill for chronic areas would be accordingly increased.

Mr. Speaker, the fast tax writeoff as provided in my bill, H.R. 274, is aimed at producing general industrial development in the labor surplus areas by providing jobs for the unemployed. The history of tax relief to manufacturers in the past reveals the success of the program. To be more specific many communities in the United States would be suffering from unemployment at this time were it not for the fact that fast tax writeoffs such as my bill, H.R. 274 provides, enabled them to diversify their economy by attracting new industries.

In Europe providing tax incentives to suitable industries located in areas of surplus labor has helped England, West Germany, and others to cope with their unemployment problems. When mentioning the success of the fast tax writeoff in Germany, it is only fair to point to the tremendous prosperity of West Germany and to add that tax policies designed to encourage private enterprise beginning in 1948 paid rich premiums and were instrumental in the phenomenal recovery of the economy of West Germany. In addition, the spectacular recovery of the economy is traceable to the fact that German industry enjoyed this fast writeoff of taxes in the construction of new plants.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me mention again that tax amortization has been used as an economic recovery tool here in this country, as well as in Europe and Canada with equal success. Therefore, my bill, H.R. 274, should receive prompt and earnest consideration by not only the Kennedy administration but by both Houses of Congress.

Adjustments in the Veterans' Benefits Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1961, it was my privilege to submit three bills for consideration by this body. This proposed legislation pertains to what I feel are necessary adjustments in the veterans' benefit program. I would like to make further explanation and provide a greater amplification of the purposes of this legislation and to explain to the Members of the House just what these bills are designed to do and how they will affect the veterans of this Nation. The legislation referred to by me are H.R. 2943, H.R. 2944, and H.R. 2945.

I would like first to discuss the purpose and the intent of H.R. 2945. This bill is designed to give priority to oversea combat veterans in obtaining admission to our system of Veterans' Administration hospitals. At the present time, entrance into our Veterans' Administration hospitals is according to a system of priority or categories defined by the Veterans' Administration regulations. Naturally, emergency conditions must, through necessity, have first priority, and this expediency must be maintained.

A second category in order of preference is those veterans of either wartime or peacetime service who seek hospitalization and treatment for disabilities specifically incurred in or aggravated by service. A third group or category is veterans with a service-connected disability but who seek treatment for disabilities not necessarily adjunct to their service.

In a final category are those wartime veterans who require treatment for disabilities not a result of service but who indicate they cannot financially bear the burden of hospitalization for the disability from which they suffer. It is in this final category that the legislation mentioned, H.R. 2945, would be effective. This group is furnished hospitalization only when surplus beds exist after taking care of the service-connected disabilities or emergency conditions mentioned in those categories of higher priority. In other words, after all the service-connected disabilities and after veterans with emergency medical conditions have been taken care of, then I feel that the combat oversea veteran should be given preference in obtaining treatment from any surplus beds which may exist. I think this is just and fair legislation, and I encourage favorable consideration by this body.

I would next like to discuss H.R. 2944, which I believe corrects an inequity which has existed for many years in regard to veterans' benefits. I might state at the outset that it is necessary to speak generally regarding this subject matter since all of the veterans about whom I speak will not be affected by this change in legislation.

During the history of our Nation, we have been engaged in many campaigns and expeditions, a great many of which actually involved armed conflict with an enemy of our country, but such campaigns and expeditions are not recognized under law as wartime service. To state it another way, many veterans who have been subject to the risk and the rigors of military living during a campaign or expedition against armed enemies are still considered peacetime veterans for many benefits available from our Government. To make this even more clear, I would like to state that one day of wartime service provides the prima facie eligibility for hospitalization, while a veteran may serve 6 months or even a year during a campaign or expedition of our Nation and this service would not constitute eligibility necessary for entrance into a veterans' hospital.

Such men and their dependents receive only benefits which accrue to veterans of peacetime service. This proposed legislation which it was my privilege to introduce would provide that all veterans who served during the numerous campaigns and expeditions, or their dependents, shall be entitled to the same benefits they would have had if they served during a wartime period.

I think you will agree that the risks involved, the mental torment and rigors involved, during such campaigns or expeditions are just as dangerous, just as hazardous and trying as those experienced by veterans who served during wartime service.

The third piece of legislation, identified by H.R. 2943, would remove many of the objectionable features of Public Law 86–211. The bill which I introduced would affect the nonservice benefits to either the veteran or his dependents for service during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict. It would provide a great liberalization of the basis on which pensions are payable by eliminating many of the legal bars which now prevent receipt of such benefits. This legislation would provide first that public or private retirement pensions shall not be counted as income in determining whether or not a veteran or his dependents shall receive pension benefits, or in what amount they shall receive these benefits. The bill also eliminates the income of a spouse in the determination of the annual income of a living veteran.

I would like to point out that these changes cover two of the most objectionable features of the current law concerning nonservice benefits. At the present time, public retirement or private retirement payments are counted as income in determining the monthly allotment of pension payable and also in determining whether or not a veteran will qualify at all for such benefits. Also, the veteran is penalized if his spouse continues to work, since the income of the spouse is also counted in determining annual income thereby rendering many worthy and deserving veterans ineligible for this type of benefit.

The legislation which I introduced further eliminates the net worth eligibility test and repeals the requirement of the reduction of pension benefits during hospitalization of the veteran. I would like to point out that if there is ever a time when income is desperately needed, it is during a period of hospitalization. Cases have come to my attention where veterans who needed hospitalization actually refused this benefit because they simply could not afford to lose their pension rights during the period they were hospitalized.

Another feature which has received widespread opposition—and this is also changed by the legislation I proposed—is the so-called corpus of estate feature. This has caused widespread hardship and has penalized the veteran who has attempted to be thrifty and prudent during his lifetime. With the soaring cost of living, I also find it necessary to propose that the annual income requirements to receive nonservice pensions or death benefits be materially liberalized, thereby qualifying many veterans who

at present are barred from receipt of such benefits.

On January 23 I introduced H.R. 3087, designed to further improve the status of the veterans of this Nation, and particularly those who served in combat zones and were injured in line of duty under enemy fire. The present regulations provide disability compensation in the same amount whether a veteran is injured due to actual enemy fire or whether he suffers his disability during service within the continental limits of the United States.

To make this example even more clear cut, a veteran who suffers a disability in a jeep wreck in the United States, or perhaps is injured during an authorized pass at a recreational center receives the same rate of compensation as a veteran who is injured under combat conditions and under fire of the enemy. It would not be feasible to argue the point that one is not just as badly disabled whether he is injured within the United States or on the battlefield. But I do believe and hope that this body will agree that the veteran who has been subjected to enemy fire and whose disabilities were incurred under combat conditions is entitled to some additional consideration. My bill would provide a 20-percent increase over the regular rates for disabilities incurred in combat. This additional consideration of 20 percent would be given only for such disabilities incurred in line of duty and resulting from actual armed combat.

These bills which I have proposed are not tremendously costly items but will result in a fair adjustment with due consideration to the type of service to which our Nation's veterans have been subjected. I would like to point out that the hospital beds are already in existence and available in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This proposed legislation merely gives priority to those who have suffered in armed conflict. Also, this legislation proposed adjustments to those who have served in the numerous campaigns and brushfire wars to which the United States has been subjected in the past and it is possible could be subjected to in the future. The Government would give official recognition to the type of disability of the individual veteran and whether or not such disability was combat incurred.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the inauguration, we await expectantly and hopefully the proposals that will carry us across the New Frontier toward solution of major problems and meeting the complex challenges that confront the world in the early 1960's.

Now the time has arrived for deeds, not just words; for actions, not just admonishments; for realistic solutions to solve our problems, not just repetitions of time-tested, hope-raising ideals unaccompanied by adequate formulas to attain these goals.

These trying times, of course, also demand cooperation, bipartisanship, insofar as possible, and broad support of realistic efforts to meet our national goals.

Building upon the policies and programs of the past—and, as necessary, creating new ones—I am confident that, by putting our shoulders to the wheel, we, as a people, can succeed in surmounting the obstacles and going forward to build a better, brighter future.

Recently, in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review some of the long-range challenges confronting the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have the text printed in the RECORD.

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

WILEY REVIEWS ISSUES BEFORE CONGRESS; OUTLINES ANTI-COMMUNIST PROGRAM

On Friday, the inauguration of our 35th President, John F. Kennedy, marked a next step of our Nation's long march toward its destined role in world history.

The occasion was a solemn one—shot through with a realization that upon new shoulders—that of the President and newly appointed administrative officials—rest decisions and responsibilities affecting the welfare and survival of all of us—now, and for the next 4 years.

The inauguration of a new President, also, presented to the world a dramatic demonstration of the workings of a true democratic process.

Now, we must adopt the right kind of policies and programs. If this is done, the nations of the globe—particularly the newly emerging ones—will again witness that a free government, "of, by, and for the people" best serves its citizens. We will again demonstrate also that—our free system—being more than self-serving, is capable of world leadership, of supporting efforts to protect the integrity of other nations; and of participating in programs to promote progress and peace for mankind.

The inauguration—involving parades, inauguration balls, and other festivities—was a gala affair. Now the ball is over. As a nation, we must get down to the business of carrying forward projects—and, as necessary, designing new policies—to serve our country and our people in the trying times ahead.

Currently, the new administration—with new appointees as heads of departments and agencies—is now attempting to get a grip on the reins of government.

While occupants of the driver's seats have changed, we find, however, that many of the long-range problems—more broad scope and lasting than the service of a one- or two-term administration—are still with us.

As we move forward into 1961, these big jobs include:

1. The issue of peace or war;
2. The task of combating communism;
3. Resolving our economic problems;
4. Fulfilling our obligations in education, housing, care of the aging, civil rights, and other fields; and
5. Generally creating the wide variety of policies and programs necessary to serve our country domestically and internationally.

The significance of these and other issues to progress and our survival demands a strong effort from the American people.

From time to time, there will—as in the past—be differences among us on how best to attain our goals. There is no pay dirt, however, in opposing for the sake of opposing. In circumstances of differing opinions, rather, we must encourage the offering of constructive alternatives to policies and programs which—in our individual judgment—are not adequate to the times.

Only by so doing, can we create the kind of constructive, realistic programs necessary to meet the great challenges of the early 1960's.

PEACE OR WAR

Briefly, now, let's take a look at some of the specific steps required in each of the major fields of endeavor.

The maintaining of peace—or, conversely, the prevention of a third world war, as well as brushfire wars—requires:

A strong national defense;

Greater cooperation with our allies—militarily, as well as in other ways—to block the outspreading of communism; and

Effective efforts to prevent the domination of the non-Communist and newly emerging nations by communism—to avoid the Reds' gaining a balance of power in the nonmilitary fields of battle.

MULTIPRONGED PROGRAM TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Combating the worldwide Communist offensive is, in itself, a tremendous challenge.

The American people, despite a natural inclination for peace, must gird themselves for a long, tough pull against the Communist threat to our survival and world peace.

I am confident we have the manpower, resources, and technological know-how—and also a superior political-economic-social system, as well as principles and ideals—to defeat communism.

However, this will not happen by wishful thinking. Rather, it will be done only by creation of a strong anti-Communist program, including:

1. As I mentioned, the creation of an ever stronger nuclear-missile-space defense to deter military aggression by the Communists—since the Reds understand missile muscle better than words.

2. Development of an economic policy—strengthened by cooperation with our allies—to win on the economic front;

3. Carrying forward and, as necessary, expanding, our counteroffensive on the ideological battleground; and

4. Further strengthening our internal security program to protect ourselves from the Communists' nefarious activities.

These, then, are the basic steps for combating communism. However, this must not be allowed to absorb all our efforts, energies, and resources.

Instead, we need to engage in, not just a reaction program, but rather in positive, forward-moving efforts to channel more of the resources and manpower to creating a better life for more people.

STRENGTHENING THE U.S. ECONOMY

Briefly, now, let's take a look at our economic problems.

Across the Nation, there are—regrettably—about 4½ million unemployed and economic slowdowns in some businesses and industries.

As President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, pointed out, however, the country is still moving ahead with levels of employment and output of goods and services unsurpassed in our history.

In dealing with these economic difficulties, let's face some facts of life. The antidote to an economic setback is not to throw up our hands and shout: "Depression!" Psychologically, this could help to create one; perhaps it has already made the situation more difficult in this case.

Nor should Uncle Sam be expected to bear the whole burden of pump priming the

economy—as some would propose. The Treasury is not a bottomless pit, kept full by an invisible genie, creating new money without cost to the taxpayers.

All segments of the U.S. economy have a vested interest in, and a fundamental responsibility for, helping to resolve our economic problems. Among other things, this means attempts to create jobs for the unemployed and keeping the wheels of our free enterprise system rolling forward at a good rate of progress.

Now, what can be done?

In my judgment, new efforts are needed to:

Encourage greater confidence in—not attempt to undermine—our economy;

Encourage greater investment in enterprises—large and small;

Encourage greater labor-management-consumer cooperation; and

As necessary, expand Government programs for highway building, airport construction, etc.; and loosen up money policy; but only as necessary.

In all of this, of course, it is extremely important not to take action that would spur inflation and further depreciate the dollar.

The Nation, I am confident, will be able to deal swiftly and successfully with the economic slowdowns and unemployment—if we (1) encourage the cooperation of all segments of the economy to deal with the situation; (2) realistically emphasize the positive aspects of the picture—not enlarge the negative out of perspective; and (3) get rid of the pass-the-buck attitude of "Let Uncle Sam do the whole job."

MEETING NEEDS OF PEOPLE

Confronting us, also, in Congress is the need to better meet the needs of our people in the following fields:

1. Education: According to reports, we now lack about 130,000 to 142,000 classrooms and about 135,000 teachers, to serve the school population. As a result, our educational program is being handicapped by the lack of well-trained and well-paid teachers; obsolete, overcrowded classrooms—often attended in double shifts by students; a general inability to meet the special needs of students with differing degrees of intelligence and capabilities; and other shortcomings that handicap our system.

2. A good program for the aging: Today, there are more than 16 million people over 65, who do not have adequate incomes to provide a decent standard of living. The Congress will need to give attention to this problem—particularly to the health needs of our senior citizens; and

3. Civil rights: Through the effective administration of existing laws and, as necessary, the adoption of new ones, we need to assure protection of all the constitutional rights of our citizens.

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS IN AGRICULTURE

Now, what about agriculture? As all of us recognize, no real solutions have yet been found for the production-consumption imbalance of farm commodities in dairying or other segments of farming.

Unfortunately, there is a strange anomaly: The United States has a stockpile of surplus commodities, valued at about $9 billion. By contrast, however, billions of people elsewhere in the world are living on inadequate diets.

Over the years, efforts have been made to channel these valuable foodstuffs to the needy people. For example, President Eisenhower recently recommended distribution of more surplus foods through the United Nations. In addition, we have distributed these commodities abroad, either for humanitarian purposes or for exchange of other commodities.

Fundamentally, however, the American farmer is interested in—and must have to survive economically—sales, not giveaways.

Recognizing the increasing capability of our food production plant, as well as the growing need by the exploding population for more food, we need more effective, creative ways to distribute these lifegiving products at home and abroad. As this can be successfully done, it will not only serve humanity, but also will strengthen our lagging agricultural economy.

In addition to Federal efforts in the field, farm organizations also could well cooperate by working together, as well as with the United Nations and other international groups, in the much needed effort to find new markets.

On January 26, the national farm organizations are meeting with the new Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. I am hopeful that the conference will result in some realistic proposals for dealing with the economic problems, not only in dairying, but also in other segments of agriculture.

The American Weekly Confirms Its Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, before we of the House take up the serious and exacting duties of this 87th Congress, let me ask your indulgence on this first day of congressional activity under the administration of President Kennedy to offer a few comments in recognition of an outstanding public service.

No doubt most of you had occasion to see the American Weekly magazine distributed with the Sunday newspapers of January 15 and to note the magnificent cover portrait of President and Mrs. Kennedy which graced that page. During my years in business and in public life I have never seen a more attractive portrait, nor have I ever seen a more timely and effective public service undertaking by a major publication. I believe all of you have received, as I have, an enlarged copy of this same portrait suitable for framing. This special enlargement arrived at my office during the inaugural days when many of my constituents were visiting with me, and I was amazed and gratified by the unanimous approval expressed by everyone who viewed the picture.

In recognition of a service which in my judgment merits such recognition, I have today written Mr. John K. Herbert, publisher of the American Weekly and extended my congratulations to him. With your permission, I will include a copy of that letter at the end of these remarks.

Recalling the reactions of all who saw the picture in my office, however, I was struck with another possibility. It seems to me that, as we launch this new administration headed by determined and highly skilled young men—young men who will probably sweep aside many existing roadblocks to progress and install new methods and techniques—at this time we might well consider revision not only of the American national image abroad from an economic and political standpoint, but also a complete revision of the image of our President and First Lady.

We have had more than enough dusty oil paintings on the walls of our Embassies and Legations overseas. Our people have broken with precedents in the recent national election—now they have chosen one who is relatively young, but widely acclaimed for his courage, determination, and capacity for meaningful work. And his is the great good fortune to have at his side a consort of such beauty, grace, and charm that even the haughty world of high fashion stands aside in deference to her tastes.

If any of us were to travel in a foreign country, we could point with pride to such a portrait and say, "This is our President and his wife. Regard them well and carefully, for of such is the leadership of our country constituted in these most troubled times throughout the world." I suggest, then, that this is the portrait to be displayed in every country with which we maintain diplomatic relationships, in the most ornate Embassies and most distant outposts of our consular structure.

These are Americans of this day and time, placed in their high position by the popular choice of a free people, and prepared to do what must be done at any cost in personal sacrifice. Let our friends be reassured, and let our enemies make of it what they dare.

Further, 10 million copies of this portrait distributed throughout the sensitive areas of the world will do more for American prestige at the beginning of this new administration than all of the loan funds dispensed during the past 4 years. By means of the qualities so beautifully portrayed in this portrait our friends will know that they have chosen wisely in their allegiances, and our enemies will give pause to think again before they reopen the gates of vituperation at the American Chief Executive.

JANUARY 23, 1961.

Mr. JOHN K. HERBERT,
Publisher, the American Weekly,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HERBERT: Periodically in the Halls of the Congress complaints are voiced about the American press. Speeches are made criticizing various publications and denouncing the positions taken by certain editors and publishers. The question of just what liberties are included in the freedom of the press is raised, and sometimes ill-considered motions designed to limit or inhibit that freedom are introduced. In the long run, however, the good sense of the majority prevails, and our press remains free, chiefly because each of us who must consider the laws that govern our country has some recollection of instances in which the press has performed an enormous public service.

In recognition of such a service I write you and your colleagues of the American Weekly on this, the first official day of congressional activity under the administration of President John F. Kennedy. From many sources I have heard complimentary references to the magnificent portrait of President and Mrs. Kennedy which you distributed to 10 million American homes through the American Weekly, and to these approving words I wish to add my own compliments. You have played a major role in lending a certain tone of national unity and broad fellowship to Inaugural Week in Washington and to the beginning of a new national administration.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Herbert. This was a "10-strike" indeed. The election results were close and many of our people were troubled about the outcome. Precedents were broken in all directions.

President Kennedy is the youngest man ever to be sent to the White House; he is the first man of his particular religious faith to be elected; he is the first President who was born in the 20th century; and, most thought provoking of all, he is our first President to have matured in his convictions since atomic fission turned loose among us the power to destroy all life on this planet. There is no previous President to whom he can be compared, and it is easy to see why many of our people held reservations about his candidacy.

But the votes have been counted and the proclamation has been made; he has taken the oath, and now he stands alone to face burdens of crushing weight and gargantuan size. Our people must learn to know him well, and they will look often at his picture for reassurance during the coming days of turmoil around the world. You have placed in their hands a superb portrait of a man who seems linked to high destiny—who has survived the dangers of war and the threat of serious illness to rise to the highest national office.

By your forethought, skill and sense of public duty you have made one of those great public service contributions which reaffirm the faith of our founders in the constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press to pursue its course without interference from government at any level. Again, I congratulate you upon what must be for you a most prideful accomplishment.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.

Importance of Enacting Distressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last Wednesday, I was afforded the privilege of testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1, Senator DOUGLAS' area redevelopment bill. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I made before that committee inserted in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, the English poet John Keats penned a line of striking simplicity and truth when he wrote, "A thing of beauty is a joy forever." The reason I recall those words at this time is that they bring to my mind a somewhat resembling thought: A good piece of legislation is always a pleasure to talk about.

I refer, of course, to S. 1, the so-called distressed-areas bill, which has been offered for our consideration by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

With the keen foresight which we have come to admire and appreciate in him, Senator DOUGLAS, as far back as 1955, foresaw the chronic nature of the problem and at the time offered the Congress an opportunity to enact legislation to strike at the root of the recession problem. He saw that many sections in the country were not sharing in the rising standard of living and in the expanding economy of the Nation, and he sought to aid them before their distress became a contagion affecting the entire country.

In each succeeding Congress, as the problem of chronic unemployment and underemployment grew, as the number of economically declining areas began to multiply, and as the lengthening lines of unemployed workers also began to cast elongating shadows across the land, the earnest and courageous senior Senator from Illinois beseeched us again and again to harken to his warnings and pass legislation to help those declining areas.

The recession which the country is experiencing right now is, no doubt, at least partially, due to the drag that the chronically depressed areas have had upon the economy. The record is clear that the country has never fully recovered from the 1958 recession. We cannot have a healthy economy when large numbers of people in distressed areas are poor customers for the products made in other sections of the country.

Right now we have at least 100 areas in the country which have been classified by the U.S. Department of Labor as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. But in a number of these distressed areas, unemployment has reached depressionlike proportions. In these areas we find that every fifth able-bodied person willing to work and seeking work cannot find gainful employment because of the distressed economic conditions existing there.

This appalling situation has forced some 4 million people throughout these United States to depend for basic subsistence upon the meager rations distributed from surplus commodities by the Department of Agriculture. I used the word "meager" advisedly because the surplus food distributed by the Department of Agriculture is totally inadequate for the maintenance of even reasonably good health. Our people are the greatest and most important resource of the country. They are a resource we cannot afford to neglect through unemployment and through a handout diet of flour, cornmeal, rice, powdered milk, dried eggs, and lard.

Few people realize that we are trying to feed needy families on rations amounting to a retail value of less than 8 cents a day per person. Can anyone wonder, therefore, that there is real hunger in some sections of the country—not just an inadequate diet?

My own State of West Virginia has suffered most sharply from economic reversals during the past decade. Today, almost 295,654 persons, or about 1 out of every 6 in the State, are now dependent upon surplus foods. Today, too, the only balanced meal which many children of the unemployed get is the hot lunch served in schools.

Despite the gravity of the situation, the Federal Government has done very little to promote a positive program to help the depressed areas in these United States. The Government has demonstrated an ability to act speedily when disasters occur, either in the United States or in any part of the world. But it has also demonstrated an ability to shut its eyes to the disastrous situation that exists in many of the depressed areas.

The day for eye shutting is over. Our bitter experiences during the past decade should convince the most sincere believer in occult arts that the depressed areas are not going to disappear from our midst just because we choose to ignore the plight of the millions of people living in those areas.

Economists frequently suggest that a solution for the unemployed in distressed areas is to migrate elsewhere. Many have done just that. They try to find jobs in other areas. The population of West Virginia has declined by 145,131, or about 8 percent, during the last 10 years, while the population of the United States increased by almost a fifth. But migration does not offer a solution to the problems of distressed areas. If anything, it adds to those problems because it encourages the dilapidation of vast invested social capital in the form of churches, schools, roads, and many other kinds of public facilities.

There is also another side to this migration proposal which thoughtful economists should consider. And that is that the movement of unemployed into new areas creates social and economic problems for those areas—increasing the pressure for housing, schools, and other public facilities, at a time when job opportunities have sharply diminished throughout the Nation. In recent years there has not been a single area in these United States which has experienced labor shortages.

There is no single simple solution to effectuate the rehabilitation of distressed areas. A variety of programs is needed. Happily, this is a situation recognized in the bill which the senior Senator from Illinois has introduced and which I have cosponsored.

This bill has four major provisions:

1. It provides technical assistance to communities to enable them to study their physical and human resources and evaluate their economic potential. On the basis of these facts, an economically distressed community would be able to approach potential employers with definite proposals as to the type of industry it could absorb.

2. In order to encourage prospective businesses to locate in a distressed community, or to encourage existing businesses to expand in the area, Senator DOUGLAS' bill would provide employers with needed capital at attractive rates of interest.

It is a well-established fact that conventional lending facilities are inadequate in distressed areas, particularly insofar as long-term, low-interest capital is concerned. What is needed, therefore, is an effective program to provide essential capital when it can be usefully employed. This should be a joint venture on the part of all levels of government and private enterprise, and S. 1 provides for such a joint endeavor.

Consequently, the Douglas bill provides for Federal loans which would cover, at most, 65 percent of the total capital needed for land and for building a new plant or commercial facility, or for the rehabilitation of a plant. The balance of the needed fund would have to be supplied either by the State, community, or by private capital.

In exceptional cases, the loans may also cover part of the cost of the machinery or equipment needed for the establishment of a successful enterprise, providing the working capital will be left completely to private enterprise.

I submit that this is a realistic approach to supplement the inadequate investment capital that exists in distressed areas. Altogether, the bill would establish revolving funds totaling $200 million from which loans would be made for new businesses locating in distressed areas, as well as for expanding businesses. The loans would cover industrial and commercial enterprises, including tourist facilities.

I am of the opinion that the $200 million in revolving funds established by the bill is a rather modest sum in view of the great needs and the large number of depressed areas. The fiscal year 1962 budget for foreign aid, I am advised, provides $200 million for technical assistance and there is a request for $700 million for development loans. As late as December 27, 1960, we extended, according to the newspapers, an additional $100 million to Yugoslavia—this on top of all the millions of dollars we have already

extended to that country. We have long been cognizant of the needs of peoples in foreign countries, and now that we are equally concerned with the needs of our own people we should not be stinting in the aid we extend to them.

3. Many of the distressed areas do not have needed public facilities to attract new industry. Because of a deteriorated tax base over a long period of chronic unemployment, or chronic partial employment, these areas do not have sufficient resources to provide such facilities without outside help. The Douglas bill would, therefore, establish a revolving fund of $100 million from which communities would be able to borrow funds in order to build industrial parks, improve public facilities, when necessary, and provide industrial water supply or other facilities essential for industry.

In extreme cases of need, the Federal Government would make grants to the communities on a matching basis to build such facilities. The extent of the Federal grants, however, would depend upon the ability of the communities and the States to participate in establishing the essential public facilities.

4. Finally, the bill also provides for training and retraining of workers in the distressed areas. The Federal Government has made grants to States for vocational training since 1917, when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. The Douglas bill provides additional funds to expand such vocational facilities in distressed areas. The type of training or retraining that would be provided in these communities would, of course, depend upon the needs of the individual distressed area and the industries likely to be attracted.

Many of the unemployed workers in distressed areas have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. It would hardly be reasonable to expect that workers without any means of subsistence could undergo an effective training program. The Douglas bill, therefore, provides a limited appropriation of only $10 million from which subsistence payments will be made to workers who are no longer eligible to collect unemployment insurance while they are undergoing training or retraining. The subsistence payments, however, would be limited to a period of 16 weeks.

These, in brief, are the major provisions of the area redevelopment bill.

There are many other provisions in the Douglas bill which merit careful consideration. However, I would like to touch on only two controversial provisions:

1. I have also heard that the bill would rob nondepressed communities of potential employees and additional jobs. Underlining this criticism of the bill is the assumption that our economic growth is extremely limited. This, I believe, is not true.

If anything, I believe the bill will help establish an atmosphere which will foster expanded economic growth, and that the new plants which it will encourage will provide additional jobs in the distressed areas. This will make it possible for additional total growth of the economy. Distressed areas, instead of serving as a drag on the economy, will aid in total economic expansion and growth. The distressed areas bill will, therefore, aid not only the people in these communities, but will also contribute to the healthy economic development of the whole Nation.

Finally, I would like to stress that the area redevelopment bill does not offer the total solution to the problems of the distressed areas. But this in no way detracts from its importance. As I have stated before, to evolve a comprehensive plan to solve the problems of distressed areas requires diverse measures. Such a full-bodied program has been thoroughly spelled out by the task force to aid distressed areas which President-elect Kennedy appointed in December of 1960.

A major recommendation of that task force was the passage of the area redevelopment bill which I have just outlined. This committee, to which I had the honor to serve as a consultant, rightfully gave priority to the passage of the area redevelopment bill. It is my deep conviction, and hope, that the 87th Congress will assign highest priority to the approval of this bill. The Douglas bill is not only a good piece of legislation; its enactment into law is vitally necessary.

Federal Rail Equipment-Leasing Agency Bill, H.R. 2078, Provides Needed Assistance for Our Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1961, I introduced H.R. 2078, a bill to establish a Railroad Equipment Administration within the Department of Commerce to purchase, finance, lease, and dispose of railroad rolling stock and to have available to it a working fund of up to $500 million.

The proposed administration would be authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time negotiable bonds in an amount aggregating not more than four times the total advances to its working fund and its accumulated surplus.

Under the proposed administration would be established a Railroad Equipment Board, composed of the Secretaries of Commerce and Defense and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or their nominees, plus four persons appointed by the President from outside the Government.

My bill, H.R. 2078, embodies provisions much like those of the so-called Symes plan put forward in mid-1957 by the Eastern railroads and presented to a House subcommittee by James M. Symes, then president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Similar legislation was introduced in the last session of Congress by Representative FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2078 would provide that no lease would set a term of years with respect to any particular class or type of railroad equipment exceeding the true economic life of such class or type. And unless the equipment board later changed the span, the following economic lives would apply to the classes indicated:

First. In the case of equipment to be used wholly or partly for the transportation of passengers, not more than 10 years.

Second. In the case of equipment designed solely for the transportation of property, not more than 20 years.

Third. In the case of equipment designed solely as locomotive power for the movement of other equipment, not more than 15 years.

When determination is made by the board of the true economic life of any class or type of railroad equipment the same shall not be changed for a period of 3 years thereafter.

The bill carries the following declaration of purposes:

It is hereby declared to be a matter of legislative determination that the equipment now being operated in interstate commerce by railroad companies is, to a considerable extent, inadequate and outmoded; that the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of such equipment is essential to (1) the proper functioning of the Government of the United States, (2) commerce among the several States, (3) carrying out the national transportation policy adopted by the Congress, and (4) the postal service and the national defense; that the Congress finds these essential objectives cannot be effectively achieved with the limited resources of the railroad industry, particularly in periods of shortages in the capital markets, that, in order to provide public participation in attaining these ends, it is necessary to enact the provisions hereafter set forth granting to a public agency certain powers to accomplish these objectives, and that the purchase, financing, leasing, and disposition of such equipment by the public agency hereinafter created, all as provided in this act, is hereby declared to be a public use and purpose.

The railroad lessees would assume sole responsibility for the construction of the equipment and would be obligated to assume the full cost and expense of securing proposals or bids for the construction. The submission of bids would be by public advertisement.

No tax could be imposed by any State or political subdivision on the manufacture, sale, purchase, or use of equipment owned or to be acquired by the rail administration.

In drawing up the leases, the bill provides that the following be included:

The amount of rental to be paid by the railroad to the administration over the term of the lease, which shall aggregate the following: (a) The original cost to the administration of purchasing the equipment covered by the lease, less such amount as the board shall at the beginning of the lease estimate to be the current scrap value thereof, and (b) the estimated interest cost to the administration of providing the funds with an added interest factor equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum annually with such combined interest factor being applied against the declining balances.

The railroads would be required to keep the equipment in good condition, would have to make good any equipment losses, would have to comply with all laws and with the equipment rules of the Association of American Railroads and would have to obtain permission to assign or transfer the lease or sublet the equipment. The administration could repossess equipment in case of default of any terms of the lease.

Section 304 of H.R. 2078 deals with the disposition of the equipment. It reads as follows:

SEC. 304. (a) Upon the expiration of the term of any lease, or sublease or assignment thereof, the administration shall promptly accept return by the railroad of the equipment covered thereby, or shall repossess the same by appropriate judicial process.

(b) Railroad equipment repossessed by the administration prior to expiration of the term of the original lease thereof may be

leased by it to another railroad for not more than the balance of said term, upon such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the board are most favorable, and the leasing of such equipment need not be subject to such terms of the standard lease as the board deems inappropriate in the circumstances.

(c) When the administration repossesses railroad equipment at the end of the term of the original lease, or is unable to re-lease equipment repossessed prior thereto, the administration shall offer to sell such equipment to the department or agency of the U.S. Government designated by the President by Executive order to undertake the stockpiling of railroad equipment. The sale price for each unit shall be the fair value as determined by agreement between the administration and such agency, but in no case may be less than the then scrap value of the said equipment. The department or agency acquiring such railroad equipment for stockpiling purposes shall not thereafter dispose of the same for other purpose than scrapping the said equipment, except that (1) in the event of national emergency declared by the President or by joint resolution of the Congress, or (2) pursuant to a decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission that a shortage exists in particular classes or types of railroad equipment, any such equipment may be temporarily released for use by the railroads under appropriate terms and conditions until new equipment can be acquired.

(d) Any railroad equipment repossessed by the administration, which is not leased to another railroad under the provisions of the act, and which is not purchased for stockpiling purposes by a department or agency of the the U.S. Government, shall thereupon promptly be sold and disposed of by the administration under such terms and with such guaranties as will assure that the said equipment shall be scrapped and not used by any railroad.

Among other provisions of H.R. 2078, the ICC would be directed to report to the new agency at least once a year on the supply and demand for railroad equipment. Rail equipment owned by the new agency would be subject to applicable provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and to the exercise of jurisdiction by the ICC, with the agency required to file copies of all leases of equipment with the Commission.

A fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, is provided for anyone making any false statement for the purpose of influencing the rail administration or for obtaining money, property, a lease of real equipment, or anything else of value.

Terms of the members of the Railroad Equipment Board, aside from the three Government officials, would be 6 years. The Board would be directed to hold at least four meetings a year. The members would receive $100 a day when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such. An executive director would be appointed by the Board itself, but the bill does not specify what his salary would be.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that most of the railroads of the Nation are faced with serious financial problems. As a matter of fact, the future of some of the eastern railroads is in jeopardy. The program provided for in my bill, H.R. 2078, is badly needed, and I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule early hearings on the legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 10: 22: *Let us draw near unto God with a true heart in full assurance of faith.*

Most merciful God, at this noon hour, we are again entering the sacred retreat of prayer and approaching Thy throne of grace where none has ever been repelled or sent away without Thy needed blessing.

May our minds and hearts be the shrines and sanctuaries of Thy love and gird us with the spirit of humility and devotion as we strive to build the highway toward peace and good will.

Show us how we may dispel our doubts and fears by the expulsive power of a strong faith and teach us the wisdom of yielding our wills to the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine spirit.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 127, Rept. No. 1), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 127

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of fifteen members.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 109

That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

THE STORY OF AN INDUSTRY, A UNION, AND A LAW

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, today I had an opportunity to join with other Members of Congress from the New England States and representatives of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, at a breakfast meeting held in the Congressional Hotel. The purpose of this get-together was to urge participation by the Members of Congress in the program of this textile trade union and to avail these leaders in the trade organization an opportunity to discuss with us their legislative aims in the 1961 session of Congress.

We were informed that the matters that interested the textile labor unions included an increase in the Federal minimum wage, area redevelopment, medical care for the aged, aid to education, adequate housing and tariff, and related problems affecting the welfare of textile workers and the economy of the communities in which these textile industries are located.

Each one of us was presented with a special so-called "white paper" which the Textile Workers Union of America had prepared and which was addressed to the Congress on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Law, and the abuses heaped upon labor by the present National Labor Relations Board as presently set up.

From the various speakers that addressed our meeting, I am thoroughly satisfied that there is an immediate need for a congressional committee to be set up to investigate and review the policy, the workings, and the decisions of that Board. I am hopeful that such a committee will have an opportunity to investigate this Board that evidently leans heavily to the side of the employer and management instead of rendering fair and reasonable decisions.

So that the Congress may be afforded an opportunity to know more about this situation that was so vitally brought to our attention by the 1951 report of the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to include their "white paper" document entitled "Almost Unbelievable—The Story of an Industry, a Union, and a Law":

This is the story of 14 stormy years in the life of America's oldest industry, textiles, one of the Nation's most responsible trade union organizations, the Textile Workers Union of America, and one of the most controversial and least understood laws of the land, the Taft-Hartley Act.

Although it has been temporarily elbowed aside by the Landrum-Griffin Act, a law even more sweeping in scope, Taft-Hartley continues to be a colossus which stands in