

section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wyatt Caraway, O17659, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, O18143, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198, U.S. Army.

Lt. Col. Alfred Frederick Ahner, O2018089, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States, to be Reserve commissioned officer of the Army to the grade of brigadier general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a).

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Edward C. Kenney, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Leonidas D. Coates, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

LINE

To be rear admirals

William E. Ellis	Charles K. Duncan
William S. Post, Jr.	John A. Tyree, Jr.
Harry Smith	Frederick L. Ashworth
John B. Colwell	George H. Miller
Bernard F. Roeder	Benedict J. Semmes,
Thomas R. Kurtz, Jr.	Jr.
Charles T. Booth II	Bernard A. Clarey
Hazlett P. Weatherwax	William I. Martin
John L. Chew	Samuel B. Frankel
John W. Gannon	William T. Nelson
Forsyth Massey	Edward A. Wright
John S. McCain, Jr.	Edwin B. Hooper
Louis J. Kirm	Henry A. Renken
Ralph C. Johnson	Morris A. Hirsch

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Cecil D. Riggs
Langdon C. Newman

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admiral

Herschel J. Goldberg

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be rear admiral

Joseph F. Dreith

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admiral

William C. G. Church

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

Eric G. F. Pollard

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Louis A. Gillies
Wharton E. Larned

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admiral

Levi J. Roberts

Vice Adm. Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be

within the contemplation of said section for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, U.S. Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS AND NAVY

The nominations beginning James B. Glennon, Jr., to be colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, and ending Wilton K. Witzgall, to be second lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps, said nominations having been received by the Senate on January 17, 1961.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning William H. Schmidt, to be captain, U.S. Air Force, and ending David W. Weiss, to be second lieutenant, U.S. Air Force, said nominations having been received by the Senate on January 10, 1961.

NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Woodrow W. Hill, pastor, West End Baptist Church, Petersburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we approach Thy throne of grace today because we hunger and thirst after righteousness, not only for ourselves but for this troubled world. Thou has placed great responsibility upon our shoulders, but we readily recognize that in our own wisdom and strength we are insufficient to face it alone.

Thy word says "If any of you lack wisdom let him ask God that giveth liberally * * * and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." We courageously study our motives and limitations today and face our need.

We pause at this noonday hour to ask for wisdom and strength. Responsibility is great, and we pray that it might be matched with wisdom from God, with devotion to duty, and with strength to perform.

Grant us Thy grace for living and leading these days; and as we find ourselves being weighed in the balances we pray that we shall not be found wanting. Grant, O Father, that the time might speedily come when other nations of the world might look upon us and say, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Bennett, Mich.	Knox	Rabaut
Fino	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Jensen	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 426 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of fifteen members.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, as is customary, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is one assignment that I did not seek.

I have deep affection for all parties involved in this controversy, and I have deep respect for the rules of the House.

I am a Democrat. I have always fought my political battles in the battle-scarred uniform of the Democratic Party, and I shall continue to do that. However, I have a firm belief in the position that with the majority rests the responsibility. If the Republican Party were in the majority here today and had the Speaker and they were seeking some means of assuring the leadership leeway to conform to their full responsibilities, as the majority I would vote with them on a similar resolution.

We are a two-party system. My prayer is that never in this great land of ours will we become so confused and

mixed up with different parties that we will become the victim of the lack of authority to function as a majority that exists in some of the states of Europe and of Asia. I believe in a two-party system. Of course, as a Democrat, I naturally want the Democrats always to be leading, at least one jump ahead.

Another thing, we in this Hall of the House of Representatives and all the people of the United States are brothers and sisters. We are partners in this great enterprise called America, and the necessity of affirming our leadership abounds. We are the beneficiaries of a Republic dedicated to us by the trials, sacrifice, blood, and tears from Plymouth Rock, Jamestown, Lexington, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, clear on through to Pork Chop Hill and Heartbreak Ridge in Korea.

Yes; it is my country. It is your country. It is our country. And it is challenged today as it has never been challenged before by a shrewd, wily, calculating, relentless foe. As we sit here in this Chamber today the Russian Bear has its claws in the front door of our yard, and in the backyard there is a Red dragon as long as the back porch. So the challenge is ours.

This is no time for dissension and lack of unity. We must keep our powder dry. We are not at all unlike the pioneer who had his musket loaded and in the rack above the door in his home. He was not an enemy of anybody, he did not want to fight, but let man or beast challenge his right to live, to love, to grow a family, own a home or business, or carry on a farmer's job, or any job, or to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, the old musket came down from above the door and it spoke. We, his descendants, must meet that challenge which confronts us. We must have that same posture as the pioneers.

I hope as we vote upon this resolution that when it ends, whichever way it goes, we can return to our work without malice, without bitterness, without selfishness, proud of the heritage that is ours of a great Republic dedicated to the proposition that freedom is even dearer than life itself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for the purposes of debate.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who wanted this conflict to come to the floor of the House. I know of no one who could have prevented it from coming here. There is a situation existing which no one can deny. We have reached a stalemate in our Committee on Rules, a stalemate produced because of tie votes of 6 to 6. What is the basic cause of our difficulty? Reflect for only a second. The basic cause is self-evident—it is very simple, and that is that the Committee on Rules is composed of an even number of Members and, therefore, is prone to tie votes. Our Founding Fathers realizing the danger of tie votes in a deliberative body, and as the Senate must always be composed of an even number, two from each State, provided a mechanism in

the other body for breaking a tie vote and permitted the Vice President, not a Member of that body, to vote in order to break a tie. But, no mechanism was provided in the House of Representatives. Why? Because the House is presided over by a Member of this body; and, in addition, because it was always contemplated that the House would consist of an odd number or an uneven number of Members. In providing for the first Congresses until after the taking of the first census, each State in the Union was assigned a finite number of Members to sit in those Congresses before the first census could be taken. Each State was assigned a finite number and it added up to 65—an uneven number. Congresses very close in time to the Constitution fixed the membership of the House at an uneven number.

The number provided after the first enumeration was 105; in the second, 141; then 181; 213; 240; 223; 233; 241; 283; 325; 356; 386; 433; and since 1913, 435 with a temporary increase to accommodate Hawaii and Alaska to 437. Every time Congress has fixed the number of the House of Representatives, it has fixed it at an uneven number. When the House has consisted of an even number, it was because of States admitted to the Union after the last decennial census or because the Congress did not fix a finite number, but provided a formula which produced an even number. If you will turn to rule 10 of the rules of the House, you will see, under the permanent rules of the House, every committee of the House is to consist of an uneven number of members except the Committee on Rules. True, in specific Congresses as in this Congress, it has been provided that certain committees of the House shall consist of an even number. If you think there is something sacrosanct about the number 12 on the Committee on Rules, there is no reason for that feeling. It was created as a standing committee of the House in 1880. Prior to that time, it existed as a select committee. When the Committee on Rules was created in 1880 it consisted of five members. That continued until 1910 when the number was increased to 11 members and in 1917 to 12 members and in 1935 to 14 members and in 1945 and since that time, it has consisted of 12 members. So that the numbers on the Committee on Rules have been changed, and have been changed a number of times since that committee has been in existence.

The rules of the House provide the number to be on a committee, but they do not provide the manner in which those numbers shall be distributed between the majority and the minority. What happens? At the beginning of each Congress, the Speaker of the House and the minority leader agree upon the ratio to be assigned to these committees, and it has invariably conformed to the ratio of the representation of the two parties in the House of Representatives, as nearly as it has been possible to do so.

That is not true as to the Committee on Rules, under the custom and the unbroken tradition of the House. The ma-

majority party, by custom and tradition, always has a 2-to-1 majority on the Committee on Rules. Under the strength of 12, there have been 8 Democrats and 4 Republicans when the Democrats have controlled the House, and 8 Republicans and 4 Democrats when the Republicans have controlled the House. Why? For the simple and all important reason that the Committee on Rules is an arm of the leadership of the majority party. The majority party has the responsibility of the legislative program of the House. The majority party has the right to bring to the floor of the House the legislative proposals of the committees. Once a proposal is on the floor, each member is a free agent to consider, to decide, and to vote as he sees fit. Because of this traditional organization one who assumes membership on the Committee on Rules must be prepared to exercise a function of leadership. His personal objection to the proposal is not always sufficient reason for him to vote to deny the membership of the whole House the opportunity to express its approval or, equally important, the opportunity to express its disapproval.

Each of us has received from the chairman of the Committee on Rules a copy of a letter which he addressed to Hon. CARL VINSON and Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER. In that letter, he reviews briefly efforts to reach a compromise on this controversy. He states:

I, therefore, want it clearly understood what we who oppose the packing scheme have offered to do.

We have offered to interpose no obstacles in the Committee on Rules to the five major bills that the President has publicly announced as his program for this session.

We have offered to support a change in the rules to deprive the Committee on Rules of jurisdiction to prevent bills from going to conference.

I submit that this proposal offers no solution.

Article II, section 3, of the Constitution reads as follows:

He [the President] shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

The proposal of the chairman of the Committee on Rules attempts to impinge upon the constitutional mandate placed upon the President by limiting to five proposals made by the President which that committee will consider. The letter from the chairman of the Committee on Rules is dated January 28. It, therefore, proposed prior to the organization of the House, prior to the appointment of the legislative committees of the House, and before any opportunity for the President to submit his report on the state of the Union and an opportunity to recommend to our consideration such measures as the President may judge necessary and expedient, a limitation of five proposals.

These are troublesome times. Action on this resolution is difficult and unpleasant. In another difficult time the following was said:

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine pa-

triot will in this crisis shrink from the service of his country. But he who stands it now will merit and receive the gratitude and love of man and woman.

Those were words written by Thomas Payne and read to Washington's troops immediately before the Battle of Trenton. I would be so bold as to add that he who shows his courage on the floor today will exhibit the hallmark of the patriot.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at the conclusion of debate on this matter and just before the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, naturally I have not been too happy in recent weeks over the misinformation, misrepresentation, falsehoods and slander which have been directed against the committee of which I have had the honor to serve for 18 years. There has been much said that is absolutely untrue and not according to the facts. Therefore, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the time and place to look at the record.

This resolution was designed and introduced for one purpose and one purpose only, to pack the Rules Committee so as to give either one individual, or a limited few, the power to completely control all of its decisions and actions.

It is exactly similar to the 1937 attempt of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court so as to obtain the favorable decisions he desired.

Never before has an attempt been made to pack any House committee to control its legislative decisions, although the membership of other committees has been changed at times for different but proper purposes.

If the Rules Committee is packed it will be possible for those in control to withhold from or send to the floor for action any and all legislation. More sinister and dangerous is the fact it will be possible for the committee to report any closed or gag rule desired, so as to prevent Members from offering amendments to a bill, or otherwise work their will thereon. Rules could also be reported to waive points of order, so any given bill could carry provisions otherwise contrary to House rules, and even to statutory law.

If the Rules Committee can be packed to obtain political decisions, other committees of the House can likewise be packed. The Ways and Means Committee could be packed to get from it the Forand type of Federal aid bill previously rejected by the committee, or the kind of tax laws some may desire. The same situation could apply to all other legislative committees.

The fallacious argument has been made that it is necessary to pack the Rules Committee to guarantee that certain major administration bills can receive House consideration. Such bills most discussed are minimum wage, medical care for the needy aged, Federal aid

for education, housing, and depressed areas. While it is charged House consideration of measures dealing with these same subjects was blocked by the Rules Committee during the last Congress, such charge is absolutely false, for House bills on each of those subjects did reach the floor and were actually approved by the House.

That similar administration bills on these subjects will reach the House floor for consideration during this Congress has been guaranteed by Chairman SMITH, of the Rules Committee. Weeks ago he gave such assurance verbally to House leaders on this matter. Last Saturday, in a letter to Congressmen VINSON and WALTER, he again so pledged himself in writing.

Republicans of the House are not obstructionists. If they disagree with any administration proposal they will have substitute proposals of their own to offer for consideration.

So the adoption of this resolution to pack the Rules Committee is not necessary to make certain the House will have the opportunity to consider the five main administration-sponsored measures which have been mentioned so often.

In the 86th Congress, out of the 146 requests for rules on House bills, only 5 were denied by the Rules Committee. Out of the 19 requests for rules on Senate bills, only 1 was denied.

Charges have been made that an unholy coalition, or coalitions, have existed in the Rules Committee. This may have been true in some instances, for I personally coalesced with my good friend and our well-known liberal colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri, as well as with other liberals, when I moved to report the civil rights bill, which was enacted into law by the last Congress. Mr. REECE, of Tennessee, coalesced with those on the Rules Committee who supported Federal aid to education when he moved to send to the floor, where it was passed, the school construction bill—H.R. 10128.

There is no reason to believe that the Rules Committee, as now constituted, will or can prevent any important legislation from receiving consideration by the House, for the House of Representatives can always work its will on legislative matters.

Wednesday of each week is designated as Calendar Wednesday, at which time the chairman of any House legislative committee can call up a bill for immediate consideration without obtaining a rule to make such action in order.

By a simple majority of the membership signing a discharge petition any bill can be called up for prompt consideration by the full House.

Any measure can also be called up under suspension of the rules procedure and acted upon promptly, providing the Speaker approves.

Bills and resolutions from the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, and House Administration, are usually brought to the floor for action without a rule.

In my nearly a quarter of a century of service here I have never known of a single instance, when the House leader-

ship desired a bill to be brought to a House vote, that such measure was not voted upon.

So actually it is only power which is being sought by this resolution—power to prevent any individual Member, as well as any minority, from a vote or free expression on legislative bills. This is power no little group, no Speaker, no President should seek. This is power no little group, no Speaker, no President, should have.

The majority leadership already have the means and the powers to bring any legislation before the House for consideration. Such have long been exercised.

Do not be misled into voting for this resolution, the adoption of which will establish a most dangerous precedent—one which in future years may greatly injure or completely wreck orderly parliamentary procedure in this body.

No Member should vote to restrict or to hamstring his own rights and prerogatives as a free and equal Member of what has long been known as a free and uncontrolled legislative body—the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to restate a position.

I doubt very much if anything said here is going to change many views on the subject. Essentially, I feel that this is an instance where two wrongs do not make a right.

I believe that this is an unnecessary resolution in order to bring matters to the floor of the House. I do believe the Rules Committee improperly, and unfairly, have been made to appear to be a whipping boy when, indeed, the majority could at all times have worked their will and brought these matters to the floor of the House. However, I also happen to believe that we as a party, ever since I have been here, have agreed on the basic proposition that whichever party obtains the responsibility to organize the Congress should have the necessary power to meet that responsibility.

I remember in the 83d Congress when we won by a majority of 6 at which time we packed the Rules Committee, if one wants to use that term, 2 to 1, or 8 to 4, the Ways and Means Committee 15 to 10, the Appropriations Committee 30 to 20. The principle is a sound principle, and I think in this instance we make a mistake as the Republican Party to oppose this basic proposal.

Finally, may I say that I hope as the result, if this is to prevail, that a third wrong does not come into the fore, and it might. History indicates it might. I hope if this comes about there will not be these gag rules coming out of the Rules Committee waiving points of order, actually forbidding the Members of the House to work their will on certain legislation.

May I say also that I intend to oppose most of the legislation I have heard Mr. Kennedy is going to send up to the House for consideration. I intend to be on the floor to do the best I can to defeat the measures on the merits.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the beginning I am very sorry that I am not given what I consider a fair amount of time in which to discuss this matter. I will have to be brief and quick and I will not be able to yield to anyone.

In the first place, a lot of people around here these days talk about this being a matter of a quarrel between the Speaker and myself. I have served with the Speaker of this House for 30 years. I have no quarrel with the Speaker. He has a right to his convictions; I claim the right to mine. That is an American right, and that is my duty as I regard it in the House of Representatives, to speak and to vote your convictions and not the convictions of someone else. So, if there is any quarrel between the Speaker and myself it is all on his side, and I say that in the kindest spirit and I hope it will not be misconstrued.

When I make this pledge to the Speaker and to the Members of this House, it is a pledge I made when I first became chairman of the Rules Committee. That is, I will cooperate with the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives just as long and just as far as my conscience will permit me to go. Some of these gentlemen who are laughing maybe do not understand what a conscience is. They are entitled to that code, and I think I am entitled to mine.

These offers to cooperate have been made. You may call it a compromise if you wish, but I want that understood by the Members of the House, because you are setting a bad precedent here today. If you purge this committee, you can purge any committee.

I was surprised to see the Committee on Armed Services engage in this assault on the Rules Committee, because I challenge anybody on that committee to mention any measure that they ever asked for since I have been a member of the Rules Committee that has been held up for a minute. The members of that committee know this is true. There are very few bills that have been held up by the Committee on Rules as compared to the legislative committees of the House. Do you know that there were some 15,000 bills introduced in this House in the last Congress, and do you know that 90 percent of them died in committee and were never reported; in other words, the legislative committees refused or neglected to report 90 percent of the bills and the Committee on Rules less than 10 percent of the bills that came before them.

Now, here is what I want to say to you, and I want to make it a matter of record: There has been a lot of talk about who is interested in this thing. I do not know whose fight this is on the Committee on Rules. I have heard it was the President's. He never said anything to me about it; never made any

request of me. Why, this morning the newspapers said it was Khrushchev. Now, I never heard from Khrushchev and I have not heard from Castro, but I have heard from some other people.

Now, here is what I have agreed to do. All of the five bills which the President has announced as his program for this session, which are five bills that I am very much opposed to and will oppose on the floor, I will not oppose his program, as so far announced, in the Committee on Rules. That is a pledge. I have agreed that I will support a resolution that will take from the Committee on Rules the power to prevent bills from going to conference. I have asked that these proposals be submitted to the President to see if it met his requirement, but that request was refused. Everything that I have proposed has been refused.

Now, I add one other thing to this. There has been some talk about my going out and milking cows once or twice. Well, I will make this statement, that so far as I am concerned there will not be any delay, any undue delay on any call that the leadership makes to hold hearings in the Committee on Rules, if these proposals are accepted. If the resolution is adopted I make no commitments.

Now, you have before you this resolution, and what I cannot understand—and it is a very great mystery to me—is what more do you want? You have a resolution to pack or purge or oppose the Committee on Rules laid before you right now. If this matter were left dormant on the calendar, it would remain there for 2 years, and if this committee did something that the House thought it should not do, then you would have cause to complain and could call it up any day and say this committee is doing wrong and "We told you they were going to do wrong, and therefore we will call up the resolution." What better position would you want to be in than that? If that committee refused to give a rule, they could bring the resolution up. Now, I wish somebody would answer that. What do they want? Is it an effort merely to humiliate one chairman of one committee in this House? Well, if it is, nobody can humiliate me except the people who have elected me to Congress 16 consecutive times.

This is a very unhappy thing; it is very unhappy for me. I have tried to be fair in every way I know. But when I am asked to pledge aid to the passage of any resolution or bill in this House that I am conscientiously opposed to, I would not yield my conscience and my right to vote in this House to any person or any Member or under any conditions. Now, if there are any here who conscientiously oppose that position on the part of a Member of this House—and this is a great body—if there is any other Member here who thinks he ought to yield his conscience and the views of his constituency to the will of somebody who is not a member of that committee, then he ought to vote the other way. As for me, I shall sustain my conviction. I want to tell you who started all this. I got into that a little while ago. I do

not think Khrushchev started it; I do not think he had anything to do with it. It started here in this House in the last Congress on the 26th day of August when gentlemen exercised their right and took time on the floor to open this assault on the Committee on Rules. They spoke at length and laid out this plan and several other plans. The gentlemen who spoke on that occasion were: Mr. Flynn, of Wisconsin; Mr. Bailey, of West Virginia; Mr. Wolf, of Iowa; Mr. Thompson of New Jersey; Mr. Baldwin, of California; Mr. Staggers, of West Virginia; Mr. Reuss, of Wisconsin; Mr. Porter, of Oregon; Mr. Hollifield, of California; Mr. Pucinski, of Illinois; Mr. Quigley, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. Roosevelt, of California.

That is where this all started. They have a little group, and I think it is still little, known as the study group. Now I have in my hand the monthly issue of Americans for Democratic Action. Have any of you ever heard of that? They claim credit for all this ruckus that is going on here now. I think we ought to be sensible and let this matter lie on the calendar and see whether you are going to have any trouble, because I do not think you are.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter sent to all Members of the House last Saturday:

JANUARY 28, 1961.

HON. CARL VINSON,
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR CARL AND FRANCIS: You called on me yesterday afternoon to discuss a solution to the controversy of packing the Committee on Rules of the House. You left me to discuss further a proposal which we three thought might be mutually satisfactory. I have heard nothing further from you and assume that all efforts to settle have been rejected. I, therefore, want it clearly understood what we, who oppose the packing scheme, have offered to do.

We have offered to interpose no obstacles in the Committee on Rules to the five major bills that the President has publicly announced as his program for this session.

We have offered to support a change in the rules to deprive the Committee on Rules of jurisdiction to prevent bills from going to conference.

We have brought out of the Committee on Rules a resolution which the leadership can pass in the House next Tuesday if they have the votes, or adopt the wiser course of waiting until the Committee on Rules in the opinion of the leadership, acts in a manner contrary to the wishes of the House, at which time the leadership can bring it up, and pass it, and stack the committee, any time the House wishes in the next 2 years.

Those of us who oppose this packing scheme have offered every honorable solution for the sake of harmony.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves one simple, basic question. What is the real purpose of this pending resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide for an increase in the size of the Rules Committee?

Admittedly, this committee has tremendous power. Its primary function is to review legislation reported to the House and to determine how and when it shall be considered on the floor. The membership of this committee has, for the most part, consisted of senior Members of the House with a broad knowledge of governmental matters and legislative procedures. Traditionally, the ratio has been 8 to 4 majority controlled.

Every committee of the House, as we all know, is vested with great power. Each can determine what bills before it shall be considered, rejected, or reported, and in what forms.

But this committee power, of the Rules Committee or any other committee, is not a power without limit. The rules of the House provide ways and means by which the majority can work its will, and often has, in the consideration of any measure.

The pending resolution does not change the functions of the Rules Committee. It does not in any way take away its powers, which it has and should have for the orderly consideration of legislation.

I ask again, what is the purpose of this resolution? It is obvious. The obvious purpose of this resolution is to "pack" the committee. It is proposed here to convert a screening committee, a senior deliberative committee, into a "rubberstamp" committee for whatever our new President may propose and subject to the dictates of our Speaker.

Surely, we are not going to increase, or reduce, or compose the membership of our committees purely for political expediency. If we adopt this resolution we shall be establishing such a precedent that memberships on committees are to be adjusted in accordance with what any administration may propose and what the present Speaker, or any Speaker to follow, may dictate as to what is to be done with respect to what is proposed.

No one knows what will be the political complexion of the next administration, nor of the Congress, nor who will be our Speaker. What we do here today is by no means as grave as what we do to our future as the Congress of the United States, where we all—each in his own way speaks for the people he represents.

As much as we revere our Speaker, we must not place in his hands, or in the hands of anyone who may become Speaker, complete control over what we do and when we do it. That is what is proposed by this resolution; enable the Speaker to control by membership composition what the Rules Committee decides.

It has been contended that the Rules Committee has been a roadblock to the consideration of important measures. That is not true. In the last Congress the committee granted a rule for the consideration of every major bill for which a rule was requested, with the exception of the depressed areas bill, which was considered under Calendar Wednesday, proving thereby that the House can work its will.

It has also been argued that the Rules Committee has delayed bills being

brought to the floor. I do not know of a single measure demanding emergency action that the committee delayed or that has had ill effect on the Nation's welfare. It has been my experience that the committee has always acted expeditiously on anything of an emergency nature.

Other than in emergency instances, nothing is lost but much is gained by delay. It enables us and the people we represent to know exactly what is proposed and why. There is an adage that "haste makes waste." By not acting hastily this committee has on many occasions done a great service to us and the country. John Nance Garner, former Vice President, once was reported to have said, "The country never suffers from the things that Congress fails to do."

That well applies to many of the proposals we hear will be presented to us in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. I cannot vote for that which is nothing more or less than "a go signal" for any and all legislation, and a move which, in the long run might well haunt those of us who seek to retain the House as a great deliberative body.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said in this Chamber on yesterday, and I quote:

Our Constitution wisely assigns both joint and separate roles to each branch of the Government, and a President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will not permit nor attempt any trespass.

So, regardless of some newspaper comments to the contrary, this is solely a matter for us to determine—the organization and size of our own Rules Committee.

On January 3, 1945, over 16 years ago, under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, there were appointed eight Democrats and four Republicans to the Rules Committee of the House and this proportion, based upon the majority held by either party in the House, has continued under the rules of the House down through the years, under different Presidents and different majority leaderships, until this very day and by unanimous vote of the House in all cases. Therefore, the question logically arises, why this change now, this year.

There have been statements that it is necessary because in the past a coalition has frustrated the majority will of the membership. But, I ask, how can this be? In every year, during every session, except on the vote to organize the House, there has been a coalition of members of both parties and there will be one on this vote today, either joined to pass or defeat the resolution. In the 10 years I have been here, I have found myself, legislatively speaking, in odd company from time to time on certain pieces of legislation, but this is only the result of men with similar convictions voting similarly on particular pieces of legislation. And, if those people with

similar convictions pass or defeat legislation, who can say that this is not a victory for the majority of the Members of the House in connection with any particular piece of legislation, and a victory for the thinking of the people they represent. What is wrong with that? Is there a pending charge that any Member of this House or any group of Members do not vote their convictions or the aspirations of the people they represent? Is there a pending charge that any Member or group of Members are inimical to the best interests of America, or that they are un-American? Of course there is not.

This is a mighty important precedent we debate today. We are not discussing the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee or its powers or procedures. We intend to keep that just as it is. But it is here suggested that we transfer from one group of our members to another group of our members the same authority which now exists. What is so sacrosanct or uplifting or heartening in this shift of power and authority to Members yet unnamed from Members now holding such power by reasons of seniority on the Rules Committee, which is the procedure and tradition governing every other committee assignment in this House. No single member ever spoke and voted so as to please every other member 100 percent of the time. Do we increase our prerogatives as members because we shift authority from those who acted in the past sometimes too slowly or deliberately to suit others to Members, yet unnamed, who might act too rapidly, too ill-consideredly, and who might even impose a gag rule on all the rest of us in connection with legislative matters to be here considered? For in so doing, we must remember we are here establishing a precedent which will haunt us for all time. Any time a legislative committee, regardless of the hearings it has held and the witnesses it has heard, does not quickly respond to the mandate of the leadership, it can be packed overnight by this kind of resolution. This procedure has been followed in some State legislatures in order to render them almost totally ineffective. I should hope to God this would not happen in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We have a new administration. Many of its legislative recommendations for this session have been announced. The present Rules Committee has agreed to report all of these measures under a rule permitting debate and amendment. The present members of the Rules Committee have agreed to send all rules passed by the Senate and the House to conference. In view of this, why the rush to change a well-established and carefully calculated legislative safeguard to all our rights and privileges as Members? We can do it any time it appears to be in the national interest and when there is a proven need.

For, in the absence of threats, promises, coercions, and distortions, I really believe this resolution would today be defeated, if every Member followed the voice that whispers within him. If that should happen, I should

say, as far as my 10 years of service here is concerned, it would be this legislative Chamber's finest hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to enlarge the Rules Committee of the House.

It is just about 24 hours ago when we heard in this House the sobering but stirring message of the President of the United States. As of the minute he spoke, the eyes of the world, particularly the hostile eyes that watch us from behind the Iron Curtain, focused on us in the House of Representatives.

Every move we make is going to be watched by our friends and enemies alike. Every mistake we make is going to be magnified by hostile propaganda so as to make even our friends believe that the Nation and its representatives do not stand back of the President of the United States.

The great young man who addressed us yesterday laid down foundations for action. He courageously undertook commitments. However, the fulfillment of his commitments on which the survival of this Nation and, indeed, the survival of freedom depends, is our job.

The propaganda value of a negative vote on this resolution cannot be overestimated. A negative vote on the resolution will hand our enemies on a silver platter the priceless instrument which will be used in their attempts to destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, before this day is over we must once again face the stark facts brought before us yesterday by our new leader. The eloquence of those facts must have the effect of a command. We must not fail the United States and her leader in our vote today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I read off a list of names of the study group a short time ago, and I inadvertently named Mr. SCHWENGLER who interposed some remarks on another subject and was not a member of that study committee. Also, I did not designate which Mr. Flynn it was. It was Mr. Flynn, of Wisconsin, and not Mr. FLYNN, of Georgia, I am happy to say.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 50 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this proposal to pack the Rules Committee in order to make it a rubberstamp for any one in the Congress or outside it, is one of the easiest to vote against that I have faced in 18 years.

I might say, in reference to the remarks just made by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], that I do not know when any President of the United States, whether new or old, was ever given any authority to make commitments or to announce programs that amount to commands to the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

There are three reasons why I am against this proposal. First, it is demonstrably not necessary. Will somebody please spell out just what impor-

tant legislation desired by the Democratic leadership of this House has been blocked by the Rules Committee? In the last Congress, bills reported out by the appropriate committees in the five fields that President Kennedy says are the essentials of his program, were also brought out by the Rules Committee and acted upon by the House.

In addition, the Rules Committee brought out civil rights legislation, which so far as I have observed, the President has not placed on his list of essential legislation.

What important legislation has been held up by the so-called coalition of Republicans with reactionary southerners?

If and when legislation desired by a majority of the Members of the House should be blocked by the Rules Committee, there are remedies and everybody here knows it. By Calendar Wednesday or a discharge petition, any bill can be brought to the floor and acted upon whenever a majority of the Members of the House want it to be brought to the floor and acted upon. Millions of Americans have been misled into believing that the Rules Committee has life-and-death power over legislation, that it exercises a dangerous minority control over any and all bills. It just is not so.

If a majority of the Members do not want a bill passed because they do not think it is good legislation for the country, I ask you why should it be brought out and perhaps jammed through by the kind of pressures we all know exist?

We are grown men and women. Every one of us here knows that frequently Members go to the Rules Committee members and say, "Please hold up that legislation. I do not think it is good, but if it does come out, there is so much pressure in my district that I will have to vote for it."

Are the Members of Congress to be Representatives? Or are we to be reduced to mere delegates of the largest or most powerful groups at home? Are we to be just like the flag on a cash register, registering whatever button is pushed by somebody else? If they push the 10-cent button, the 10-cent flag goes up, without any thought or judgment on our part? If they push the "aye" button, the "aye" flag goes up? Our country is a Republic. It was not expected by the founders that the people themselves could make direct decisions on the complicated issues that come along. It was expected that the people in a given district would select one of their number in whose character, ability, and judgment they had confidence, and send him to Congress to give his full time to studying issues and making decisions in the interest of the Nation.

My title is not Representative of Minnesota. It is U.S. Representative—from the State of Minnesota. I have only one mandate here, and that mandate is to help govern this country the best I can as one member of the board of directors of the United States of America, the greatest organization the world has ever known. If some say that is not democratic because it does not reflect what the pressure groups demand, I deny it. It is democratic in the sense

that every 2 years the people in my district can defeat me or send me back, according to whether or not they think I have done a good job as their representative on the board of directors.

It is much like the patient's relation to a doctor. Suppose a lady calls up her doctor and says, "My boy has a stomach ache and he is vomiting. He has a little fever and pain in his stomach. I fear he may have appendicitis. Will you come over and see him?"

What would you think of the doctor if he were to reply, "Please do not ask me to figure out what is wrong and decide what to do? Just tell me what do you want me to do? Do you want me to operate or not operate? Should I operate on the right side or the left side? Tell me what you want me to do and I will do it, whether I think it is wise or not." No; the doctor uses his best judgment as long as he is on the case. If the patient is not satisfied, he chooses another doctor.

Are we to be asked to subordinate and sacrifice our own honest judgment to the pressures of the moment? Everyone knows that many Members, perhaps all of us to some extent on some measures, feel we have to vote the way the crowd wants, if the bill comes up for vote in the House, even though we may believe it is not wise in terms of the total national picture.

So I repeat this proposal is not necessary. The Rules Committee cannot block any legislation that a majority of the Members of the House wants. If the majority does not believe it is good, why should it be passed? Would it be likely to be beneficial to the country?

But the biggest reason I am against this is not just because it is not necessary, and I do not see any real benefits to flow from it. The proposal has real dangers. It is a calculated assault on the whole committee system, which is the best yet devised for providing careful consideration and study of legislation.

Once such a precedent has been established, in order to get some few measures passed that some one or some group outside this House demands, there will, of course, be pressures to pack other committees—Ways and Means, Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor—whenever those committees fail to subordinate their own judgment to pressure groups, or the Executive, or to others who have not studied the legislation half as thoroughly as has the Committee.

Should this House be intimidated into abandoning sound committee procedures developed and tested through more than 170 years—and giving the stabiliest and best government the world has known?

Just what are the good ends that justify such bad means?

Furthermore a packed Rules Committee can be expected to bring out bills under gag rules, making it impossible for Members to propose, debate, and act on amendments. Is that democratic? Is that proper protection of the rights of the minority?

If the proposal before us were one to modify or take away some of the powers of the Rules Committee, that would be a different issue. But this resolution

does not alter in the slightest the automatic powers it is claimed the Rules Committee has. It merely packs the committee so it will be a rubberstamp in the hands of the Speaker, without appearing to be so. I cannot believe that is being candid, democratic, or wise— whoever the Speaker may be.

So when a proposal is not necessary, will not bring out legislation likely to benefit the country, and entails grave dangers, why should we pass it? I believe it should be defeated.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I am opposed to this legislation. I hope to state some legitimate reasons for that opposition.

I am against it because it is unwise, unjustified, untimely, unnecessary and, therefore, unsupportable. I am not suffering under any illusion here about changing the votes of some of my friends on the right, or possibly even on my side. There have been pressures exerted in this controversy that perhaps would far exceed any argumentative effort on my part. We have even had Mr. Khrushchev dragged into the controversy. I would just like to say that if the President really is concerned about his ability, as reported from unknown sources at the White House, to deal with Mr. Khrushchev if this resolution is not adopted, I would like to have word direct from down there.

I have had an avalanche of mail, most of it handwritten, from people opposed to this resolution. And why are they opposed to it? They are concerned about rash and reckless platform promises repeated in the campaign, some of it added to by some of the task force reports.

As I read that mail from the people of this country, right-thinking people by the millions, I am convinced they are afraid that this effort signals a collapse of the opposition to such unwise measures. They are afraid the floodgates will be let down and we will be overwhelmed with bad legislation.

As a former member of the Committee on Rules and twice majority leader and now minority leader, I know because I have worked there that the Committee on Rules performs a most constructive service for the Members of this body and for the people of this country. I am submitting that the Committee on Rules time and again has responded by granting rules that individual members of the committee did not want; and I know by experience, I have observed, that a determined majority leadership can get action in the Committee on Rules and can get measures to the floor if it wants to. Certainly the Committee on Rules is not obligated to report to this floor every bill that comes before it; and as I look around I see Members who I am quite sure are thankful for that. At the same time, it is not the province of the Committee on Rules to roadblock legislation that ought to be seriously considered.

The safeguards against such indiscriminate action are well known.

I say this present effort proceeds first, on a false assertion and second, on a false assumption. The false assertion is that in the last Congress the Committee on Rules did roadblock legislation that should have been considered. As has already been pointed out, that just is not true. All five of the measures that are now called the key measures were considered and all but one of them under a rule, and in that one instance the Committee on Rules did not even have a chance to grant a rule before the measure was called up under Calendar Wednesday procedure.

The false assumption is that we Republicans are going to be obstructionists just for obstruction's sake. That is not true. Why, we have not even filled our two vacant places on the Committee on Rules. I do not think it is fair to assume that the Republicans on the Committee on Rules and in the House of Representatives are going to be unmindful of their responsibility to the Nation.

When I presented our great Speaker to you, I said, "Whenever economic and military well-being is at stake, we on our side will cooperate." I meant every word of that then, and I still mean it.

I suggested that this action is untimely. On the opening day, by action started on the majority side, the number of members of the Committee on Rules was fixed at 12, with the division being 8 and 4. You on the Democratic side designated your members, we designated our two carryover members.

Why is it not the better part of wisdom and good judgment to wait and move along in this Congress and see how the Committee on Rules performs? The chairman of the committee has given definite assurance of consideration of certain measures and, speaking for my side, I do not think it is fair to assume that we are going to have a recalcitrant committee arbitrarily blocking measures that reasonably ought to be considered.

I have heard our beloved Speaker say many times when we have had measures on the floor like this—he has used the phrase, "Wait a minute." If it is good in Texas it is good in Indiana. And that advice is good here today.

I mentioned our great Speaker. When we wound up the last session of Congress the Committee on Rules was supposed to have been such a bad performer, but the Speaker said at that time:

We have come to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. And I am winding up my 24th term.

Some of us on the Republican side did not think we had done quite that well, but, at least, that was the Speaker's opinion.

In the final analysis, speaking for myself, I have no fear of bringing any measure to the floor to be debated and considered here that reasonably ought to come on the floor of the House of Representatives. But I want to say on my responsibility that I carried here on the majority and minority sides, there

have been many times I have said, "Thank God for the Committee on Rules," from the standpoint of the welfare of the country I love and serve.

We have had every reasonable assurance here today that proper measures that ought to be considered will come to the floor of the House of Representatives, subject to full debate and action.

I am afraid what we are being asked to do here today under this resolution could signal the breakdown of a very vital part of the legislative machinery, the Committee on Rules which has for many years enabled the House of Representatives to conduct its essential business in orderly fashion.

I ask you to vote against this resolution.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, whether you vote with me today or not, I want to say that I appreciate your uniform kindness and courtesy that has been displayed toward me. This issue, in my mind, is a simple one.

We have elected to the Presidency a new leader. He is going to have a program that he thinks will be in the interest of and for the benefit of the American people.

I think he demonstrated on yesterday that we are neither in good shape domestically or in the foreign field. He wants to do something about that to improve our situation in the United States of America and in the world.

Now, they speak about these five bills. The Democratic leaders of the Senate and the House met with the President of the United States this morning. He is going to send 10 or 12 messages to the House of Representatives in the next few weeks that he thinks are vital to the welfare, the prosperity, and the well-being of our country. The House of Representatives is elected every 2 years, and after the legislative committees hold hearings, after executive session, when every "i" is dotted and every "t" is crossed, and when the chairman comes to the Committee on Rules—and I do not say Rules Committee, because that is not the proper designation; it is the Committee on Rules—comes to the leadership of the House and wants a rule after all of that consideration, I think that the Committee on Rules should grant that rule whether its membership is for the bill or not. I think this House should be allowed on great measures to work its will, and it cannot work its will if the Committee on Rules is so constituted as not to allow the House to pass on those things.

Now, I have a letter here that if I were easily insulted, it would do rather so to me. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the great Committee on Rules, sent out a letter, and in that letter he used the words "stack" and "pack" four times. The gentleman from Virginia, nor any other Member of this House, can accuse me of ever packing any committee for or against anything. It is a reflection on the majority leader. It is a reflection on our great

committee on committees on the Democratic side of the House. And, talk about packing. Away back in 1933 we had a tremendous contest in this House. One side won. They put up a man for membership on the Committee on Rules; our side put up their man, and we at that time packed the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that I was a member of the committee on committees, and my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, is the only Democratic Member in my 33 years that was elected by the committee on committees to the Committee on Rules when he was not recommended by the then Speaker and the majority leader. He was the choice of those of us who were defeated. Might I also say that this is a procedural matter; entirely a procedural matter. The former Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], is paired in favor of it. He recognizes the justice of it. Might I also say to my Republican friends, the other night on television my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], said he was very happy to have the Republicans on our side, not he on your side but the Republicans on his side. This is only a fair proposition and one that should be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for his splendid contribution.

And then in 1939, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] came to me and said he very much desired to go on the Committee on Rules. I told him I thought it was a mistake for him to go on the Committee on Rules, for various reasons. But he insisted and then we packed the committee with Mr. COLMER.

But a strange thing is in this House today. The Democrats have eight Members on the Committee on Rules who have served there, some of them, a long time, six of them—and I do not think they are long-haired radicals, either, who want to destroy the country—six of the eight are supporting this resolution today to add three Members to the Committee on Rules. To me that is very significant. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] says that he is not going to report anything that violates his conscience and then winds up his talk on the floor by saying you have nothing to fear from the action of the Committee on Rules.

Let us move this program. Let us be sure that we can move it. And the only way that we can be sure that this program will move when great committees report bills, the only way it can move, in my opinion, my beloved colleagues, is to adopt this resolution today.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in the current session of Congress, as in all sessions, there are many issues and problems facing us. The first of these issues we meet head on today.

If these issues, of which this is one, are not determined along the lines of orderly processes, then there is reason

to fear that we may have passed the zenith of our national life, and that the United States of America might deteriorate and decline as did the Roman Empire centuries ago. I sometimes think that Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" should be required reading for all Members of Congress.

Truly, the decade of the 1960's might well be described as the decade of decisions. It is a decade which may well confront our people, our National and State leaders alike, with problems of decisions of vastly greater significance than even the decisions of a century ago.

This is neither the time nor the place for dogmatism or exhortation. I intend neither of these.

Rather, I earnestly and briefly wish to express some personal convictions concerning this particular question.

I believe that the sole issue here is whether the House of Representatives shall operate on established rules or change the rules whenever it appeals.

This particular issue is one which we as Members of a legislative body understand. It is one which is sometimes difficult for individuals not conversant with parliamentary procedures to fully appreciate.

Efforts have been made to confuse this issue by saying that the Rules Committee as presently constituted has both the power and the desire to block the legislative program recommended by President Kennedy.

This is not the case.

Efforts have also been made to say that bills conforming to the five points described by the President as his principal legislative program for this year were blocked, bottled up, or pigeonholed in the Rules Committee during the 86th Congress.

This is simply not so.

The chairman of the Rules Committee has given his word to both the President and the Speaker that every single announced portion of the President's program would be cleared for action without delay. He is a man who has never broken his word.

It might be remembered and emphasized here that the Rules Committee, under House rules, not only has the power to grant rules, but that it also determines what kind of rule is granted. For example, it can grant open rules or closed rules. In the former instance, the House is permitted to work its will by amendments, both substantive and technical. Under a closed rule, amendments can be either restricted or prohibited entirely. The Rules Committee, as presently constituted, has been more inclined to grant open rules which is clearly the more democratic method. This I would like to see continued. I believe all persons who believe in free legislative debate and deliberation prefer this method.

In my home State, but not confined to that State, some of the editorial comments and editorials, and cartoons have presented an unrealistic and distorted picture of what this issue has been all about. In fact, some have gone so far as to completely reverse the true roles of the opposing sides of this controversy. Some have either been ignorant or for-

getful of their history, because those who have read and studied know, and know well, that in 1910 the Democrats and liberal Republicans revolted against the then Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, a Republican from Illinois, to keep him from completely dominating the House Rules Committee. The rules which are now in effect were the direct result of the revolt against Speaker Cannon and his tyrannical power over the House.

As presently constituted, the Rules Committee could not block or unduly delay legislation even if it wanted to. There are at least four distinct ways, under House rules, by which the House can act on, and work its will on, legislation, notwithstanding the action of the Rules Committee:

First. Every Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. One Member of the House can demand this procedure, and on Calendar Wednesday, the roll of committees is called in alphabetical order of committees, and as each committee is called, it can call up any bill it desires.

Second. The House can suspend its own rules and frequently does. On alternate Mondays—the first and third Mondays of each month, and at any time during the last 7 legislative days of each session, it is in order for the Speaker to recognize a Member for the purpose of moving to suspend the rules and pass a given piece of legislation. It is probable that more legislation is passed in this manner than after the granting of a rule by the Rules Committee.

Third. Any piece of legislation which a majority of the Members of the House really want can be brought up by means of a discharge petition signed by a bare majority of the Members of the House.

Fourth. The Speaker can call up any Senate passed bill he shall desire without referring it to either a legislative committee or to the Committee on Rules, provided certain conditions exist.

So, if anyone tells you or attempts to tell you that the Rules Committee can block legislation that a majority of the Members of the House really want, then let us be charitable and say that they are simply mistaken or that they have not read the rulebook.

The Rules Committee has operated without major changes for 51 years. Twice, that I know of, the House has hastily changed the rules affecting the orderly processes of the House, and each time at the very opening of the next Congress, the rules have been restored to their present form.

I believe that the best interests of our Nation are served by those established, orderly processes. The Rules Committee in the House, and rule XXII in the Senate are the last bulwarks and safeguards we have against tyrannical and punitive legislation, and I believe that both should be defended against frontal assault, flanking attacks, and any other efforts to destroy them.

For these and other reasons, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against House Resolution 127. It has, for some time now, seemed to me that there has been an unfortunate aspect to the public discussion of this proposal in the form of misguided or de-

liberate misinformation on the need to expand the Rules Committee of the House by three members. Consequently, I want to be on record as saying that if it were true—as it has been many times stated both here and in the news media—that the Rules Committee could block consideration of key legislation by the full membership of this House, then I would vote for this measure without hesitancy. Such control on the part of a small committee is basically repugnant to me as a citizen, and inherently at odds with the concept of representative government. But each of you in this House knows that if the majority of Members desire to consider any legislation, that we have the distinct parliamentary methods to accomplish such consideration on the floor of this House—Rules Committee or no Rules Committee. All of you who were here in the last session of this House can remember that we used the Calendar Wednesday provision of the rules to bypass the Rules Committee to bring to this floor for debate and to vote on the depressed areas bill. We used the discharge petition to bypass the Rules Committee and bring to this floor the Federal pay raise bill. And, time and again, we used suspension of the rules—through a two-thirds majority—to bring bills on the floor of this House, bypassing the Rules Committee.

At the present time, the Democratic majority have a 2 to 1 majority on the Rules Committee, that is, eight Democrats and four Republicans. The Speaker's proposal would pack this committee giving the Democrats a majority of five. However, in fairness, I point out that proportionate representation would only entitle the Democrats to a majority of 3 on a 15-man committee. Also, in fairness, I ask if the assignment of a proportionate number of Republicans would mean that the new administration's program would be jeopardized? To believe that it would is to take, in my view, an unjust position. It was the recently reappointed Republican member, Representative CARROLL REECE, who just last session supported the Federal aid for school construction bill in the committee, and whose vote insured the bill's success to the floor from the committee. Was that obstructionism? We are members of the minority party in this session, but we are a responsible party. The heart of this issue is not the threat that key legislation would be blocked in the Rules Committee—because no such threat exists. It is not the arbitrary size of the committee, though in all fairness Republicans should receive proportionate representation. At the very center of the discussion is the inability and unwillingness of the majority to cope with its membership which stems from the philosophical chaos which cleaves the controlling group. Again, I say if the majority has tough sledding, it is a problem for the majority themselves to solve. The disruption of orderly procedure and precedent cannot possibly be regarded by historians of the future as a substitute for the leadership which is so clearly needed now.

Finally, if this measure should pass, there is the present danger and threat that it will be possible for the newly composed committee to report any gag or closed rule desired which would prevent Members from offering amendments to a bill or otherwise work their will upon it. Surely no one will deny that the Democratic majority has a problem within its own ranks. Then I say, the solution to such a problem lies within their own ranks. If they should decide within their ranks to purge and replace one or more of their own Members who now sit on the Rules Committee, that would be their business. It is a remedy they have immediately at hand, and they could use it promptly. Frankly, it seems strange to me that Republicans should be criticized for the disorganization of the Democratic Party. I vote against this measure now, and if it passes, I believe we will witness a stunning blow against the cornerstone of representative government. Thank you.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a single issue before the House today. It is the issue of power—power to push the program of the new administration through the House with a minimum of effective resistance and with a maximum of speed and conformity to the wishes of the executive branch.

Otherwise the assurances which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has given, combined with the normal parliamentary devices available to the majority, would be sufficient.

Obviously this does not satisfy those who call for adoption of this resolution. Their concern is not to keep on the legislative brakes but to loosen them up, if not remove them. This has as much as been stated in the debate by proponents of this resolution.

Some days ago the arch-liberal columnist, Doris Fleeson, commented that the then President-elect has "all but promised to use his Presidential powers to the utmost." Miss Fleeson added the amazing observation, without any indication of regret, that "recent history suggests that the Presidential powers are subject to very little practical interference by the courts or Congress."

What is here proposed today is to reduce still further this already "very little practical interference" by Congress.

I oppose such action as I will continue to oppose those items in the President's program which I believe contrary to the best interests of our Nation.

I might add that after listening to the President's recitation on yesterday of the very numerous and, in many instances in my judgment very unwise, proposals, which he contemplates sending to Congress, it becomes more imperative than ever that we preserve such checks and restraints on pressure tactics exercised both by the executive branch and by powerful minority groups as we now possess.

Let no one be mistaken about it. If this resolution passes, it will be only the beginning of the pressure tactics.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the House votes on today pre-

sents such an elementary proposition for democratizing the procedure of the House that one wonders how it is possible for any Member to oppose it.

Power corrupts—

Said Lord Acton—

and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

From time to time when the ebb and flow of control in the House is moved from one power center to another, and where control became too autocratic, the House has taken action to remedy the situation. In 1910 too much control was centered in the Speaker and on March 19 of that year, the Democratic Party and a group of insurgent Republicans broke the iron grip within which the Speaker held the House through his membership on and domination over a five-man Committee on Rules.

At that time in a very prescient speech, Mr. Underwood, of Alabama, declared that those who favored the resolution then pending to expand the size of the Rules Committee from 5 to 15 members were not making their fight on personalities, just as today we do not make our fight on personalities.

We are fighting a system—

Said Mr. Underwood—

and that system is the system which enables the Speaker by the power vested in him to thwart and overthrow the will of the majority membership of this house.

Mr. Underwood continued:

If this resolution goes through, ultimately, if not today, the Speaker of the House of Representatives will cease to be its leader and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, elected by this House, will become the leader of the majority party in the House. It does not deprive this House of one scintilla of the power to control its business. It does not deprive it of the right of leadership, but it divorces from the Speaker the leadership of the House.

Today, too, Mr. Speaker, we fight a system which has deposited too much power in the Committee on Rules, power which prevents the House from working its will on many occasions. Over the years, this committee has frustrated the will of the majority by refusing to grant rules on major legislation or by insisting that bills pending before it be amended in substantial respects as conditions to the granting of a rule. These are privileges which were never given nor intended to be given to the committee, for the Committee on Rules is supposed to be a traffic artery, not a dead end street.

Passage of this resolution will not destroy the function of the Rules Committee. Rather, it will only temper in measure the power that the committee now possesses. Freedom to appraise and to voice approval or disapproval of legislation still remains in the committee even with passage of this resolution. The membership of the House will still be in a position to receive and give due weight to the opinions of the members of the Committee on Rules.

By this resolution the responsibility for passing upon legislation will be transferred to the body where it rightfully belongs, namely in the membership of

the House. If a major legislative committee of the House after serious consideration has passed a bill, certainly it deserves to be heard by the membership of the House—not necessarily passed, Mr. Speaker, but a chance to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion throughout the country supports the resolution. The Chicago Sun-Times in its very perceptive editorial of January 29, 1961, entitled "Let the House Vote," points out that although it supported Republican candidates for President, U.S. Senator, and a number of Republican candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives, it believes that the Republican leadership in the House is doing the wrong thing in opposing this resolution.

The 20 or so Republicans who are expected to be with RAYBURN on the vote Tuesday—

It says—

are showing commendable nonpartisanship on a matter of principle * * * all the Members of the House and not just the members of the Rules Committee should be entitled to vote on controversial matters. This is the democratic way of government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times, dated January 29, 1961, entitled "Let the House Vote":

This newspaper supported the Republican candidates for President and U.S. Senator from Illinois as well as a number of Republican candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives. We believe, nevertheless, that the Republican leadership in the House is doing the wrong thing in opposing Speaker RAYBURN's proposal to break the hold that six Congressmen have over all legislation. The 20 or so Republicans who are expected to be with RAYBURN on the vote Tuesday are showing commendable nonpartisanship on a matter of principle.

The six Congressmen are two southern Democrats and four Republicans who, by coalition, control the Rules Committee. They can prevent any piece of legislation from coming to the floor through the normal processes for debate and a vote by all House Members.

The purpose of the Rules Committee should be to introduce order in the scheduling of bills for House debate, not to block legislation. It should decide when, not whether, the House should be permitted to vote on a matter as the Senate majority and minority policy committees do.

Although the Kennedy administration is concerned about its own program being bottled up by the Rules Committee, the committee has, in the past, used its power against the Eisenhower administration, too. And last summer it defied the clearly expressed will of both the Senate and the House when it refused to send to conference an education bill passed by both Houses.

There are only two ways the committee can be circumvented. Legislation can be brought to the floor by a petition signed by half (219) of the House Members. This is a long and tedious process and many Representatives, wishing to dodge taking any stand on controversial matters, won't sign up. Any legislation can be brought up on Wednesdays if it can be squeezed in, but any bill so called up must be disposed of that day. Highly controversial legislation should not be railroaded through in 1 day, even if the votes are there to do it.

Speaker RAYBURN proposes that the membership of the Rules Committee be increased from 12 to 15. The present 3-to-2 ratio of Democrats to Republicans would be retained.

But the southern Democrat-Republican coalition would become ineffective. It should be noted, however, that it still could be effective on the House floor.

Much of the opposition to RAYBURN's plan comes from those who oppose President Kennedy's spending plans. We are against reckless and unwarranted spending, too, but we believe the responsibility for voting such proposals up or down rests with the elected Representatives of all the States, not with the Rules Committee.

At his press conference last week, President Kennedy said that speaking only as "an interested citizen" that he hoped a "small group of men" would not prevent the Members of Congress from letting their judgments be shown. We agree. All the Members of the House and not just the members of the Rules Committee should be entitled to vote on controversial matters. This is the democratic way of government.

While we expect to oppose some of the Kennedy legislation, nevertheless we believe it should have a fair hearing in the Halls of Congress. We hope that when and if it does, there will be enough sufficiently conservative congressmen, Democratic or Republican, to prevent reckless or costly legislation from passing. We are against filibusters in the Senate obstructing the process of government and we are against the Rules Committee in the House doing the same.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution increasing the size of the Rules Committee to 15 members. No more important issue or decision has faced this House in several decades or will face this House this year or for many years to come. On this vote hinges not the power or prestige of individuals or groups comprising this body, but rather the answer to the question of whether the majority will shall rule in this House in considering legislation which will determine the future course of national and world events in these critical times insofar as this House is able to shape them.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that 2 years ago I urged that the membership of the Rules Committee be increased to 15. The outcome of the current debate then would never have been in doubt because of the huge liberal majority make-up of this House at the time. The decision against my proposal was made, but the tragic consequences could not have been foreseen at that time. No one knew then that reasonable men of good faith from the other side of the aisle, interested mainly in the orderly process of Government and legislation in the House, would be replaced by others, motivated largely by partisan, political objectives and their own self-interests. No one knew then that certain members of the majority would splinter off and take counsel only with themselves, regardless of the views of their own leadership and the majority of their colleagues. No one knew then that the forces of reaction of both parties would join together in an unholy alliance dedicated to thwarting the will of the majority of the Members of this House and the Nation itself. If nothing else, this debate has forced into the open for all to see the fact that a coalition does exist between southern conservative Democrats and the minority Republican Party. Despite all their protestations, the leaders of these two groups can no longer smugly deny that they are and have been

working hand in hand to thwart the leadership of the House and deny to the majority of the Members the opportunity to participate in full and open floor debate.

This coalition is now fighting to maintain its stranglehold, the key to which is its domination of the Rules Committee. Deprive them of that and the coalition will split asunder when the debate is free and the record open for all to read and the votes recorded for posterity. Then the Republican leadership cannot with tongue in cheek chide the Democratic majority for its inability to produce legislation despite its 2-to-1 majority on the Rules Committee. Our Republican tormentors fail to point out that even in the present Rules Committee, 75 percent of the Democratic members vote for needed legislation, while not one of the Republicans join with them. If the Republicans have any confidence in their position or point of view, we could expect that at least one of them would join the six Democrats to bring these bills to the floor for no other reason than to give the conservatives a chance to vote them down.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this coalition wield such incredible power that they, through their control of the Rules Committee, are even able to deny the House and Senate the right to adjust differences in legislation previously approved by the majorities of both Houses. Now we do know what we are up against and now we must act to overcome the obstacles lying in the path of progress and orderly procedure.

Many argue, Mr. Speaker, that by increasing the size of the Rules Committee to 15 we are undoing the good of the past. Many years ago the Rules Committee was liberalized, as it is termed, by limiting the powers of the Speaker, who up to then literally dictated the committee's activities. We are not now attempting to return to those days. We simply seek to place the Rules Committee in a proper context with relation to the whole House.

The Rules Committee never was intended to be a super, all-seeing, all-knowing independent overseer of the House of Representatives. It is not for the Rules Committee to decide what the House shall consider, but rather the order and the conditions in which it shall consider the legislative proposals favorably reported to the House by the various legislative committees. While the committee may be the traffic coordinator of the House, assuring the orderly procedure of this body, it is not and was never intended to be the arresting officer, judge and jury of legislation. That is the function and duty of the legislative committees. It is for the Rules Committee to simply establish orderly rules of procedure under which these proposals can be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the good people who elected me to this House did so with the feeling that I would be an equal Member of this body with my colleagues chosen by others. My constituents did not cast a free ballot for the office of U.S. Representative to Congress to have the functions of that office limited by one or two or even six other Members. They under-

stand that in a body as large as this the majority shall govern and the policy of that majority shall be established in caucus and put forward in the form of legislation by the leadership chosen by the majority. It is difficult to explain to them how 2 members of the majority can desert the majority's program, join with 4 members of the minority and among them determine the course of action of 431 other Members of this House. This situation makes me and all the other Members of this great body conditional Congressmen, limited in our actions to those proposals agreeable not to the majority, but to the small group comprising the leadership of the coalition. Does their judgment supersede the cumulative judgment of the legislative committees? Do they have some inherent right not afforded the other 431 Members to determine the course of legislation and in that way the Nation's future in these troubled times?

It would appear that they at least think so. Who else would have the audacity and arrogance to even suggest that in exchange for our agreeing to the status quo they would permit us to consider five pieces of legislation said to be the cornerstone of the new administration's domestic program? This offer was an insult to the House and its Members. The fact that it was a bona fide and sincere attempt only heightens the frightening picture of two men telling a nation that they will permit five bills to pass if they can reserve their right to kill off any others that do not meet with their approval.

Mr. Speaker, in the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am chairman, we consider hundreds of individual navigation projects affecting the well-being of many communities and areas throughout the country. We consider the projects that come before us carefully and approve those with adequate cost benefit ratios. No question of party loyalty is raised, no political considerations are made. These projects are considered solely on their merits. I raise this point, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that this is all I ask of the Rules Committee. To permit us, the Members of the House, the right to consider on their merits the various legislative proposals hammered out of legislative committees after what is often days and even weeks of hard work and lengthy consideration. Is this too much to expect? Obviously, to the present membership of the Rules Committee it is. They have forsaken the fundamental basic tenet of our Republic—the will of the majority shall prevail. They have flaunted principles and precepts which we hold dear. They have ignored the needs of the Nation and taken unto themselves powers never delegated to them. Such a situation cannot be tolerated any longer. The membership of the Rules Committee must be increased so as to convert it into an instrument of responsible party leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to you the heartfelt best wishes and thanks of all of us concerned with the problem confronting us this afternoon. Your leadership has been an inspiration to us all.

History will record your valiant efforts. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the enlargement of the Rules Committee is the clear and present danger that I see of disruption of the democratic legislative procedure.

I concede the right of the leadership to recommend the addition of members to the committee, and the correctness of a 2-to-1 majority so that the majority party can control the programing of legislation. That is their responsibility and duty. But I do oppose and protest the intent at this time of liberalizing the committee to become expressly a rubberstamp of the administration's program. The procedures of the House are now adequate to consider and adopt any legislation desired by the House. It seems to me that the time to change the rules is only when the Rules Committee is derelict, if such a time comes. Certainly, no change of the legislative procedure should be made because of administration pressure. This destroys the separation of executive and legislative.

The great danger is the zeal of the liberals who can and will change the ground rules of debate, through the closed or gag rule, waiving of points of order, and prevention of amendment. Limiting debate and amendment is disrupting orderly democratic legislative procedure. Such a move is hardly a credit to the Democratic leadership at this time or to the so-called liberals. Indeed, throttling debate is a radical move. So by my vote against the resolution I am opposing the change of the ground rules of debate.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution to enlarge the Committee on Rules. My reasons can be briefly and simply stated.

First, the Committee on Rules should be the agent, not the master of the House. Second, I value and will fight for my right to debate and to vote for or against measures on the floor of the House. The country has a right to expect the same.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this body will vote to uphold your position and that of President Kennedy in the matter of the Committee on Rules. I do not believe that a majority of the House of Representatives will agree that any single committee should have the power to halt the legislative process indefinitely—that any single committee should be able to determine the substantive merit of legislation in all fields.

The Committee on Rules should have a function similar to the traffic policeman at the intersection. It should regulate the flow of legislative traffic to the floor of the House, but should not be in the position of creating bottlenecks where none existed before.

Mr. Speaker, there may once have been a good reason to transfer much of the power of leadership to this committee. It seems obvious that any such reason is long out of date. It is time for a change—and this House has never shirked its duty to change its rules and procedures when the time was right. The real mark of genius in our political

system, as I have said before, has been its flexibility in meeting new circumstances and situations. The House of Representatives holds a unique position in this system. I am sure it will now adapt itself to overcome what amounts to a thwarting of majority rule, so that we, the representatives of the American people, will have an opportunity to enact President Kennedy's vital program.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many arguments both for and against the move to enlarge the House Committee on Rules and I am sure that if there was more time I would hear many, many more arguments on both sides of the question.

The principal argument that I have heard, both here on the floor and in the corridors and have read and reread in the press in support of the plan to broaden the committee is that without such a move the program about to be submitted by President Kennedy would suffer. It is charged that the Committee on Rules would block the five-point Kennedy legislative program. It is further charged that the committee stands in the way of progress in this country.

All of these arguments are specious, Mr. Speaker. They grow out of an emotion-charged atmosphere, not as the result of calm reasoning and reflection.

The hard facts are these: First, the Rules Committee, though potent, is not all powerful. Second, the Rules Committee, though hesitant to endorse some liberal legislation has, nevertheless, permitted every major bill requested by the leadership to come to the floor for action. Third, the Rules Committee through its able chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has assured the House, and I have a letter to that effect from the distinguished gentleman, that none of the Kennedy legislative program billed as "must" legislation would be blocked during the 87th Congress.

I need not undertake here a discussion of the methods of getting legislation to the floor. It need only be said that they are numerous and that the majority of the Members of this House controls its destiny, not the members of the Rules Committee.

I would like to clarify the situation as regards the major bills which the committee is alleged to have killed or hindered. During the 86th Congress the Rules Committee approved rules for such measures as the civil rights bill (H.R. 8601), aid to depressed areas (H.R. 5722), school construction bill (H.R. 10128), a bill granting aid to the aging (H.R. 12580), the minimum wage bill (H.R. 12677), and a number of omnibus housing bills, among them H.R. 12603.

What, I ask, can the Kennedy program possibly contain that would go beyond this broad sweep of legislation?

It is noteworthy that all of these bills obtained a rule and were considered by the House.

Can the leadership ask for anything more? Will they get anything more through packing this committee?

Mr. Speaker, the action we take here today will be far reaching, indeed. We are not here acting for today alone; we

are acting to bind ourselves for 2 years and are setting a precedent which may guide the Congress for many succeeding sessions.

I cannot help but think that to pack the Rules Committee now is not only wrong, but is dangerous.

For these reasons, I cannot go along with this resolution and must, in good conscience and to keep faith with my country and my constituents, vote no.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to increase the membership of the House Committee on Rules.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the committee, mentioned in his own remarks today, I have been among those who have led the vanguard in bringing about a more realistic formula for moving legislation through this House. I need not apologize for the fact that I have felt the present structure of the committee has on past occasions frustrated the ability of the House of Representatives to work its will.

While I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Rules and his colleagues feel completely justified in the past actions of this committee, I for one have found it extremely difficult to accept the doctrine that the will of 437 Members of Congress can be frustrated by 6 men.

Every day we here in Congress hear great speeches about democracy representing the will of the people. It is inconceivable to me that we can on the one hand proclaim to the American people that we as a nation have found strength in the representative form of government, but on the other hand, we see the very dynamics of our representative government being thwarted consistently by a handful of men on the Committee on Rules.

I respect the chairman of this committee for his honesty and sincerity, but I could not sit idly by and fail to raise my single voice in protest when I see the fibers of democracy are being weakened through the will of an infinitesimal minority of this body.

The real issue here today is not whether the Rules Committee has done a good job or a bad job. The issue here today is whether every Member of this Congress, both Democrat and Republican, shall be given an opportunity to cast his vote on proposals to help our Nation; or whether this opportunity shall be relegated to the limbo of the Rules Committee files.

I am sure that our action today is not being directed at any single person on the Rules Committee, but rather we are today fighting for a principle which involves the very survival of representative government. Democracy cannot long endure when the will of the people can be frustrated by a handful of individuals. I sincerely hope this resolution will be adopted so that the House of Representatives can indeed work its will as proclaimed in our Constitution. If the Founding Fathers had intended for a super board of individuals to control the workings of this Congress, I am sure they would have so provided in the Constitution.

I earnestly hope that this resolution to enlarge the committee will be adopted here today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today is crystal clear. We are to decide two basic matters: First, whether or not the House is going to condone the present intolerable situation which gives six men, elected by a small handful of the people of this Nation, the sole right to judge which legislation is to be considered on the House floor by Members elected by Americans from every part of the country; and, second, whether the Democratic leadership of the House will be under the direction of our beloved Speaker, duly elected both in the Democratic caucus and by the House itself on the day this Congress convened, or whether the coalition party led by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is to take over the control of the legislative process in the House of Representatives.

Many of our friends from the other side of the aisle have argued that there is no such thing as the Republican-southern Democratic coalition—that it is merely a coincidence of voting alignments on issues such as area redevelopment, housing and urban redevelopment, minimum wages, aid to education, and similar measures, on which most Republicans and many southern Democrats share ideological convictions.

I have in the past disputed this argument in remarks on the floor, documenting the historical background and development of the coalition over the past generation. However, it seems to me that the acid test of the existing nature of the coalition in this Congress will take place today. Today we vote on a procedural matter of the rules of procedure of the House. While we all realize that in one sense we are, in effect, deciding whether or not we will have the opportunity to debate and vote on the important legislation to be reported by legislative committees in the coming 2 years, we are really voting on a question of procedure. Should the vote on this resolution produce a clear-cut coalition voting alignment, it will prove to the American people once and for all time the actual existence of the Republican-southern Democratic coalition. In such a case the coalition will take on all the aspects of a new political party with a negative outlook reflecting as its objective the obstruction the legitimate legislative processes of the House.

This is not a partisan matter. My Republican friends genuinely concerned as I am over the needs and problems of our Nation which require legislative action during the 87th Congress must surely realize that once they take the first steps down the road of obstructionism and irresponsibility now being counseled by the opponents of this resolution, they will henceforth be entrapped and labeled as part of the negative coalition.

Like you, my constituents sent me to Congress to consider proposals recommended by the President and duly acted on by legislative committees and to cast my vote for or against them when

brought to the floor of the House, according to my best judgment as to what is in the best interests of my district and the Nation as a whole. I am proud of this responsibility with which they have entrusted me and in due time I will give an accounting of my stewardship to the voters of my district.

I resent the implication, often expressed by the opponents of this resolution, that somehow I must be protected from political embarrassment by the six big brothers on the Rules Committee in the exercise of this right to vote on legislation reported by legislative committees. Such an implication is insulting to the chairman of every committee and to every other Member of the House who serves on a legislative committee. If we are not to be trusted in our deliberations, we are not deserving of membership in this august body. I reject completely the suggested proposition that somehow those selected to serve on the Committee on Rules are superior beings endowed with greater wisdom or supernatural powers to decide what is best for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hold that it is not unreasonable to expect that the Members of this Congress should have the right and opportunity to debate and vote on the legislative proposals recommended by the Kennedy administration after they have been considered, modified, and reported by legislative committees. Only by the adoption of this resolution can we be sure that we will have this opportunity.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the motion to increase the number of members on the Rules Committee of this House. Those who argue in support of the measure make emotional appeals to democracy, fair play, and the like, but underneath it is nothing but a cynical political grab.

There is a lot of talk about the power of the Rules Committee. Of course it has a lot of power—it could not do its job if it did not. But if a majority of this House believes the committee has too much power, that majority can do something about it by changing the rules governing the committee. If the Congress of the United States cannot control its own committees, then Heaven help us.

But those who support the move to pack the committee do not wish to curtail its power. Rather, if they were to be successful, my money would be bet that they will increase its power if they can do so. What they really want to do is to capture full use of this power for themselves.

If the supporters of this motion held a true majority in this Congress, they would have every right to hold a majority in this, and in every other committee in this House. But the fact that there is no certainty how the vote will go, despite the tremendous pressures that have been brought to bear by the administration and by the Speaker himself, is ample evidence that they do not hold a majority. If every Member here could vote his true personal conviction, free from administrative pressure and fear

of retribution, this motion would be emphatically defeated.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States carefully provided for three branches of the Federal Government, each with its own job to do and a sufficient degree of autonomy to do it. We, the Members of this Congress, are charged with a high responsibility, and not the least part of this responsibility is to keep inviolate the right of this and future Congresses to administer its internal affairs and to do its assigned job without unwarranted interference from the other branches of the Government. If we succumb to this bald effort by the present administration to dictate how we are to operate, we not only will have failed in our duty, but will have set a precedent for knuckling under to administration pressure that may lead to final reduction of Congress to a condition of servitude to administration masters.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recognize this question of membership on the Rules Committee as an extremely important one.

It is vital to the independent work of this Congress.

At issue, it seems to me, are two questions; one of precedent and the other whether or not the administration's program and the program of the loyal opposition will both have a full and fair consideration before this House.

Mr. Speaker, the party of my choice presents a moderate but adequate program for America. In the last campaign, Mr. Nixon received 49.7 percent of the vote cast for President while running on the Republican platform compared to the 49.8 percent received by the winner running on the platform adopted in Los Angeles. Then there are hundreds of thousands of people, as we know, who did not vote for either candidate.

These figures indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the loyal opposition has a mandate, too. It is a mandate to use every honorable means to assure ourselves and the country that our program, as reflected in the platform adopted in Chicago by the Republican Party, be given a chance for a full and fair hearing in this House and an opportunity to be voted on by its Members.

This program is a moderate approach but it is a constructive and realistic one and one which, as Mr. Nixon stated many times during the campaign, is an excellent base from which to start to build for a better America.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that according to published reports at least and endorsed by certain public statements made recently that this administration is veering toward this center position or what I would call a more moderate approach.

With this in mind, it seems to me we should ask the ranking members of the Rules Committee and those who represent the so-called liberal wing on the Rules Committee these questions: First, will the programs of both parties be given a chance to be heard and considered in the committee? Second, when these bills are voted out, will the committee grant rules that will allow full and adequate discussion and amendments so

that the Members of the House will be given their right to vote on amendments to the proposed bills after a full and fair discussion of the issues and the problems?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the packing of the Rules Committee has some extremely serious implications which may not be apparent at first blush.

The public has been bombarded with the propaganda that the present Rules Committee bottles up so-called progressive, leftwing legislation. So it is proposed that we pack the Rules Committee with leftwingers to break the bottleneck and open the spending floodgates. Has anyone stopped to think what this new, leftwing Rules Committee will do with some so-called conservative, constructive legislation?

There is an omnibus bill now pending before the Congress which contains 17 provisions to tighten the internal security laws of this nation, to correct some of the asinine decisions of the Supreme Court which have wrecked our security program. When this bill reaches this new stacked Rules Committee, it will not have a Chinaman's chance of getting to the floor. It will make the present Rules Committee under the chairmanship of Judge SMITH smell like a rose by comparison.

There is another more serious evil in this committee-packing business. Once you set the precedent and people realize it can be done, what's going to happen to some other committees?

All of us are aware of the movement afoot to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Since the American people at the crossroads are behind this committee, there is no chance of getting rid of it, but you can destroy its effectiveness by packing it with a few Roosevelts and Cellers. Let these liberals get their foot in the door by packing this Rules Committee and then just watch them move against the Committee on Un-American Activities and possibly two or three others that they do not like.

It is dangerous business. We are playing with fire.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the new year opened with the word "purge" in the air. Even those who planned the deed used the word. But the word struck the public ear with a note which grated against the moral sensitivity of the people. The tone sounded somehow of purification, pasteurization, cleaning of the unclean. Synonyms came to mind—exile, banishment. The people rebelled against the concept of elimination of opposition by physical expulsion. A new concept was proposed which some artist of semantics first called numerical adjustment. And which some realist later called packing.

But purging sounds only a little worse than packing, and the process itself is only a little less subtle. Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. In terms of consequences, purging and packing are equal to the same thing and therefore are equal to each other.

What are those consequences? In their sum total, they amount to usurpation of the independent autonomy of one

of the great committees of the House of Representatives. The Rules Committee would become the mere emanuensis of the majority leadership. As such, the majority leadership and not the Rules Committee would have the power to dictate the content and character of each rule regulating debate on each piece of legislation reported for floor consideration. The majority leadership and not the committee would have the power to decide how much time would be allowed for debate, how the time would be divided between the majority and the minority, whether or not amendments would be in order and whether or not points of order would be waived. In the hands of the committee, these powers are diffused among the membership of both parties on the committee and subject to a majority vote of that membership. In the hands of the majority leadership, these powers would be concentrated and consolidated in a small, partisan group and subject perhaps to the will of one member of that group.

From this consequence, further consequences entail. If one committee of the House can be packed and its autonomy usurped, every committee of the House can be packed and its autonomy usurped. This would mean the virtual obliteration of the committee system and the internal system of checks and balances of which it is a part, without which the organizational and functional democracy of the House of Representatives would perish.

The great battle for the votes is about over. The last threat has been made and the last inducement has been offered. Now comes one final appeal. If the resolution does not pass, we are told, America's prestige abroad will suffer. Artfully, the inference is left that an affirmative vote is the only patriotic vote. When America's stature is truly at stake, this appeal is legitimate; otherwise, it is wholly spurious. The spurious appeal always comes only as an afterthought—only after a complete bankruptcy of valid justification. Does anyone really believe that America's stature, her prestige, her world image is at stake on this vote? If so, I can think of nothing which would better enhance that image than a negative vote which would dramatize the determination of the elected Representatives of the people to remain the master of their own house.

Just as I oppose elimination of opposition by physical expulsion, just as I oppose usurpation of the power of the many and consolidation of power in the hands of the few, just so—for the same reasons and to the same degree—do I oppose this numerical adjustment as a transparent effort to pack and thus to destroy the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a few short minutes we in this historic legislative body will face a momentous test.

It is momentous because this vote may well determine whether America starts to move forward again.

It is a momentous vote because, psychologically, it will be a vote of confidence in a new administration now

attempting to solve tremendous problems facing our country. Many words of praise have been uttered about the great ability of men who have been selected to serve in the administration. The words are hollow mockery indeed if they are denied by a vote today.

This will be a momentous vote because it will be the test of the good faith of the opposition. It is the duty of the loyal opposition, where it believes it necessary, to oppose openly and straightforwardly. It is the opposite of duty, for the opposition to block and obstruct by clandestine means.

This vote will be a test of our fundamental belief in the process of representative democracy. It will test whether we want to avoid the responsibilities placed on us by the American people by delegating our responsibilities to six of our colleagues.

There may be better ways than the present proposal to assume our responsibilities but in the nature of things this will be the only opportunity we have to do our duty.

Finally this vote will be a test of loyalty. Not merely loyalty to our party but loyalty to that symbol of the greatest of our party, the man we have chosen to be our legislative leader in every Congress since 1940, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is probably the most democratic legislative body in the world. It is revered as a temple of responsive government, a symbol of our freedoms. I know that every one of us is proud and honored to be a Member.

But like all human creations, the structure of this House is marred by some flaws. One of the most serious of these, it seems to me, is displayed in every session of Congress by the operation of the Committee on Rules. Surely it is an incredible situation when, in a body supposedly devoted to responsible and equitable majority rule, 6 men have the power to decide in which direction 435 shall move. Surely it is even more incredible that these men, who are not even the duly elected leaders of their respective parties, hold such dictatorial power as to prevent the consideration by this House of important and often vital legislation. Surely we hold our trusts lightly when we permit these men to thwart, disregard, ignore, or mangle measures we know the country wants us to consider.

Mr. Speaker, our committees are generally composed of experienced and knowledgeable men and women from both parties and from all sections of the country. Many of them are experts in their fields. They often devote months to the study of specific legislation in those fields. The bills they report are usually, and justifiably, treated with respect by this House.

Yet how often have we been witness to the spectacle of measures so conceived throttled by the capricious will of half the Committee on Rules? How often have committee chairmen been ordered to modify in line with the biases of the Rules Committee, measures their committees have reported, on penalty of

having the bills completely withheld from floor consideration? We are all familiar with numerous incidents of this kind. They make a mockery of democratic procedure.

This is an old complaint, Mr. Speaker. Many Members of this body will recall that something was done about it in the 81st Congress. In 1949 the House adopted a significant curb on the Rules Committee's powers, the 21-day rule. Under this procedure the Rules Committee retained its traffic powers over the business of the House. It even retained some of the ability to delay which it had so long enjoyed. But it lost the almost absolute power to deny to the House the right to deal with measures considered important by the majority.

The 2 years during which the House operated under that rule were happily productive ones. Legislation which had long been desired by the country but frustrated by the Rules Committee was finally brought to the floor. Not all measures were passed, but at least they were considered in open debate. I am not one of those who believe that the House must be protected from declaring its position on important issues, especially when that protection is exercised by men over whose actions there is virtually no control.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. Both great political parties have a stake in democratic procedure. Every section, faction, and interest in this body should have the right to express its views in open debate on all the pressing problems that confront the American people. As the President has said: "Shouldn't the Members of the House themselves and not merely those members of the Rules Committee have a chance to vote on the measures?" By adopting the pending proposal to enlarge the membership of the committee, we will approach more closely the ideal of this House as a responsive and responsible instrument of democratic government.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 127, providing that the Committee on Rules shall be increased to 15 members.

The U.S. Congress is not a political body but is a branch of the Federal Government, composed of representatives of all the American people. Its proper functions are not merely partisan or political but reach much farther than that to the objectives set forth in the Constitution itself, among them, the promotion of the general welfare of all Americans. Well recognizing these things, our great President, as such, has rightly and publicly stated that he would not undertake to influence the decision on the proposed rules change and made it clear that he considered the rules of procedure a matter entirely for the membership of the House of Representatives to decide. Furthermore, a legislative representative from the White House visited my office last week and personally stated to me in emphatic terms that the President was not entering this controversy. In the face of these facts, it has been represented in my district that the pending resolution is a Kennedy proposal and is necessary to his program.

The proposition of changing and liberalizing the rules of the House has been banded back and forth for many years, certainly more than 4 years because it was a subject of frequent mention when I first came to the House in 1957. Many speeches have been made from time to time on the floor of the House advocating a variety of changes in the rules, most of them constituting pleas for rules changes that would make it easier to pass any sort of bill that might be offered. I say this by way of pointing up the highly significant fact that the move to change the rules is not the brain child of our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, and was not originally initiated by him. I can say this because every Member of the House knows that if the idea had been his in the beginning, and he had thought it a good one, it would have been brought up for consideration by the House a long time ago. It should be noted, too, that the proposal was conceived and set in motion long before our great President was nominated and even before he became a candidate.

The campaign to stack the Rules Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives by increasing the membership from 12 to 15, as it was conducted in my district, was misleading and well calculated to prove embarrassing and humiliating to me as an individual, as a Democrat, and as a Member of Congress. The issue was put before the people of my district on the basis of loyalty to Speaker RAYBURN, to President Kennedy, and to the Democratic Party, and my friends were led to believe that my stand against stacking the Rules Committee amounted to disloyalty to one or the other of them. It was further represented to my people that President Kennedy's legislative program depended upon the adoption of this resolution to change the House rules. Upon this basis, and this alone, hundreds of the good people of my district were encouraged to call, write, or wire urging me to be loyal to the Democratic Party or to Mr. RAYBURN. But this is not a political issue in any sense of the term and I strongly deny that my position on the rules question constitutes disloyalty to my party, its leadership, or to the Speaker.

I yield to no one in my genuine respect and esteem for our beloved Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN; nor do I yield to anyone in my record of loyalty to and active support of the Democratic Party, having supported every Democratic nominee on the ticket throughout my voting life, without a single exception, and having contributed heavily in time, money, and effort to promote Democratic success. I actively supported Mr. Kennedy in the 1960 campaign, just as I have supported every Democrat on the ticket, from President to constable, since 1928 when Al Smith was our candidate. I have held and worked at every menial job in the Democratic organization of my county, precinct registrar, judge, marker, and have served on the transportation and absentee committees. I have served as secretary of the county executive committee, and for the past 25 years have served as treasurer and county chairman

of the Democratic Party. It is unthinkable, therefore, that I should now be a party to preventing House consideration of a Democratic program, or in any other way disloyal to the party for which I have worked these many years.

I cannot believe those who were responsible for representing the rules proposal as a partisan political issue involving party loyalty really anticipated the enormous injustice it would bring upon our congressional delegation. But the effect is no less damaging than if the misrepresentation had been intentional. Whether designed or not, I repeat, it has been embarrassing and humiliating to me as an individual, as a Democrat, and as a Member of Congress; all the more so because the implications and inferences cast were false and unjustly reflect upon my personal integrity and my loyalty to the Democratic Party.

It is unfair to us who oppose the rules change to solicit our support on the basis of party line loyalty or loyalty to Speaker RAYBURN, because it is not a partisan question. Democratic sponsors of the "stacking" resolution, together with Democratic leaders in the House, have appealed to Republicans for support because both Democrats and Republicans are bound by any change in the House Rules. The sponsors say to the Republicans: "This is nonpartisan," but to Democrats and their constituents they say: "Your Congressman is not loyal to the Democratic Party; call, write, or wire him to support Mr. RAYBURN." It is a nationwide campaign, and is directed in large part against the South. It is often referred to here as "the purge of the South."

Aside from all these considerations, and by way of getting right down to "brass tacks" about this matter, what is to be gained by changing the House rules? What will be lost if they are not changed? These are the questions that practical people want answered. The answer is that nothing will be gained if they are changed and nothing will be lost if the present rules are retained. The sponsors of the change allege that they want to get floor action on legislation for Federal aid to education, depressed areas, medical care for the aged, minimum wages, and public housing. Congressman HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, a southern gentleman in every sense of the term, and chairman of the House Rules Committee, has specifically agreed to give prompt consideration to all of this high-priority legislation and to bring it to the floor for prompt action by the House. This agreement on the part of Judge SMITH covers every piece of legislation that the sponsors of the rules change say they are afraid the Rules Committee will "bottle up." Furthermore, the sponsors of the change agree that Judge SMITH's word is his bond and that he will do exactly as he has promised. Yet, it is still insisted that the rules be changed. Why? Having been conceded everything they have publicly said they wanted, why do the sponsors still insist on stacking the committee? The answer is twofold and too obvious to question: First, a favorite pastime in Washington is to slap the South on every possible occasion. Sec-

ond, some ultraliberal Members of Congress expect to offer some bills which have not been mentioned. I predict with reason that a series of bills will be offered during this session of Congress which will reveal the real reasons behind this move to nullify the influence of southerners now on the Rules Committee.

It would be absurd and ridiculous for a single committee to have power to indefinitely stall congressional action on bills, but this has been widely reported as true. Contrary to these reports, the Rules Committee has not in the past and cannot now "bottle up" and prevent floor action on bills. The most it can do under present rules is to temporarily delay action on a bill, not longer than 7 legislative days. The present rules provide three separate and specific ways to get floor action on any bill. First, if the Rules Committee fails to report a rule on a bill within 7 legislative days, the House by simple majority vote can force a rule and thus bring it out for floor action. Second, if the Speaker desires to do so, he can recognize any Member to bring up a bill under suspension of the rules. Third, on any Wednesday, the chairman of any committee may call up for a vote any bill previously reported by his committee.

The proposal to change the House rules was not initiated by the Speaker, President Kennedy, or by the Democratic leadership. It was originated by a small group of ultraliberals who are always in the forefront in pressing for more and more extreme legislation and for taking authority away from our States and centralizing power in Washington. In a nutshell, that is what the rules fight is about. As I understand their thinking, our people are opposed to these things.

I agree entirely that the Kennedy legislative program, as announced by him many times during the campaign, should be brought up for prompt consideration by the House. Accordingly, I have talked personally with Judge SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, about the rules controversy. He has stated to me personally, as well as on the floor of the House, that his committee would interpose no obstacle whatever to action upon the President's legislative program. He has even gone further than that and offered to support a change in the rules to deprive his committee of jurisdiction to prevent bills from becoming tied up in conference.

In addition to Judge SMITH's agreement to give prompt action on the legislation comprising the Kennedy program, a number of other fair and effective proposals have been offered by our southern group. Congressman COOLEY, dean of the North Carolina delegation, suggested that the Speaker be made an ex-officio member of the Rules Committee so that he would always be able to vote and break any deadlock in the committee. It was also proposed, in the event of a tie vote in the Rules Committee, that the House membership take a vote on bringing bills to the floor, thus assuring that the majority would always prevail. Thus, it is seen that our southern members have offered to assure prompt floor consideration and action on President

Kennedy's program. But all of these proposals have been turned down and we who hold the southern viewpoint have been challenged to a winner-take-all showdown. It is regrettable, indeed, that the South is thus being denied any consideration whatever in a matter of serious nationwide concern. This is not the way to promote either party harmony or national interests. The best legislation, like the best human relations, has always resulted from reasonable and honorable compromise.

It is plain, therefore, that President Kennedy's announced program, the proposed legislation that he stressed and to which he gave priority during the campaign, will be promptly brought to the House for its consideration. If this were not true I would unhesitatingly vote to change the rules. But since the Kennedy program is assured of consideration under present rules, I must oppose any change. One of the reasons why I cannot conscientiously vote to change the rules is this: It is generally known here that a small minority group of northern leftwing Democrats expect to offer some extreme legislation that, in our opinion, would be harmful to the country, and particularly to the South. This is not a part of the program outlined by Mr. Kennedy during his campaign, and no Democrat in Congress is in any way obligated to it. On the contrary, I believe our people expect me to oppose extreme legislation that goes far beyond any that our great President has proposed.

In conclusion, I would like to express my regret that it has been considered necessary to the passage of this resolution to resort to outright threats of reprisal in various forms against many of us who conscientiously oppose the rules change as a matter of principle. To threaten to penalize a congressional district for a Member's opposition to the pending proposal is a serious matter, indeed, and raises a question in the minds of our people as to whether Federal funds will be used on the basis of need and public benefit or as a whiplash upon those who oppose it and a reward to those who support it.

For my stand on this question, I have been personally threatened with defeat in the next primary election. In all kindness, and with no animosity, I am compelled by conscience and honor to say that if the price of my continued membership in Congress is support of a proposal which is not necessary to the end it purports to serve, and which I do not believe is good for my district, for our country, or for the Democratic Party, the price is too high; or if in order to hold this high office I must learn to be frightened and to flee in political terror from what I conceive to be my duty, that price, also, is too high. Therefore, I vote my convictions on this issue.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the current proposal of some in the Congress and outside to increase the membership of the House Rules Committee has been presented to the American public in many forms and in some ways that do not always accurately reflect the facts involved, many of us think.

The public has been led to believe that the Rules Committee is composed of a majority of conservatives, or at least moderates, who have time and time again defeated the will of a majority of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Such representation by any person or any news medium is totally inaccurate.

The Rules Committee has been erroneously blamed in the past 4 years for the fact that on several occasions the two branches of Congress have not been able to agree on different versions of legislation. This, of course, is a misrepresentation of the facts. The truth is that the conferees of the House and the Senate were unable to agree on the different versions of the same type of legislation that had been passed by the two branches of Congress. The Rules Committee has been publicly blamed from time to time even for the fact that legislative committees did not report out favorably the exact type of legislation some people wanted. And, while it may appear facetious, it has even been claimed that some Presidential vetoes of bills might not have occurred if the Rules Committee had looked with more favor on such legislation.

Now, as somebody or something has to be blamed for everything, it becomes very obvious that the Rules Committee has been selected to be the "whipping boy" even for those Members of Congress who are seeking an excuse for not being able to do or to get all their people call on them for.

A simple majority of House Members—or 219—can bring any bill or resolution from any committee—the Committee on Rules or otherwise—when they so desire. This procedure of the House of Representatives is known as the discharge petition. Any Member can offer a discharge petition any time he or she desires. Those who propose the packing of the Rules Committee know this and they know, too, that the discharge petition has been used repeatedly for this purpose.

Serious questions in the minds of some Members seem to be: Shall we increase the membership of the Rules Committee this year, 1961, by adding Members who are committed to a certain political philosophy to insure that we have on every vote on any matter before the Rules Committee more liberals than moderates or conservatives? What will the situation be in 1963, 1965, and in the years to come?

Moderates at times have been known to take liberal or even conservative positions. Even liberals sometimes turn conservative, or vice versa. Shall we increase or decrease the membership of the Rules Committee or any standing committee from time to time to meet what appears to be purely political expediency? America needs stability and balance in Washington today and it cannot be obtained in this manner. Such a radical departure will establish an unwise and a dangerous precedent.

To me there is even a deeper principle involved. Every student of our U.S. Constitution knows, and every person who has read our Constitution understands, its provisions with respect to

the required complete independence of, and separation of, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

If the executive branch of the Federal Government can this year, or at any time in the future, through any Member or group of Members, increase the historical membership of committees of the Congress on the alleged theory that action on legislation desired by the executive will be quicker, then we will have destroyed the whole constitutional concept of the separation of powers in our Government.

When I stand—as I have done in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on several occasions, and as late as January 3, 1961—and hold up my hand to Almighty God, in the presence of my fellow countrymen, and solemnly swear to support, maintain, and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, I intend—now and in the future—to do just that.

I cannot escape the conclusion that some of our fine friends who are advocating this change, and who are the proponents of this proposal, are being led unwittingly to undermine constitutional government itself.

In conclusion, I can unequivocally state that if any committee of the House, Rules or otherwise, could thwart or defeat the will of a majority of the membership of the House of Representatives to consider any legislation, then I would be willing to pack, cut, or even abolish this committee. I believe that legislative proposals of our new administration should win committee and congressional approval on their merit.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I told the Congress my position on the proposed expansion of the Rules Committee. My comments can be found on page 1441 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30, 1961.

I was willing to support the expansion of the Rules Committee under circumstances which would have guaranteed that opposition to the Kennedy program would not be silenced on the floor of the House of Representatives by "gag rules" issued from the Rules Committee. Although many advocates of Rules Committee expansion have discussed this matter with me, none of them have been willing to give such firm assurance. It would appear that the real purpose of this expansion of members on the Rules Committee is to drive the Kennedy program through the House without perfecting or modifying amendments and without deliberate debate. I suspect that advocates of fantastic new Federal empires have suddenly realized that the people really do not favor such programs.

The advocates of expansion of the Rules Committee had a weak case to begin with, but I was willing to go along with them and to be entirely fair in eliminating what can only be characterized as a minor impediment to the Kennedy program. I now find that extremists have taken command of negotiations. The most important objective of these extremists is clearly to use the Rules Committee to gag everyone who

opposes any aspect of the Kennedy program. Their demands are dangerous; their guise is false. I unequivocally reject their unreasonable demands, and accordingly I have no choice but to cast my vote against expansion of the Rules Committee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker—

If 50 men did all the work
And gave the price to 5,
And let those 5 make all the rules
You'd say the 50 men were fools
Unfit to be alive.

In quoting Charlotte Gilman, I do not suggest to the Members of this body that we are not fit to be alive, but I do suggest that our folly matches that of the foolish 50.

Through trial and error our predecessors from the 1st Congress through the 86th have developed a wondrously effective system to enable 437 men to deal with the more than 10,000 legislative measures which are introduced in the House of Representatives during almost every session of Congress. It makes sense for a body of 437 men to charge a committee of 38 men to report to the body its recommendations on all proposed legislation dealing with the armed services. It makes good sense for a body of 437 men to charge a committee of 31 men to report to the body its recommendations on all proposed legislation dealing with Banking and Currency. The Members ordinarily seek election to the committees with jurisdiction of a field in which they are most qualified and most interested. And in this body more than a few of the Members are nationally and internationally recognized experts in the fields of the committees and subcommittees on which they serve. After the committee has heard the testimony of those who favor and those who oppose the legislation, after the committee has weighed the merits of the legislation and reported its recommendation to the full body, then the Members of the full body have the evidence they need to be able to discuss the issues intelligently on the floor and decide whether enactment of the legislation would be in the best interest of the Nation and the people who elected them.

The committee system is the only way this great legislative body could accomplish its work and I say the committee system makes good sense. But does it make good sense to give to just 6 men out of this body of 437 the power to prevent every one of the bills recommended by the other 19 standing committees from reaching the floor? Does it make good sense to require a committee of experts to tear the heart out of a legislative proposal, framed only after days or weeks of hearings and committee debate, as a condition for getting the proposal to the floor? Does it make good sense to give any group the power, after imposing its own amendments on a bill, to report it under a closed rule limiting further amendment? Of course it does not make sense. And it redounds to the great glory of this body that whenever any man or group of men has acquired this kind of stranglehold over its orderly parliamentary process, the Members, speaking with the voice of all the people who elected them, have put the legisla-

tive power back where it belongs, in the majority of the Representatives elected by the people.

Some may feel that to take any step now to curb this kind of power would be to part with tradition. I say to permit a small group to usurp the power entrusted by the Constitution and the people to the entire House of Representatives is immoral. To permit this usurpation to continue is to abdicate our constitutional role. But if tradition is important—I say that to fail to curb this kind of power is to part with tradition, not to follow it.

The Rules Committee does not play its present role as an instrument to thwart the majority by any long tradition. Nor does it have 12 members by any long tradition. For 90 years the Rules Committee functioned as a select committee, set up at the beginning of each Congress and authorized to report a system of rules. During this period it exercised no authority over the legislative program or the contents of legislation. So minor was its role, that no appointments were made to it in the 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th and 21st Congress. For many years in its early history it made no reports. It was not until 1880 that it became a standing committee with its membership fixed at five. Nor is the size of the committee sacrosanct. It was increased to 11 members in 1910, to 12 members in 1917, and to 14 members in 1935. Its present membership of 12, 8 representing the majority party and 4 the minority party, was not established until 1945.

Although the legislative powers of the Committee on Rules developed gradually over the years, if there is any function of the committee which can be said to be traditional, it is its function, as Hinds tells us—

as an efficient means of bringing up for consideration bills difficult to reach in the regular order (IV Hinds' Precedents, sec. 155).

There have been times, when, in exercising this function, the committee was given to an inordinate exercise of its power. One of the factors which made such committee excesses possible was the ex officio membership of the Speaker until 1910. In that year the House revolted, removed the Speaker from the committee and increased the committee membership to 11.

In 1924 the House had to take action to curb a penchant of the chairman of the Committee on Rules for holding in his pocket for weeks at a time resolutions which he had been authorized by the committee to report. It was also in 1924 that the discharge rule was amended to require just 150 signatures on discharge petitions. This number was raised to 218 in 1926, lowered to 145 in 1931, and again increased to 218 in 1935. So you see the Members of the House have at their disposal, and in the past have not hesitated to use, several techniques for increasing or decreasing the power of the Rules Committee, and for changing its role to better suit the needs of this great legislative body. The time has come again for the Members to reassert themselves, to take unto themselves and their committees the

power to determine that legislation reported upon favorably by committees will be debated upon the floor, not pigeonholed or pocket vetoed in the Rules Committee.

It was in 1937 that the Rules Committee first began to take away from the majority and assume for itself a role as the shaper of legislative policy, as the virtual final arbiter of what bills will reach the floor. During the last half dozen years it has become increasingly clear that the Members of the House have let a few men on the Rules Committee substitute their own personal and political prejudices for the good judgment of themselves and their committees. In so doing we have lost face in the eyes of the people as an effective and efficient legislative body. I say the time has come again for us to exercise our judgment as men, not marionettes. And to increase the membership of the Rules Committee is a time-honored, traditional way for us to regain our self-respect.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. I do so because I believe enlarging the membership of the House Rules Committee is a reasonable and moderate solution to a serious problem.

It is especially important that Republicans in the House of Representatives support this proposal. If a solid phalanx of Republicans vote against enlarging the committee, the Republican Party leaves itself open to the charge of obstructionism. We cannot permit a vigorous, strong, and needed Republican Party to play such a role. For too long we have borne the criticism for being responsible for the death of certain legislation, when the truth of the matter is the Democrats could well have enacted whatever they wanted with the majority they have in both Houses of Congress. For too long, although the Rules Committee may have been the stumbling block for action on certain legislation, the Democrats have been getting out from under for not delivering their promises by putting the blame on the Republicans. This is the public image, and it is time the picture is changed and that the Democrats accepted their own responsibility. The enactment of this resolution should afford no excuses in the future. What is more, it is vital that all Members of this House be given every opportunity to vote on legislation properly approved by its respective committees.

Each Congressman—Democrat and Republican alike—has a responsibility to act in the public interest. Getting legislation, controversial or otherwise, to the floor of the House is in the public interest and the resolution before us is a reasonable proposal to expedite legislation.

I have vigorously advocated the re-instituting of the 21-day rule to break the bottleneck of the Rules Committee. If the new lineup proposed by this resolution will accomplish the same objective, I am all for it. It seems to me every piece of legislation that has been duly reported by the respective committees of this House should have every oppor-

tunity to be voted on by the Representatives of the American people. Likewise, we can be denied the opportunity to vote on legislation already approved by either the House or the Senate where a change of content has been made by either body because this all-important committee determines to bury it. It is high time this kind of situation was corrected.

Mr. Speaker, the plan before us is a long step toward eventual realization of a sorely needed, long overdue, reform.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 212, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—217

Addabbo	Granahan	Nix
Addonizio	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alford	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Anfuso	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Hagen, Calif.	O'Konski
Aspinall	Halpern	Olsen
Ayres	Hansen	O'Neill
Bailey	Harding	Osmer
Baldwin	Harris	Patman
Baring	Hays	Perkins
Barrett	Healey	Peterson
Bass, N.H.	Hechler	Pfost
Bass, Tenn.	Holifield	Philbin
Bates	Holland	Pike
Blatnik	Holtzman	Plicher
Boggs	Hull	Poage
Boland	Ichord	Powell
Bolling	Ikard	Price
Bonner	Inouye	Pucinski
Brademas	Jennings	Rains
Breeding	Joelson	Randall
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Brooks, La.	Johnson, Md.	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers, Alaska
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Karsten	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Karth	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Rooney
Cahill	Kee	Roosevelt
Cannon	Kelly	Rostenkowski
Carey	Keogh	Rutherford
Casey	Kilday	Ryan
Celler	King, Calif.	St. Germain
Chelf	King, Utah	Santangelo
Clark	Kirwan	Saund
Coad	Kluczynski	Scranton
Cohelan	Kowalski	Seely-Brown
Conte	Lane	Shelley
Cook	Lankford	Sheppard
Corbett	Lesinski	Shipley
Corman	Libonati	Sibal
Curtis, Mo.	Lindsay	Sist
Daddario	Loser	Slack
Daniels	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Spence
Dawson	McFall	Staggers
Delaney	Macdonald	Steed
Dent	Machrowicz	Stratton
Denton	Mack	Stubblefield
Diggs	Madden	Sullivan
Dingell	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	Mahon	Thomas
Doyle	Marshall	Thompson, La.
Duiski	Mathias	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Morrow	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	Miller, Clem	Thornberry
Elliott	Miller,	Toll
Evins	George P.	Trimble
Fallon	Mills	Ullman
Farbstein	Moeller	Vanik
Fascell	Monagan	Vinson
Feighan	Montoya	Wallhauser
Finnegan	Moorhead, Pa.	Walter
Fino	Morgan	Watts
Flood	Morris	Wickersham
Fogarty	Morrison	Willis
Friedel	Morse	Wright
Fulton	Moss	Yates
Gallagher	Moulder	Young
Garmatz	Multer	Zablocki
Glaime	Murphy	Zelenko
Gilbert	Natcher	

NAYS—212

Abbott	Frazier	Moore
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Moorehead,
Adair	Garland	Ohio
Alexander	Gary	Mosher
Alger	Gathings	Mumma
Andersen,	Gavin	Murray
Minn.	Glenn	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Goodell	Norblad
Andrews	Goodling	Norrell
Arends	Grant	Nygaard
Ashbrook	Griffin	Ostertag
Ashmore	Gross	Passman
Auchincloss	Gubser	Pelly
Avery	Hagan, Ga.	Pillion
Baker	Haley	Pirnie
Barry	Hall	Poff
Battin	Halleck	Quie
Becker	Hardy	Ray
Beckworth	Harrison, Va.	Reece
Beermann	Harrison, Wyo.	Relfel
Belcher	Harsha	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Harvey, Ind.	Riehlman
Bennett, Fla.	Harvey, Mich.	Riley
Berry	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Betts	Hemphill	Robison
Blitch	Henderson	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Hiestand	Roudebush
Boykin	Hoeven	Roussot
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Bromwell	Hoffman, Mich.	Saylor
Broomfield	Horan	Schadeberg
Brown	Hosmer	Schenck
Broyhill	Huddleston	Scherer
Bruce	Jarman	Schneebeli
Burleson	Jensen	Schweiker
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen	Schwengel
Cederberg	Jonas	Scott
Chamberlain	Jones, Mo.	Selden
Chipfield	Judd	Short
Church	Kearns	Shriver
Clancy	Keith	Sikes
Collier	Kilburn	Siler
Colmer	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Cooley	King, N.Y.	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	Kitchin	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Knox	Springer
Curtin	Kornegay	Stafford
Curtis, Mass.	Kyl	Stephens
Dague	Laird	Taber
Davis,	Landrum	Taylor
James C.	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Davis, John W.	Latta	Thomson, Wis.
Derounian	Lennon	Tuck
Derwinski	Lipscomb	Tupper
Devine	McCulloch	Utt
Dole	McDonough	Van Pelt
Dominick	McIntire	Van Zandt
Dooley	McMillan	Weaver
Dern	McSweeney	Weiss
Dowdy	McVey	Westland
Downing	MacGregor	Whalley
Durno	Mailliard	Wharton
Ellsworth	Martin, Nebr.	Whitener
Everett	Mason	Whitten
Fenton	Matthews	Widnall
Findley	May	Williams
Fisher	Meador	Wilson, Calif.
Flynt	Michel	Wilson, Ind.
Ford	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Forrester	Milliken	Younger
Fountain	Minshall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—4

Bennett, Mich.	Rabaut	Tollefson
Martin, Mass.		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLS TO REPEAL THE FEDERAL TAX ON THE TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS AND ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced bills today to repeal the Federal tax on the transportation of persons and on communications.

I feel that the repeal of these taxes is long overdue. As we all know, they were enacted originally not so much for the revenues they would produce, but as a means of discouraging long distance telephone traffic and unnecessary travel during World War II when the telephone lines of the Nation were greatly overloaded and our railroads and other means of transportation were hard-pressed to take care of vital military travel.

These taxes are discriminatory in nature and certainly should be removed without further delay on the part of the Congress. The tax on the transportation of persons is one of the primary reasons for the decline in bus and railroad passenger traffic. The tax is a contributing factor to the great decline in our railroad passenger car fleet, which has dropped to one-half of the 1941-45 level. In case of great national emergency, the Nation's railroads would not have adequate passenger cars to meet our military requirements.

The Federal tax on communications is an unnecessary burden on our taxpayers. The American people were led to believe that it would be repealed shortly after the war, but, as we have learned from experience, there apparently is no such thing as a temporary tax.

THE B-70 WEAPON SYSTEM AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in his first state of the Union message, delivered before the Congress yesterday, President Kennedy made one thing clear: there is nothing on record to indicate that the Communist leaders of Soviet Russia and of Red China have abandoned their plans for world domination.

Undoubtedly, one way in which they aim to achieve that objective is by gaining control of space.

The strategic space race is, therefore, of utmost importance to us. As President Kennedy pointed out last fall and again in his state of the Union message, the United States cannot run second in this vital race. In his own words:

To insure peace and freedom, we must be first.

Further, in the light of recent world events, we must steer a steady course

toward increased military superiority in all relevant areas. For military superiority is the only thing which will act as an effective deterrent to Communist attack, and provide our Nation with a reasonably adequate measure of security.

I am taking the floor today to discuss some aspects of this vital issue—in particular, the potential role of the B-70 weapon system in enabling us to achieve, and maintain, military superiority.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, shortly after the adjournment of the last Congress, the Department of Defense announced that it had authorized the Department of the Air Force to proceed with a substantially augmented development program aimed toward the demonstration of the B-70 weapon system capability.

Prior to this announcement the Air Force had been proceeding on a program which involved the fabrication of two prototype air vehicles, known as the XB-70, and also work on a limited basis in connection with the bombing and navigation subsystems.

The new authorization provided the funding for an effort directed toward weapon system prototypes, known as the YB-70, as contrasted to the strictly experimental flight vehicles in the prior program.

Not long after this announcement, and while serving a tour of active duty with the Air Force, I had an opportunity to visit the North American Aviation plant, to view a mockup of the B-70 and to learn of the many revolutionary developments in aerodynamics and manufacturing techniques which have made this aircraft possible.

The B-70 is a new airplane which will operate higher and faster than any combat aircraft the world has ever known. It is expected to insure that the Air Force and the Strategic Air Command will have the proper military vehicle to carry out their combat responsibilities in the post-1965 time period.

Let me review the B-70's military capabilities.

The B-70 is an airplane designed to cruise at three times the speed of sound, roughly 2,100 miles per hour. At this speed it would have an unrefueled range of almost 7,000 miles. With aerial refueling from existing tankers, the range of the B-70 becomes appreciably greater.

The B-70 can carry the heaviest nuclear bombs built—or numbers of smaller ones; whereas in the present state of the art, the ICBM can carry but one warhead, and it is of relatively small yield when compared with what the bomber can carry. Furthermore, if nuclear weapons should be outlawed by agreement, a missile is an expensive one-way vehicle to deliver conventional explosives.

Unlike the missile, the B-70 is controlled by the human factor. The presence of the judgment of a man over the target permits the selection of the best bomb to do the job that must be done. For heavily emplaced targets, only such a manned bomber can carry the heavy

load and deliver it with the required accuracy to prevent any hiding place from being a plausible haven for aggressors.

But more than this, the B-70 will continue that time-for-decision capability which we have known under the shield of a manned bomber force. Manned aircraft can be launched on less than positive information of a possible enemy all-out attack. The situation can then be evaluated while the aircraft are en route, and a decision can be made to recall or attack.

It seems to me that we would place our President in an almost untenable position if we were to rely solely on a missile force. The most awesome decision of history would be the decision to push the button on our unrecalable missiles. And that decision is irrevocable.

It is only with the aircraft portion of our total forces that we give the President a chance to order a launch, and yet not carry out the actual attack should conditions change.

In addition to these capabilities, which demonstrate the flexibility which the B-70 is expected to give us, it has many more potentials.

Armed with the hypersonic Sky Bolt ballistic missile which will travel at roughly 3,500 miles per hour, the B-70 could launch that missile approximately 1,000 miles from the enemy target with a high degree of accuracy.

Armed with many long-range air-to-air rockets it could become a long-range interceptor—seeking out, detecting and destroying the enemy far from our very shores.

Armed with antisatellite weapons, it could become a moving platform from which to launch rockets against photographic or defense warning satellites.

By replacing its combat electronic equipment and some of its fuel compartment, it can be used as a mach 3 transport capable of airlifting people to any spot on the globe in 5 hours.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the international situation, we must continue to modernize our bomber forces, and the B-70 has been selected to replace the aging B-52's. In these critical times, we must give our friends and allies definite visual proof of the state of our combat readiness. The B-70 will provide that proof to both friend and foe alike.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress acted wisely in appropriating additional funds for the development of this weapon system. And I also believe that the executive branch should be complimented for releasing those funds to the Air Force, to permit the return of the B-70 to a complete weapon system development.

I feel that we must carefully monitor the development of this weapon system to insure that the most technically advanced airplane, for the time period in which it is needed, will be in fact produced. From the evidence which I have seen, it certainly appears that the B-70 will meet those requirements. I hope, therefore, that this program will continue to advance with all possible speed.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEDICATION OF NEW STATE DEPARTMENT BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include the proceedings and speeches at the dedication of the new State Department Building in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the fifth day of this month the new building of the Department of State here in the District of Columbia was dedicated in a very interesting and highly dignified manner.

I am pleased to include the following program distributed on this occasion together with the remarks of each of the distinguished speakers of the day:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE BUILDING DEDICATION CEREMONY PROGRAM, JANUARY 5, 1961

Concert.....	The U.S. Marine Band, Lt. Col. Albert Schoemper, conductor.
Presiding.....	The Honorable Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State.
Invocation.....	The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington.
Flag raising: "To the Color"— "National Anthem".....	The U.S. Marine Band.
Presentation of the Secretary of State.	The Honorable Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State.
Remarks.....	The Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State.
Benediction.....	The Right Reverend Angus Dun, Bishop of Washington.
Concert.....	The U.S. Marine Band.

PRAYER BY THE MOST REVEREND PATRICK A. O'BOYLE, ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, enlighten our minds today that Thy wisdom—with Thy

wisdom—that we may dedicate this building to the high and holy purpose for which it is erected.

We pray that we shall ever as a nation by the conduct in our national and international affairs show forth to the world these truths in which we believe: that government has a moral basis; that a universal moral law is the foundation of a society; that our legal order is subject to judgment by a law that is inherent in the nature of man; that the eternal reason of God is the ultimate origin of all law; that this is a nation under God.

We pray finally that all fellow countrymen may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law; that we may be preserved in strong union among ourselves and dedicated passionately to the preservation of peace and freedom everywhere throughout the world. These things we ask through Christ our Lord. Amen.

ADDRESS MADE BY LOY W. HENDERSON, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. Secretary, distinguished guests, this is an auspicious day for the Department of State. For the first time in many years its personnel is to be housed under one roof. It is true this this roof is rather extensive and that some of the corridors seem rather long. Nevertheless, the members of the Department are happy that they are finally able to work together in a single building. There is particular rejoicing on the part of those members of the Department who, scattered for years among some 20 subsidiary buildings, have at times felt themselves separated from the main stream of the Department's activity.

We are confident that in this building, equipped with the kind of facilities which a modern foreign office should possess, the Department can make and implement decisions much more rapidly and will in general perform more effectively.

We are also pleased that this building will house the International Cooperation Administration which is an integral part of the Department. Its new location should facilitate even closer cooperation between it and other areas of the Department.

We appreciate the friendliness which has prompted so many of our distinguished guests to join with us today in the dedication of our new building. Among them we see the diplomatic representatives of many countries; Members of Congress; a former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson; a future Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk; representatives of other executive agencies; representatives of the architects and contractors who have made this building a reality; and a number of distinguished citizens from private life.

Before presenting the Secretary of State I would like on behalf of the personnel of the Department and the Foreign Service to express our gratitude to a few of the many persons and firms to whom we are indebted for our new premises.

In the first place we wish to thank President Eisenhower who gave his support to the new building and who has shown a sustained and active interest in it. Without the energetic and effective backing of the late John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, and of Herbert Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State at the time the project for a new building was being launched, our new building would not be here. We are also deeply indebted to Mr. Dillon, who as Under Secretary, has been of great help to us. We are appreciative of the cooperation and of the suggestions received from the Budget Bureau.

Among the members of the Department to whom we are particularly grateful are the former Assistant Secretary of State, Zeke

Carpenter, and his Deputy for Operations, Tom Estes. Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Estes took the initiative in formulating the project. They carried most of the burden of gaining the support of other interested executive agencies of the Government and of the Congress. Mr. Estes has practically lived with the project since its inception some 5 years ago.

We are also deeply indebted to Mr. Floete and his associates in the General Services Administration, who have been responsible for the supervision of the construction and who have cooperated closely with us during the planning and building stages.

We wish to express our appreciation of the support given to us by the Congress in the carrying out of this project. We are particularly indebted to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees, Mr. JOHN ROONEY in the House and Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate. The sympathetic attitude with respect to our housing needs shown by these committees was to a large degree responsible for the decision of the Congress to give us the necessary appropriations.

Among those to whom our thanks are due are the architects who carried out the difficult task of designing an extension three times as large as the building to which it was to be affixed. They are Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, of Chicago; Harley, Ellington & Day, of Detroit; and A. R. Closs, of Washington. We are also appreciative of the work of the W. B. Ford Co., of Detroit, assisted by Mary Dunn, of New York, who designed the interiors of the new building.

It was, of course, upon the general contractor, John McShain, Inc., that the main burden of construction fell. We are grateful to this firm for bringing to completion a project so huge and so complicated.

We wish also to express our gratitude to Mr. David Findley and to other members of the Fine Arts Commission who have devoted much time and thought to this project and whose advice has been most helpful.

Mr. Secretary, the whole Department is grateful to you for the support which you have given this project from the moment that you became associated with us. I am happy to report to you that your instructions and those of your distinguished predecessor, John Foster Dulles, have been carried out and that our new building is now ready for dedication.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to present the Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian A. Herter.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF STATE HERTER INTRODUCTION

Distinguished guests and fellow members of the Department of State, we meet today to dedicate the new Department of State Building. We meet on the spot where many of us met 4 years ago in January 1957 when President Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles helped lay the cornerstone. They did so with the same trowel George Washington used when the cornerstone of the National Capitol was laid in 1793.

With these historic ties in mind at this moment of dedication, it is appropriate to have a look at the past before we turn to the prospects before us.

THE PAST

Most of us who have worked in or with the Department of State for the past 15 years have come to think of New State as a permanent home. But New State was in fact the 21st home of the Department. Our first home as the Department of Foreign Affairs was in a little wooden building 12 feet in width on South Sixth Street in Philadelphia

in 1781. The Department then consisted of the Secretary, four advisers and clerks. Since that time we have been moved from Philadelphia to Annapolis, to Trenton and then to Faunces Tavern in New York. From that building, in which Washington delivered his Farewell Address, the Department moved in the 1780's to two addresses on lower Broadway in New York. It was in the latter of these that the Department was located when its name was changed in September 1789 from the Department of Foreign Affairs to the Department of State.

The pattern of movement and growth continues from there: The Department moved back to Philadelphia, where it had six locations between 1790 and 1800 and where epidemics of yellow fever made it necessary to withdraw to the statehouse in Trenton during the summer and fall of 1797, 1798, and 1799.

From 1800 we have, as a Department, lived continuously in Washington. One of our next homes, directly west of the White House, suffered the indignity of being set afire by the British after the Battle of Bladensburg in 1814. Fortunately, the clerks of the Department, under orders from the Secretary, were wary enough to save the records of the Department—which then included the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence—by taking them first to a gristmill on the Virginia side of the Potomac 2 miles above Georgetown, and thence, when that location seemed unsafe, to Leesburg, Va.

While the burned building was being rebuilt, between 1814 and 1816, the Department occupied a house on G Street near 18th Street. In 1816 it moved back into the building west of the White House.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams supervised the Department's next move, which was into a fine new structure known as the Northeast Executive Building. This building, at 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, was the home of the Department from 1819 until 1866.

There followed an interim phase when we were—because of the difficulty of accommodation at the time—housed in one of the city asylums. I am gratified that our letters and memoranda no longer issue from an address of such ambiguous authority. In addition, the building was small and inadequate, and two fires there during the Department's occupancy nearly proved disastrous.

In 1875 the Department moved into another new building—the south wing of the State, War, and Navy Building, more recently known as the Old State Building, at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. Appropriations for this building—with its cantilevered stairways and intricately designed bronze balustrades—were spread over a period of 17 years. This fine edifice was to have been a permanent home for the Departments of State, War, and Navy. But what happened? We not only absorbed the whole of Old State—now the White House Executive Offices—but began to overflow into the several dozen annexes that have plagued our lives and delayed many conferences since the early part of this century.

In 1947 we began the final move into what was then known as the New War Building which, in its extended form, is the one we dedicate today.

These are the dry facts of our search for a physical center—of one location giving way to another. There has been much frustration, much lost effort and lost time. The wide progress that has been made in the formulation of foreign policy has been ground out against considerable disadvantages. Now, however, the Department of

State is a complete unit, with easy communication possible between all its parts. We can have no excuse for performance which is not first in its field.

THE PRESENT

This brings us to the present and to the critical question of performance in the field of foreign affairs. What are some of the issues we face?

I think we may find a clue to this question by examining some of the documents of foreign policy interest which were placed in a copper box in a niche of the cornerstone 4 years ago. These papers describe U.S. action in the development of a United Nations police force for troubled areas—at that time the Middle East. They concern the Soviets' suppression of national freedom—at that time the tragic case history of Hungary. They deal with matters of economic cooperation and technical assistance—ones on which we continue to focus as among the most significant aspects of foreign policy. They relate to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. In short, these activities—in the political, military, scientific, and economic fields—are some of the same ones that occupy our attention today regardless of whether the scene shifts to Cuba, the Congo, Laos, or Tibet.

We call these topics foreign affairs. But are they only this? Of course not. The manner in which decisions affecting them are made has become an integral part of our domestic and public life. The depth of our exposure to international events puts many hard questions to us. The future of our leadership in the world and the survival of free nations will be determined by the perceptiveness and vigor of our response.

PROSPECTS

We are in a new month, a new year, a new decade, and a new building. The cause of peace and the chance of consolidating orderly relations among free nations have become a more complicated affair than when Patrick Henry made those passionate appeals for liberty which so electrified the colonies in the 1770's. He spoke on several occasions in Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia, where the first effort was made to establish a Foreign Service. His words made us conscious of the degree to which the forces of freedom depend on the freedom of forceful expression.

Our words and our ability to perform are under severe scrutiny today. The possible alternative of Communist leadership in the less developed areas challenges all our diplomatic and technical skills. It especially challenges our capacity for determined, long-range action which will promote areas of political, economic, and social stability.

A look at the Foreign Service roll of honor reminds us of the sacrifices that have been made in the past in many corners and capitals of the world. We read of death by exhaustion, earthquake, and exposure; of death by fever, drowning, and hurricane as well as by gunfire and grenades. May our new building serve as a secure seedbed of ideas and actions that will meet the requirements of a swiftly moving age. We live close to many worlds of challenge and opportunity that lie beyond these doors. We look to the areas outside us not for conformity with our external political judgments but for a healthy diversity of opinion among peoples, countries, and institutions that are in the process of consolidating the precarious foundations of independence and self-respect. We face competition, and our response to it brings us to the critical question as to whether we live in a world where the best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.

My beliefs run contrary to these lines. Our best efforts will continue. They will carry conviction. The dedication of this building will, I know, provoke a rededication by the men and women of this Department to the ideals and actions of the great men who founded our Nation.

This dedication carries light for the future. It is the light of many minds working together. But more than that, it is the practical example of individual freedoms, national independence, and international cooperation.

PRAYER BY THE RIGHT REVEREND ANGUS DUN,
BISHOP OF WASHINGTON

May the Lord of Lords and King of Kings who was able to do exceedingly [and] abundantly above all that we ask or think, overrule for good all that is done in this place. May He grant to all who labor here, unswerving loyalty to the best hopes that have been granted this Nation, a just understanding of the aspirations and fears and needs of other peoples, quiet wisdom in times of stress, and courage in adversity.

May the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit rest upon you and all your work, now and forevermore. Amen.

IMPORTS OF MERCHANDISE BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill aimed at cutting redtape for small business concerns importing merchandise up to a value of \$400.

My bill is identical with H.R. 9240 passed by the House last year. The purpose is to increase to \$400 the present \$250 limit on the value of goods that may be imported by business firms or individuals under the informal entry procedure.

This bill does not affect the amount of duties collected on any items. It concerns only the procedures.

Section 498(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 originally provided a \$100 limit upon the value of merchandise permitted informal entry. This ceiling was increased to \$250 in 1953. I consider that the higher \$400 ceiling provided in my bill is justified by the price inflation that has occurred during the 8 years since the previous limit was authorized. Because of higher prices the shipments qualifying for informal entry are smaller than was contemplated at the time Congress established the present ceiling.

Under my bill the Secretary of the Treasury would retain the discretion, given to him in the Customs Simplification Act of 1953, to establish a lower ceiling for certain types of merchandise and transactions when circumstances warrant his doing so. This bill does not affect the amount of duties collected.

The Committee on Ways and Means last year received favorable reports on H.R. 9240 from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, and the

U.S. Tariff Commission made no objection. The committee's recommendation was unanimous. I am hopeful that the House will take favorable and early action on this subject during the present year because many small business firms, especially those dealing in comparatively inexpensive jewelry items, need this relief from complex and burdensome customs procedures.

THE LATE HONORABLE BENJAMIN F. JAMES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come to address this House this afternoon. My predecessor and your former colleague passed away Thursday of last week.

I had known Ben James for many years. When I first met him he was a commissioner in Radnor Township. I had the privilege of sitting next to him in two sessions of the Pennsylvania Legislature. I had the honor and the privilege to support him every time he was elected to this great and august body.

Ben James will be missed by his colleagues, by his friends and by the Republican Party of Delaware County. We in Delaware County always thought well of Ben's advice, of his fellowship, of his leadership, and of his fatherly help.

Ben was always on the liberal side voting in Harrisburg many times on such issues as to extend the Workmen's Compensation Act, unemployment insurance, provisions to take care of occupational diseases, and other liberal measures. Ben was one of the leaders in our delegation who worked to abolish the Philadelphia wage tax on nonresidents of that city.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in great humility, that I am able to succeed such a fine statesman and gentleman as my friend Ben James.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry when I read of the death of my dear friend, our late and beloved colleague, Ben James. Ben James was one of the finest men I have ever met. As the gentleman has so well said, he was a dedicated legislator but he had other qualities that were attractive. He was constructive, with a refreshing personality. He was a kindhearted gentleman. He was one who appealed not only to his colleagues in the House but to the people of his district and countless thousands of others.

In the death of Ben James I have lost a dear friend and the country has lost one who was truly a dedicated legislator.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness and great sorrow that we learned of the death of our former col-

league and friend, the Honorable Benjamin F. James.

Even though he had been ailing for a number of years the announcement of his death on last Thursday came as a shock to those of us who knew him best.

He was taken to Bryn Mawr Hospital, Philadelphia, on Saturday, January 21, for a series of tests. His condition became critical and he passed away on Thursday, January 27.

Mr. James was born in Philadelphia on August 1, 1885. He attended the public schools and furthered his education, extensively, in the graphic arts—serving continuously in this field.

Since 1910 he resided in Radnor Township, Delaware County, Pa.

In 1929 Ben was appointed a member of the Board of Commissioners of Radnor Township to fill a vacancy, and was reelected to two 4-year terms.

As a Republican, in 1938 he was elected to the House of Representatives in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and served for the next 8 years.

On November 2, 1948, he was elected to the 80th U.S. Congress as the Representative from the Seventh District of Pennsylvania. He continued in that capacity until he voluntarily retired at the end of the 85th Congress because of failing health. The Honorable WILLIAM MILLIKEN succeeded Mr. James in the 86th Congress.

Ben's history is replete with many fine and interesting accomplishments.

As a printer Ben was a great admirer of Benjamin Franklin, and he became the president of the Franklin Printing Co., founded in 1728 by Benjamin Franklin at Philadelphia. For a number of years and until his death he served as the chairman of the board of that company.

He was a past president of the Typothetae of Philadelphia, and of Printing Industries of Philadelphia, Inc.; past president of the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia; member of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution, Union League of Philadelphia, Lions Club of Wayne, Merion Cricket Club, Welsh Society of Philadelphia and the Masonic Fraternity. He was a veteran of World War I, and a charter member of Anthony Wayne Post No. 418, the American Legion.

During his service in the Congress Ben was a valued member of the Appropriations Committee, and served on the Subcommittees of Post Office and Civil Service, and General Government Matters.

As a member of the Subcommittee on General Government Matters his great experience and knowledge of the graphic arts was of great assistance to Maj. Gen. Thomas North, secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and his assistants, in advising them on the program of photographs—colored lithographs—of our World War II cemeteries and the individual graves of our veterans. His devotion to his duties on his other subcommittees was appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. James is survived by his widow Frieda, several brothers and sisters. To

them is extended the heartfelt sympathy of myself and family. I have lost a fine, personal friend.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Benjamin Franklin James the Pennsylvania delegation mourns the loss of one of its most distinguished former members while those of us who were privileged to be counted among the inner circle of his friends are made desolate by this sad event.

Ben James came to the Congress following a successful career in the printing business and 8 years of distinguished service in the State legislature. His success both in business and in politics reflected an integrity and dedication to duty of the highest order, and our colleague in all of his activities brought credit to the honored name he bore. As a former president of the Poor Richard Club he modeled his life after that of the great Franklin and as a descendant of patriotic Welsh stock he displayed the commendable qualities of that sturdy race.

I was privileged to be not only the close friend but also the confidant of our late colleague and the recital of his life's experiences, together with his sage counsel and advice, has made me a bit better able to meet the challenge of this congressional assignment. Ben James was a conservative in the best traditions of that dedicated group and it was his constant concern that America should avoid the pitfalls which dot the pathway of unbalanced budgets and deficit financing. As a member of our Appropriations Committee he earned the respect of his fellow committeemen of both the right and the left and it was his shrewd but kindly insistence that brought to light many facts resulting in benefit to the taxpayer. Generous to a fault with his own money he was downright parsimonious with public funds and he feared inflation as he did the plague.

Ben James was my good friend and I shall miss him greatly. But I shall always count myself richer for having known this stalwart citizen and distinguished public servant. Ben James was forthright in his spiritual concept and he recognized with most of us that this life's journey is but a fleeting experience in preparation for that larger role beyond the sunset where life truly begins and where he now waits in peace.

To Mrs. James, his brothers, and his sisters, goes our heartfelt sympathy together with the prayerful hope that they will find strength for this sad hour in his life of unselfish service.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our colleagues from Pennsylvania and my other colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our late and beloved friend, Benjamin F. James, of Pennsylvania. We came to the Congress at the same time and I was saddened, indeed when I learned of his passing.

It was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations where I learned to love and to respect him greatly. He was a great American. We shall all miss him. To the members of his beloved family, I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about my friend, Benjamin F. James. He was one of the people in the Congress whom we all respected for his integrity and for his quiet dependability. Ben was the type of person who always had the time to talk with you. He had a gentle, quiet laugh that made everyone of us attached to him. Now we hear of his passing and all of us in the Pennsylvania delegation are sad to hear of it. Ben James was one of the stalwarts in the House when he served as Congressman. You always knew where Ben stood when a matter of principle and conscience was involved on a particular vote or a particular resolution or a particular policy, there was never any doubt where Ben would go, and that was right down the line for that policy which he believed to be best for the American people in the long run, and for no temporary advantage or popular gain.

Ben James was always willing to stand up and vote and be counted. To his family and friends, I extend my sincere sympathy in their loss and express my deep gratitude for his friendship.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to that of my colleagues in noting with sorrow the decease of our esteemed former colleague, Benjamin F. James.

Ben James passed away last Thursday, ending a fruitful life of public service. His service in this great body for five terms which ended with the 85th Congress, followed many years of outstanding service as a member of the Pennsylvania General Assembly.

During his many years in public life, Ben James was known for his intimate knowledge of legislative affairs and his dedication to the welfare of his country and his district.

We shall all miss him greatly—the country has lost a great legislator and many of us have lost a good friend. Our sympathies go out to his bereaved widow, Frieda.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that we record the passing of our very good friend, Benjamin F. James, who served with us in the House for 10 years. It can be said that he was one of Pennsylvania's outstanding Representatives in the Congress.

Ben, as we all knew him, was a humble man who had a kindness of heart and the highest concept of citizenship.

He was always calm, gracious, and courteous, and he will be long remembered for his kind words and deeds.

He was a hard, conscientious worker. A man who was greatly admired and respected by all who knew him and by all who were associated with him.

In all things it can be said that Ben was a great citizen and a great American who very ably served his district, State, and Nation.

So it is with great sadness that we record his passing. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed sorry to learn of the untimely death of my very good friend and colleague, the Honorable Benjamin F. James, and wish to extend my deepest sympathies to his devoted wife.

Mr. James and I were close friends for many years and I prize very highly today the remembrance of this unspoken bond.

He was never too busy to lend a helping hand. He was a willing listener, a gentleman, a scholar, and a fine legislator.

The memory of his goodness will endure.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEART DISEASE AND CANCER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of this body, I am in deep accord with President Kennedy's quick and compassionate action in providing additional food to people both in the distressed areas of this country and abroad.

I respectfully suggest that this compassionate concern for our distressed people be immediately extended to the fight against mankind's most ancient and devastating foe—unchecked disease.

Mr. Speaker, last year heart disease killed 900,000 Americans. It is the leading cause of death in this country today, and it is rising in its incidence as we prolong life. The cold statistics tell us that 90 million Americans will die of this disease unless medical research produces new treatments and cures. Two-thirds of the members of this body will die from heart disease unless expanded medical research gives us some urgently needed answers.

At the present time, when our national revenues are being cut down by the stagnation of our economy, we can ill afford the tremendous losses in productivity exacted by heart disease. For example, more than 200,000 victims of heart disease last year were in the working age group from 25 to 64 years of age. If these 200,000 people in the prime of their lives had been able to live and work just 1 extra year, they would have earned over \$1 billion in 1960 alone.

Our second leading killer is cancer. Cancer today kills 260,000 Americans—twice as many as it killed a generation ago. Last year, cancer killed an American man, woman, or child every 2 minutes.

This merciless killer knows no restrictions or boundaries—it brings down the high and the mighty, as well as the average citizens who are the backbone of this democracy. In the past decade, it has killed a Secretary of State, a half dozen U.S. Senators, more than a score of Congressmen, several of our greatest atomic scientists, some of our greatest military leaders, and many more too numerous to list here.

Just 2 weeks ago, cancer killed Dr. Tom Dooley, aged 34, whose magnificent medical pioneering in the troubled country of Laos has been hailed on many an occasion on this very floor.

What price the life of Tom Dooley?

What price the lives of 2,000 of our children who die each year from leukemia, the most dreaded child killer of them all?

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is solemnly pledged to an all-out offensive against these diseases. Let me quote from "The Rights of Man," the 1960 platform of our party, adopted in Los Angeles in July of last year:

Heart disease and cancer together account for two out of every three deaths in this country. The Democratic President will summon to a White House conference the Nation's most distinguished scientists in these fields to map a coordinated long-range program for the prevention and control of these diseases.

On several occasions, President Kennedy has emphasized the need for long-range planning and financial support in mapping the ultimate conquest of these diseases. At Warm Springs, Ga., in October of 1960, he said:

We must provide long-term grants for increased medical research, including basic

research. What has already been accomplished in polio and tuberculosis shows what might soon be accomplished for cancer, mental illness, arteriosclerosis, and new ways of prolonging man's productive days instead of just prolonging his life. All of this and more is underway. But now we must do more—not only more money but longer commitments so that experiments can be planned and equipment bought.

A White House conference on heart disease and cancer will be a historic event, for no previous American President has ever called together the great medical scientists of our country to plan a long-range offensive against these diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I express the sentiments of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, when I respectfully urge the President and leader of our country to lose no time in calling together such a historic conference. I am confident that out of such a conference will come long-range plans leading to a massive attack upon these two diseases which have cursed the family of man since the beginning of recorded history.

U.S. GOLD PRODUCTION, GOLD RESERVES, AND THE MONEY SUPPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the closing weeks of last year I asked the Library of Congress to furnish me with some background information on U.S. gold production, our monetary gold reserves, movements of gold into and out of the United States, the various categories of claims against our monetary gold reserves, and an analysis of the manner in which changes in our gold reserves affect the Nation's money supply. The material I requested was pre-

pared by Mr. John C. Jackson in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library. I believe that my colleagues in this body will also find this information of considerable interest. In these remarks I will summarize Mr. Jackson's findings. I also include the tables prepared at my request as a part of my remarks:

U.S. GOLD PRODUCTION, 1950-60

Gold produced in the United States in the 11 years 1950-60 totaled 20.6 million ounces, equal to less than 4 percent of the 507.6 million ounces held by the Treasury at the end of December 1960. Annual production has diminished, although some upward fluctuations have occurred, since the first year of this selected sequence of years. Production in 1950 was 2.39 million ounces; in 1960 it was 1.66 million ounces.

While gold production in the United States has been declining, world production has been increasing, reaching new postwar peaks in each of the last 7 successive years.

The principal gold producing States are South Dakota, Utah, Alaska, California, and Arizona. Since 1950, South Dakota has produced around 550,000 or more ounces each year, except in 1951 and 1952. Alaska's production has diminished, particularly after 1955, by more than a third; Utah's production has been unstable, but diminishing; California's production in 1960 was only 30 percent of the 1950 level; Arizona's production generally has increased.

South Dakota's production is entirely from gold ore. Alaska's is almost entirely from gold ore. Utah produced gold principally from copper ore, and from copper-lead-zinc ores. California production is principally from gold ore, with some gold being taken also from silver, copper, and zinc-lead-copper ores. Arizona's production is principally from copper ores, and some from combination ores.

TABLE 1.—U.S. gold production, by State, annually, 1950-60

[In troy ounces]

	1960 (preliminary)	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950
Mine production of recoverable gold:											
Alaska.....	180,000	179,918	186,435	215,467	209,296	249,294	248,511	253,783	240,557	239,637	280,272
Arizona.....	145,600	124,627	142,979	152,449	146,110	127,616	114,809	112,824	112,355	116,093	118,313
California.....	122,200	146,141	185,385	170,885	193,816	251,737	237,886	234,591	258,176	339,732	412,118
Colorado.....	62,100	61,097	79,539	87,928	96,668	88,577	96,146	119,218	125,594	116,503	130,390
Idaho.....	5,660	10,479	15,896	12,301	9,210	10,572	13,245	7,630	32,997	45,064	79,652
Montana.....	52,490	28,551	26,003	32,766	38,121	28,123	23,660	24,768	24,161	30,502	51,764
Nevada.....	59,900	113,443	105,087	76,752	68,040	72,913	79,067	101,799	117,203	121,036	178,446
New Mexico.....	5,400	3,155	3,378	3,212	3,275	1,917	3,539	2,614	2,949	3,959	3,414
North Carolina.....		965	876	1,373	882	190	214				
Oregon.....		686	1,423	3,381	2,738	1,708	6,520	8,488	5,509	7,927	11,058
Pennsylvania.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(7)	1,610	1,317	1,134	1,500	1,500	2,179
South Dakota.....	550,500	577,730	570,830	568,130	568,523	529,865	541,445	534,987	482,534	458,101	597,996
Tennessee.....		99	124	172	189	221	218	293	241	108	100
Texas.....									39	82	49
Utah.....	340,000	239,517	307,824	378,438	416,031	441,206	403,401	483,430	435,507	432,216	457,551
Vermont.....				62	181	181	185	171	162	156	146
Washington.....		118,934	113,353	89,708	70,669	74,360	66,740	62,560	54,776	67,405	92,117
Wyoming.....			117	573	762	62	407	1	1	9	4
Undistributed.....	133,730										20
Total.....	1,657,580	1,603,802	1,739,249	1,793,597	1,827,159	1,880,142	1,837,310	1,958,293	1,893,261	1,980,663	2,394,231

¹ See Washington.

² See Vermont.

³ Georgia, 3 ounces; Maryland, 1 ounce.

⁴ Maryland, 20 ounces.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

CHANGES IN U.S. GOLD STOCK, 1950-60

The monetary gold stock of the Treasury supports gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks, is held as reserve against U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and includes a gold balance in the Treasurer's account.

The monetary gold stock was \$24.2 billion in June of 1950, and \$22.7 billion at the end of that year. The stock has decreased in seven of the subsequent years, and increased in three of the years. The gold balance in the Treasurer's account has diminished in all but two of the years. The Treasury gold

stock has diminished slightly under \$5 billion net since the end of 1950; a similar but slightly larger decrease has occurred since the end of 1957.

When a gold outflow has occurred, the United States has transferred the gold to foreign ownership, usually without physically removing it from the country. Some of the monetary stock has supplied gold for industrial uses. The United States has been a net importer of gold in each of the years selected, except 1950 and 1951. Earmarking of gold reflects both import and export activity, and changes in ownership.

TABLE 2.—Changes in U.S. gold stock, annually, 1950-60

(Millions of dollars)

End of year	Total Treasury stock	Liabilities ¹	Balance Treasurer's account	Change in stock	Net import or export (—)	Change in earmarked gold (increase (—))
1950	17,766.8	17,665.6	101.2	-1,689.3	(²) 302	(²) -1,324
1951	19,456.1	19,350.5	105.6	-1,078.0	260	-2,515
1952	20,534.1	20,138.2	395.8	-2,246.6	600	-1,332
1953	22,780.7	22,272.9	507.8	507.8	104	-319
1954	21,949.1	21,458.3	490.7	490.7	97	-132
1955	21,690.4	21,199.1	491.2	-21.9	16	-325
1956	21,712.3	21,223.5	488.8	-317.2	2	-1,171
1957	22,029.5	21,545.7	483.7	-1,156.7	684	-305
1958	23,186.2	22,178.9	1,007.3	493.7	-594	618
1959	22,695.5	21,662.6	1,032.9	-10.6	-371	-1,352
1960	22,706.1	21,653.5	1,052.6	-1,721.0		

¹ Comprises gold certificates held by public and in Federal Reserve banks; gold certificate credit held by Federal Reserve System in gold certificate fund and Federal Reserve note redemption funds; and \$156,000,000 against U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

² Unavailable.

Source: Treasury Department and Federal Reserve System.

CLAIMS AGAINST U.S. GOLD RESERVES

The principal claim against the Treasury's gold stock is the gold certificates issued to the Federal Reserve banks. The certificates constitute the reserves of the 12 district Federal Reserve banks. They impose a statutory limit on the liabilities of the banks. The liabilities are of two principal sorts: Federal Reserve notes—in denominations of \$5 and higher—and liabilities for the reserves held by the member banks at the district bank. These two sorts of liabilities together cannot total more than four times the gold certificates held. Currently, they are less than three times as much as the gold certificates; in 1950 they were twice the amount of the reserves. Required reserves increase in prosperity, and decrease in recession. Since the end of 1951 the Federal Reserve banks have needed to hold above \$11.5 billion each year.

While Federal Reserve liabilities are a claim on the gold stock, the banks cannot obtain gold according to the amount

of their liabilities, but must limit their liabilities according to the amount of gold certificates. Treasury purchases or sales of gold produce a corresponding change in the amount of gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks.

The only liabilities of banks in the United States, or of the Treasury, which can be paid in gold are liabilities to foreign governments and central banks, and to the International Monetary Fund. Short term liabilities to foreign official holders totaled \$3.6 billion at the end of 1950 and \$10.3 billion at the end of October 1960. Partly offsetting these liabilities are short-term claims on foreigners, which increased from \$898 million at the end of 1950 to \$3.3 billion at the end of October 1960.

Required reserves of \$11.6 billion, short-term liabilities of \$3.7 billion to international institutions, \$10.3 billion to foreign official holders, less \$3.3 billion of claims, totaling \$22.3 billion, exceeded the gold stock of \$18.4 billion in October 1960. The excess of claims, of

course, would be greater if nonofficial foreign holdings of dollar balances were added. When appraising the possibilities of excessive demands for gold, notice should be taken of the facts that, first, confidence in the dollar is sufficiently high that foreign holdings continue to grow; second, nearly one-fifth of the claims are from international institutions which are committed to support the international position of the dollar as well as other currencies; third, one-eighth of the foreign dollar balances are held by Germany, one-eighth by Canada, neither of which has bought gold from the United States; and almost one-fifth of the dollar balance claims are held by Japan and by the United Kingdom. These nations would be expected to cooperate in preserving the position of the dollar in the world's monetary arrangements; fourth, other nations need their dollar balances for purposes of payments; fifth, foreign individuals and businesses cannot obtain gold directly from the Treasury, but their demands may lead to central bank purchases from the Treasury. It is also to be noticed that high prices of gold in the London and other gold markets—from which almost two-thirds as much monetary gold was obtained in 1958-September 1960 as from the United States—would tend to direct foreign demand for gold toward the U.S. Treasury. Another factor to consider in estimating the future demand for gold is the size of the reserves held by foreign banks and governments. More than two-thirds of Italy's reserve has been accumulated in the last 3 years. France has acquired nearly two-thirds of its reserve in the same period. Over one-third of the United Kingdom stock has been obtained in the last 3 years. Nearly 90 percent of Japan's holdings have been bought in that period. The adequacy of present stocks cannot readily be judged; several nations in Europe hold more gold in relation to currency and bank deposits than is held by the United States. Japan's gold supply is about 7 percent as much as its annual merchandise and service imports, while the United States reserves are 90 percent as much as the volume of imports. More detailed comparisons of gold supplies and related facts might demonstrate that there is no universal measure of the adequacy of gold supply; and would allow the conclusion that the volume of gold supply does not control a country's rate of economic progress and development.

TABLE 3.—Required gold certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve banks

End of year	Required reserves, 25 percent of notes and deposits	Federal Reserve notes	Federal Reserve deposit liabilities	Actual reserve percentage	End of year	Required reserves, 25 percent of notes and deposits	Federal Reserve notes	Federal Reserve deposit liabilities	Actual reserve percentage
	Billions	Billions	Billions			Billions	Billions	Billions	
1950	\$11.63	\$28.58	\$17.69	37.9	1954	\$11.06	\$26.25	\$20.37	45.1
1951	11.99	28.26	19.72	39.9	1955	12.00	26.56	21.42	44.5
1952	11.85	27.87	19.53	42.1	1956	11.91	26.25	21.34	46.2
1953	11.91	27.53	20.12	46.3	1957	11.56	25.06	21.19	46.4
1954	11.93	27.48	20.25	44.6	1958	10.85	23.59	19.81	49.4
1955	11.82	26.92	20.36	44.4					

Source: Federal Reserve System.

TABLE 4.—Short-term U.S. banking liabilities to and claims on foreigners

Millions of dollars]

End of calendar year or month	Short-term liabilities to foreigners					Short-term claims on foreigners			
	Total	Payable in dollars			Payable in foreign currencies	Total	Payable in dollars		Payable in foreign currencies
		Foreign official	Other foreign	International			Loans to foreign banks	Other	
1950	8,644.8	3,620.3	3,451.7	1,527.8	44.9	898.0	151.1	506.3	240.6
1951	9,302.2	3,547.6	4,041.2	1,641.1	72.2	968.4	177.2	699.4	91.8
1952	10,546.1	4,654.2	4,245.6	1,584.9	61.4	1,048.7	122.0	847.5	78.4
1953	11,648.4	5,666.9	4,308.4	1,629.4	43.7	904.5	156.5	646.5	101.6
1954	12,918.6	6,770.1	4,335.4	1,769.9	43.2	1,386.5	206.5	999.0	211.0
1955	13,600.7	6,952.8	4,726.5	1,881.1	40.3	1,548.5	328.1	1,056.5	163.9
1956	14,939.1	7,045.4	5,392.8	1,452.1	48.8	1,945.7	405.4	1,390.8	149.6
1957	15,158.3	7,916.6	5,605.3	1,517.3	59.0	2,199.4	385.5	1,666.5	147.3
1958	16,159.1	8,664.9	5,890.8	1,544.0	59.4	2,542.0	439.4	1,904.9	197.7
1959	19,387.5	9,145.1	7,007.1	3,158.1	77.2	2,623.3	497.6	1,908.5	217.2
1960, October ¹	21,430.6	10,291.1	7,323.5	3,681.2	134.8	3,319.3	504.7	2,359.0	455.5

¹ Beginning in August 1956 and again in April 1957, certain accounts previously classified as "Other foreign" are included in "Foreign official."

² Preliminary.

Source: Treasury Department.

TABLE 5.—Changes in monetary gold stocks of selected foreign countries, January 1958–September 1960

[In millions of dollars]

	Through transactions with—			Gold stock, Sept. 30, 1960
	United States	IMF ¹	Other ²	
Germany	0	-\$114	\$461	\$2,889
United Kingdom	\$31,250	-163	\$-162	\$2,525
Italy	\$349	-68	\$1,261	\$1,994
Switzerland	355	0	-81	1,980
France	322	-66	790	1,627
Netherlands	436	-34	200	1,346
Belgium	426	-28	-219	1,094
Canada	0	-63	-143	894
Portugal	30	0	59	550
Venezuela	-65	0	-193	462
Austria	168	-6	28	293
Japan	\$187	-63	\$97	\$244
All foreign countries	3,803	1,052	2,160	19,434

¹ Gold payments to the IMF on account of capital subscriptions.

² Residual figures; including gold acquired from new production, Russian sales, etc.

³ Through June 30, 1960. Additional \$200,000,000 of gold was purchased from the United States in the 3d quarter of 1960.

⁴ Through June 30, 1960.

⁵ Through Mar. 31, 1960. Additional \$15,000,000 of gold was purchased from the United States in the 3d quarter of 1960.

Sources: Derived from data in Federal Reserve Bulletin and International Financial Statistics. First National City Bank.

EFFECTS OF TREASURY PURCHASE AND SALE OF GOLD ON MONEY SUPPLY

Mr. Speaker, the mechanism of the effect of gold purchases and sales on bank reserves and lending power is described in the following excerpt from a pamphlet prepared by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago:

Treasury purchases of gold increase banks' reserves—an inflow of gold into this country ordinarily adds to bank reserves by an identical amount.

Since it is unlawful to hold gold in this country except as it is used industrially and in token amounts, freshly mined gold or gold coming into the country from abroad must be sold to the Treasury. The Treasury pays for the gold with a check on its account at the Federal Reserve bank. The recipient of the check deposits it with a commercial bank for which he receives a deposit account. The commercial bank sends it to the Federal Reserve bank for collec-

tion. Funds in the amount of the check are transferred from the Treasury account to the account (reserves) of the commercial bank. The Treasury then sends the Federal Reserve bank a gold certificate for the amount of the check (gold purchased) and the Federal Reserve bank credits the Treasury account with the amount of the gold certificate.

This process may be summarized on the balance sheet of the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks as follows:

1. The commercial bank's deposit liabilities are increased by the amount of the gold seller's check, say \$100.

2. The commercial bank's reserves at the Federal Reserve bank are increased by the amount of the check and will appear also as an asset of the commercial bank.

3. The Federal Reserve's holdings of gold certificates will increase by \$100. The Treasury's account at the Federal Reserve will be unchanged.

Note that the commercial bank's required reserves will go up by only \$20 while its total reserves have increased by \$100—leaving \$80 which it may lend. Excess reserves result from an inflow of gold in the same way as they do from an inflow of currency.

Treasury gold sales reduce banks' reserves—an outflow of gold destroys bank reserves. When gold is purchased from the Treasury, it is paid for by check. The Treasury sends the check to the Federal Reserve bank for collection. The Federal Reserve bank debits the account (reserve) of the bank upon which the check is drawn. It sends the Treasury a gold certificate for the amount of the check rather than crediting its account. The commercial bank debits the deposit account of the depositor who purchased the gold from the Treasury.

This transaction may be summarized on the balance sheets of the commercial bank and the Federal Reserve bank as follows:

1. The commercial bank's deposit liabilities are reduced by, say, \$100.

2. The reserves of the commercial bank are reduced by the amount of the check.

3. The Federal Reserve bank has its gold certificates reduced by a similar amount.

Note that, as was the case when there was an outflow of currency, the loss of reserves exceeds the reduction in required reserves.

Mr. Speaker, acquisitions of domestically produced gold are, in some years, greater than transfers from or to foreign ownership. In other years, these latter

transfers are 20 to 40 times as great as annual purchases of domestic gold.

Purchase of domestic gold, and gold inflow or outflow from or to other nations, increase the money supply of the United States by the amount of the purchase, since gold is money in some contexts. Whether it affects the currency and bank deposits which families and businesses have available to spend depends on whether or not the gold flow, first, is offset by action of the Federal Reserve authorities to control the volume of bank reserves; second, affects the willingness of banks to lend within the limits of existing reserves; and third, is deliberately offset or reinforced by public policies with respect to Federal expenditures, international trade, and investment.

In the 11 years 1950–60, gold movements have reduced bank reserves and, therefore, the ability to lend to business, consumers, and governments, by significant amounts in at least 5 years. These generally were years of recession. In 3 boom years, gold movements have increased bank reserves and ability to lend.

The Federal Reserve authorities have taken action which offset the effects of gold movements, or allowed other developments to offset the effects on bank reserves, to a much more substantial degree than they have reinforced gold movements. The table which follows shows the outlines of the offsetting and reinforcing actions.

If bank reserves were managed in conformity with the simplest rules for an international gold standard, the offsetting actions might not have been taken. In the recession years 1953 and 1954 the effects of gold outflows in fact were reinforced by monetary policy, but not so far as to raise interest rates in 1954. The recovery or boom years of 1951, 1957, and 1959 would have witnessed greater availability of bank credit, and the recession years 1958 and 1960 less availability and higher interest rates. If the more sophisticated textbook model were followed, a number of devaluations and revaluations of the dollar would have occurred.

TABLE 6.—Gold movements and other factors affecting member bank reserves (averages of daily figures for December of each year)
[In millions of dollars]

Year	Gold movements		Other factors		Net change in member bank reserves
	In-creasing member bank reserves	De-creasing member bank reserves	Off-setting gold movements	Rein-forcing gold movements	
1960		\$1,689	\$2,070		\$381
1959		1,078	1,101		33
1958		2,247	1,726		-521
1957	\$832		-947		-115
1956	259			\$36	295
1955		23		-16	-39
1954		317		-324	-7
1953		1,157		-103	-1,260
1952	492			78	570
1951		11	2,930		2,919
1950		1,572	2,672		1,100

NOTE.—In 1960, the gold outflow was offset principally by Federal Reserve Board action to allow member banks to count vault cash as reserves. Open market purchases were the principal offsets in 1959 and 1958, and open market sales were the most important offset in 1957. Gold movements were offset also in 1951, by open market purchases and member bank borrowing, partly counterbalanced by an increase in currency circulation. Gold movements were reinforced in 1956, adding to member bank reserves, by an increase in "float" and open market purchases, offset in part by decreased member bank borrowing. In 1955, currency outflow and open market sales more than offset an increase in float and in borrowing, to reduce reserves. In 1954, open market sales were the principal factor reducing reserves; reduction in currency outstanding increased reserves. In 1953, increased borrowing and currency circulation plus reduced float more than offset open market purchases to reinforce the gold outflow and reduce reserves. In 1952, an increase in currency in circulation was more than offset by open market purchases and member bank borrowing. In 1950, open market purchases more than offset the gold outflow.

TO THE MEMORY OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—A TRIBUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the tributes to the memory of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the occasion of his birthday anniversary which we celebrated yesterday.

Mere words are not sufficient tribute to our 32d President. Our acknowledgment of his greatness also should be apparent in our determined pledge to work for our country in the humanitarian spirit which Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought to public affairs.

In the aftermath of an inspiring inaugural address, we sense in the new administration of President John F. Kennedy the same humanitarian spirit which moved Franklin D. Roosevelt to lead America out of the depths of economic despair and through the perils of a world at war toward her rendezvous with destiny.

From the magnitude of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's ideals, we gained a new lease on life. We perceived the potential of America. He renewed our belief in the principle of human dignity. Reminding us that "mere survival calls for new pioneering on our part," he inspired us to move forward to lend ourselves and our resources to the betterment of all mankind.

In commemorating George Rogers Clark and his frontiersmen of 1774 Franklin D. Roosevelt, on November 16, 1934, cited their example "to guide us in the conquest of new frontiers of the spirit that are neither physical nor geographical." As we stand on the new frontiers of the 1960's, President Kennedy has similarly challenged us. Our tasks today are no less than they were in the Roosevelt administration. We must devote ourselves to the search for peace in the same manner President Roosevelt was dedicated in his endeavors to bring peace around the globe.

We ought to remember President Roosevelt's words which were part of an address he gave to the young men of West Point Academy, on June 12, 1935, and I quote:

The greatest need of the world today is the assurance of permanent peace—an assurance based on mutual understanding and mutual regard.

Our tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt should be no less than our total dedication toward this end.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper or a news magazine these days without reference to one of the most important domestic problems facing our Nation, a decline in business activity and increasing unemployment. Many times, these items refer to the high inventory of unsold automobiles which is resulting in drastic cutbacks in auto production. There is no question about it, automobile production has a tremendous impact on our whole economy—far more than is generally understood and appreciated.

Last week's U.S. News & World Report carried an article which I ask to have included in the RECORD, about how the auto industry is adding to recession worries as other lines of business have been weakening.

During the past few weeks and months we have heard many suggestions about a possible solution to unemployment by aid for our depressed areas. Without arguing the merit of these suggestions, I remind you of the old adage, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Why is it necessary for an area to become depressed, to have massive unemployment, and to give away surplus food before we try to act to prevent catastrophe?

Our workers in Michigan want to be active at their places on the production line, not inactive in a Government surplus food line. They do not want dried eggs; they want dried paint on new

cars so they can have dried ink on a paycheck that will buy fresh eggs. They prefer to be compensated for employment rather than compensated for unemployment.

With automobile production down, unemployment problems are naturally growing in our area and this marks the beginning of a chain reaction which will be felt in most every congressional district in the country. It is just that simple.

What must be done to stop this? We must stimulate the sale of cars which will increase production, eliminate unemployment, add to the demand for raw materials such as leather, glass, steel, rubber, aluminum, and innumerable other products as well as create business activity with the automobile dealers and finance people in every city and village of the United States.

How can this be done? By lowering the price of automobiles. There is one solution, so practical, so valid, so obvious, and so effective, it is difficult indeed to understand why it has not been done. As I suggested to you in the 85th and 86th Congresses, my answer is to repeal the discriminatory, wartime 10-percent tax on automobiles. This tax was originally enacted to put the brake on automobile production during the Korean war. Now when it is sorely needed, it is time to take that brake off and get the economy rolling and, at the same time, correct a tax inequity that continues to discriminate against an industry providing the lifeblood of one out of every seven persons in the United States.

Today I have again introduced my bill to repeal this tax and it is my hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee will give this proposal their careful study and consideration as they direct their attention to measures to stimulate our economy and the subject of general tax revision.

The article referred to follows:

A SLOW START FOR AUTOS

DETROIT.—All signs at this point suggest that the auto industry will not give business a lift in the first half of this year.

New cars are not selling as well as the industry expected. In the first 10 days of January, the daily rate of sales trailed December by nearly 16 percent and lagged behind the level of a year ago by more than 11 percent.

Used car sales, too, have been sluggish, and used car prices have fallen.

The backlog: big. With sales slower, inventories of both new cars and used cars tend to remain unusually high. At last report, more than 1 million new cars were in dealers' hands, and the number was increasing in spite of sharp cutbacks in production.

January had been chosen by the industry as the month in which to bring inventories under control. Production was originally set, according to "Ward's Automotive Reports," at about 465,000 cars, down from 522,000 in December and 688,000 a year ago. As the month dragged on, further adjustments trimmed the January estimate to about 450,000.

Short workweeks, layoffs, and week long shutdowns have been widespread, complicating the unemployment problem faced by the new Kennedy administration.

Company officials say they hope to raise output a bit in February and March, in line with seasonal trends. However, layoffs are still being announced here and there.

March, normally the peak month for output in the spring, will, at most, be only a little better than January, if present production schedules hold.

All this is in sharp contrast to the picture drawn for 1961 by company leaders at the time new models were coming out last autumn. Estimates of sales, including foreign cars, then ranged from 6.5 to 7 million, indicating 1961 would be as good a year as 1960 or better. The sales estimates are now being scaled down.

Output this year is estimated by the U.S. Department of Commerce at 5.8 million, down from nearly 6.7 million in 1960, reflecting the prospect of a cut in inventories, in place of the big buildup that occurred last year.

Now the question is being asked: What's gone wrong with the auto market? In the industry, several answers are advanced.

For one thing, the recession undoubtedly is causing some people to put off buying, many dealers and auto officials say.

The stolen sales: There is also a widespread view that heavy clearance sales of 1960 models toward the end of last year stole sales from the 1961 models and cast a shadow over their introduction. Heavy stocks of the old models were on hand when the new models came out in the autumn and, even now, some 1960 models are still available at bargain prices.

For a time, sales of the old models inflated the auto market, making it appear buoyant. Then, as the old stocks were cleared out, the sales slump showed up.

The switch to the compact cars is still being studied for its impact on the market. The complaint is heard that some of the new compacts introduced by the medium-price makes are not helping sales and may be causing the customer to hesitate longer.

Finally, there is the effect of the back-up of unsold used cars. A drop in used-car prices means lower trade-in allowances which, in turn, mean higher out-of-pocket costs and larger financing charges for the buyers of new cars. That, of course, makes it harder for the dealer to offer attractive deals.

More customers, but—Although the auto market has slipped, a recent survey by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center indicates that there are more potential customers for new cars now than there were a year ago.

A whole series of steps is being planned by the companies to meet the problem. Months earlier than usual, they are beginning to offer prizes and rebates to their dealers to induce them, in turn, to offer bigger discounts from list prices to the public.

Production cutbacks are emphasizing the trend away from medium-price makes. Ford is switching its St. Louis plant from making Mercurys to Fords. Studies of new models, smaller than present compacts, are going forward.

Finally, officials say, output for the balance of the year will be geared closely to sales and may even lag behind sales so as to reduce the inventory from the million-car level to around 750,000 by the year's end.

Thus, where last year saw more than 420,000 cars added to inventories, this year may see about 250,000 taken out. Result: a drop in output of 670,000, without allowing for any dip in sales.

That is a program which spells substantially lower output than last year, more trouble for auto workers, and less demand for steel, copper, aluminum and glass, un-

less auto sales show a far greater rebound this coming spring than the industry is now expecting.

THE WAY THE WORLD LOOKS TO THE VERY YOUNG

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our new President addressed the Nation on the state of the Union. It seems that Mr. Kennedy has an obsession with a black array of terrors, most of them badly out of perspective. He laments all worldly problems and simultaneously tells us what he noticeably neglected in the campaign, viz, that all problems cannot be solved overnight from Washington.

On January 10, 1961, the Dunkirk Evening Observer, one of the finest papers in western New York, addressed an editorial to the youthful outlook of the new Kennedy administration. I would like to share the humor and the wisdom of this editorial with my colleagues. I think it a fitting comment on the entire Kennedy administration to date, and even though written prior to Mr. Kennedy's state of the Union message, it sums up the feeling of many of us with reference to that address:

YOUTH AND EXPERIENCE

Over the Christmas holiday period members of the new administration revealed their outlook as youthful.

Reports indicated great criticism directed at the agencies of Government under Eisenhower and Truman.

That is the way the world looks to the very young. Everything done heretofore to resolve the world's ills is wrong. But it takes the seasoning of experience to learn that the world of humans will still be wrong even after the theoretical corrections dreamed of by enthusiastic youth have been applied.

There comes a time with full maturity when poor old pop will be more fully understood. Then he will not be regarded as so old-fashioned and stupid after all. Youthful brilliance must be compounded with experience to develop any leader to his fullest capacities.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States. The Council would be composed of 21 persons widely recog-

nized for their knowledge, of, or experience in, the arts. They would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for 6-year terms.

This legislation was originally proposed by President Eisenhower in his 1955 state of the Union message to Congress. Following is a quotation from that message:

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

Since 1955 bills to implement Mr. Eisenhower's recommendation have been introduced in each Congress on a bipartisan basis. I am happy to join in the effort to enact this legislation.

There is a profound national interest in the encouragement and development of both the practice and appreciation of the arts by our citizens. Not only does art enrich the lives of individual citizens, but our national life and the impact of our country abroad is enhanced by cultural development. In a variety of ways, activities of the Federal Government have an effect upon artistic and cultural development. However, there is today no means for coordinating these activities. The enactment of this proposal to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts would therefore meet a long-recognized need. I hope the Committee on Education and Labor will favorably consider the matter and that early action in the House and Senate will follow.

PACKING THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we now have a Democrat inaugurated as President of the United States. We have a Senate and House. Two-thirds of the membership in each are members of the Democrat Party.

We know what the platform of the Democrat Party is. We have read it. The reference is to the one adopted at Los Angeles.

We know and remember the campaign speeches made by the President when he was a candidate. We know what happened today.

In my judgment, all the talk today boils down to this—that now the President, the Speaker, and the leaders of the Democrat Party insist there be put upon the Rules Committee two additional Democrat members who will be "yes men."

The Speaker and his party leaders were, in my opinion, hunting for two

rubberstamps—just as the party did in the Roosevelt regime. Two on the committee who will vote or “roll over” when the Democrat leadership speaks.

All that being true, the responsibility of putting through the party program rests entirely on your shoulders over there on my right. No longer can you avoid action and its results by charging the Republican Party with obstruction. You have the President, you have two-thirds of the membership of Senate and House. You have the ball. Go someplace. We do not have the votes to stop or hold you. You have 4 years to put across your panacea. If you have the courage of your convictions, put it through and see the results.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield. Mr. PUCINSKI. I have always respected and admired the gentleman from Michigan. He is a member of the same committee on which I serve. I doubt very much if the gentleman wants to stand on the statement that any Member of this Congress, Democrat or Republican, would ever sell out his own best individual judgment and become a rubberstamp for anyone.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not say anything about selling out; no such charge is made or intended. Two hundred and seventeen Members, one less than a majority of the House just yielded to or believed in the arguments and entreaties of the President, the Speaker, the party leaders. You are old enough, have lived long enough, and you have had enough experience in Chicago to know, have you not, that during the Roosevelt administration we had rubberstamp legislation. We had yes-men. It was my privilege to be here when the House passed bills that were not even printed; just a typewritten copy. The bills came in. They were rubberstamped. Many did not know how the legislation was written; what it meant—its effect.

One time the farmers in my district called upon me to explain a farm bill. A group of farmers from six counties was assembled. They said, “I wish you would explain this bill to us.” It had 70 or 80 pages. I said, “Well, I cannot.” “Well,” they said, “you voted against it. Why did you do that?” I said, “Let me have the bill,” and I began to read. Do you know what the first paragraph was? In substance it was this: “Whenever the President”—that was Franklin Delano Roosevelt—“shall deem an emergency imminent”—then the bill continued with the granting of power to be exercised by the President. I did not then believe the Congress should grant arbitrary power to any President to be exercised at his whim.

That is what is today proposed and to make the way easier, two rubberstamps, two yes-men, are needed, both chosen by the Speaker, also doubtless the Democrat majority of the Ways and Means Committee will be permitted to approve the choice.

Who wants that kind of legislation? Who wants that power vested in any-

one under which they will undertake to reorganize this Government in such way as to transfer the powers of the Congress to the President? Are you in favor of reorganization bills to do that? Are you? Well, I will not ask you to go on record; all I ask you to do is to read what the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and what your Speaker want to do. This will give him the power to select somebody who will be a rubberstamp subject to his request—not sell out—just yield to argument, which overpowers him. I submit to you that the reorganization plan will take away from the Congress that power granted in the very first phrase of the Constitution and confer it upon the President.

THE EISENHOWER-NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, at noon on January 20, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration passed into history.

I wish those who never came back from bloody Belleau Wood, scarred Iwo Jima, and desolate Heartbreak Ridge now could be in this distinguished Chamber. They could instruct us how to cherish 8 years during which an administration kept the peace with strength and honor.

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration is the first administration which did not disarm America after a war. So it is shocking that a few highly vocal, especially motivated armchair strategists try to discredit such a record. Among the discreditors who flare loudly their discordant trumpets of criticism are those who fiddled soothingly upon their violins of praise for the Truman administration, an administration that ignored the dangers of communism and dismantled the finest conventional armies and the largest air and sea armadas in history.

Today, the United States has rebuilt the strongest, best prepared nation on earth. Let Russia attempt a Pearl Harbor. Our intelligence system will alert us, and our retaliatory forces will strike back and destroy Russia. Said the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, on a March night last year:

As one familiar with our capabilities, I want to assure you that even if the Communists launched an all-out thermonuclear attack on the United States tonight, nothing could prevent their bringing down upon themselves vast destruction from the retaliatory blows which we would still be able to deliver against them.

Said the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke:

We are stronger, far stronger, than any potential aggressor. This is true not only of our nuclear weapon capabilities—it is true of our whole military posture.

Said Air Force Gen. Curtis LeMay:

We maintain military forces capable of deterring Soviet aggression. Our forces are strong enough to prevent war—or win such war if it is thrust upon us.

Mr. Speaker, these clear-cut, concise pronouncements were made not by politicians, not by theoreticians, but by military men. They were made before we had perfected the most nearly invulnerable weapon in the history of warfare, the Polaris.

To those in the other party who sought political benefit in belittling America's military strength, I say now: For the next 4 years your party must bear the awesome responsibility of insuring that Russia does not catch up with the vast military lead this Republican administration bequeathed to you on January 20. And I warn you that the enactment of your platform promises into legislation would so sap the economic strength of our Nation that military preparedness would suffer, and our lead would be lost to Communist Russia, and freedom might die.

BRUSH FIRE WAR PREVENTION

In this dangerous age, let us never forget that we face the outbreak both of brush fire wars and general nuclear wars.

We should be concerned that our capability to extinguish brush fire wars remains constantly ready. For few Americans have forgotten how, on the eve of Korea, we had only a one-weapon capability, the big bomb, and we had only one army division at full strength. The Korean disaster forced the Truman administration to cease famishing the military in order to conduct a crash program of limited war rearmament. So great were the global Communist threats that the military strength of our allies, waning because of apathetic U.S. leadership, had to be built up.

By July 1960, the Eisenhower administration had not only freed many allied divisions from a tiedown in Korea which permitted the Communists freedom of action elsewhere, but also had raised the allied limited war deterrent capability to approximately 200 ground divisions, and some 250 strategically located bases.

Had the Truman administration prepared as had the Eisenhower administration, Korea, had it occurred at all, would have been a mere Lebanon operation, not a taker of thousands of American lives.

The problem of limited war preparedness, I point out, needs constant reevaluation. The vehicles of waging nuclear war are vehicles of the supersonic age, while the vehicles of waging limited war, the steamer, the railroad, the airplane, are still subsonic: It takes about 14 minutes for the Polaris missile to span 1,200 miles to land on target. It takes days and weeks to move divisions of troops by aircraft and ship.

True enough, our airlift performed well in Lebanon, and more recently in the United Nations action in Africa.

Still, the only way that we can decrease limited war reaction time to a par with nuclear war reaction time is by the

development of missile carriers for troops. The best technological research, as yet, makes this impossible. Thus, we must maintain our marvelous aircraft carrier versatility, our allied divisions near troubled spots, and improve our conventional airlift. This means continuing what General Lemnitzer has called a "forward strategy."

Only recently, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration took a bold, imaginative step to supplement this forward strategy. The recent offer of medium range ballistic missiles to NATO can refortify the NATO deterrent and, along with a recommended conventional war buildup, foil any Kremlin attempts to divide and nibble away NATO by actions of a lesser magnitude than a direct attack on the United States. The Eisenhower administration, even in its last days in office, constantly reevaluated military needs, met new demands with the best, latest modern technology and research.

U.S. STRIKE-BACK CAPACITY

Let us now turn to the type of war resulting from an attack by the Soviet Russians on the United States.

What are the Russian capabilities for such an attack?

The recent report on Britain's Institute for Strategic Studies credits Russia with about 35 operational ICBM's, and about 200 long-range bombers. Her fleet of medium-range bombers have a questionable capacity for hitting U.S. targets. Their IRBM's cannot hit targets in the United States. In other words, Russia and Red China combined—the entire Communist axis—have about 235 instruments that have an alleged capability of nuclear delivery upon the continental United States.

What are the comparable U.S. capabilities?

Roaming the seven seas able to hit almost any important part of the Russian heartland, are two Polaris submarines with a combined total of 32 missiles, each missile capable of much more destruction than was rained upon Hiroshima with three of these Polaris submarines soon to be launched. No military man would be willing to trade these invulnerable, flexible, solid fuel, instant reaction missiles of the second generation with the 35 first generation, vulnerable, liquid fuel Russian ICBM's, which in some cases experienced a 30-minute delay before fueling for firing can be completed.

About 16 intercontinental Atlas missiles, a number in firing position; and there are 5 more of these Polaris submarines off the ways which will soon be put to sea, each carrying 15 Polaris missiles.

And, what is even more important, as well as amazing, are two new developments which now have been successfully tested: the Minuteman solid fuel, second generation, long-range missile, which is much more mobile than either the Atlas or Titan and can be transported and fired from railway or ship, making it almost invulnerable to attack; and Samos, the intelligence rocket, which is present-

ly encircling the globe, with equipment capable of taking pictures of all parts of the earth and relaying them back for information and study, which is making such intelligence flights as the U-2 out of date. This intelligence rocket is truly amazing. Russia has nothing comparable to either the Polaris, the Minuteman, or Samos. No wonder the study made since the Kennedy administration came into power in reference to our comparative defense posture says that Russia is not ahead of us.

Over 600 long-range B-52 jet bombers, each carrying more destructive, explosive power than used by all the combatants in World War II, and many equipped with the Hound Dog, a 500 mile range missile. Could these bombers penetrate the Russian air defenses? Secretary of Defense Gates recently noted that, in the past 4 years "American reconnaissance planes have riddled their air defenses and made a proper mockery of their refusal to open their skies as willingly as we would open ours to them." So, it seems apparent that sufficient numbers of these planes, with their bombs and missiles, could reach Russia to destroy Moscow and key industrial areas, not once, but many times over.

Nearly 1,400 B-47 medium-range jet bombers, based in United States and abroad, with a 4,500 statute-mile range and distances beyond with air-to-air refueling.

Only recently SAC placed in operation B-58 "Hustlers," the first of U.S. supersonic medium-range jet bombers which incidentally just broke the world speed record for strategic bombers.

Fourteen aircraft carriers able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force. Well over 200 of these aircraft are with the 6th and 7th Fleets capable of strikes at areas of Soviet military concern.

Eighteen wings of tactical aircraft, each wing with a substantial nuclear attack capability deployed globally.

Sixty Thor IRBM's deployed in England capable of raining nuclear destruction on Russia.

Thirty Jupiter IRBM's being installed in bases in Italy, from which Russia can be hit.

Totaling all this, we see that the United States has well over 2,000 nuclear carrying vehicles capable of reaching Russia. This represents a sizable superiority of destructive power.

SOVIET STRATEGY OF DECEPTION

Mr. Speaker, this military lead over Soviet Russia, which a Republican administration passed to a Democratic administration on January 20, should afford that new administration with no reason for complacency. Time and again military history tells of the disastrous defeat of stronger nations by weaker ones. The instruments of such defeats always have been surprises and deceptions which have destroyed the opponent's freedom of action and will to resist.

I would remind the new administration of the classic deception at the Battle of Cannae. Hannibal baited the Romans into attacking his center, which he steadily withdrew. While the Romans poured their legions into the widening jaws of this trap, Hannibal's reserves closed in on the exposed Roman flanks and rear. A massacre ensued.

For 8 years now, the Kremlin masters have tried to lure America into traps like Cannae. For example, from 1954 through 1956, the Soviets attempted to deceive us into concentrating on an unbalanced, massive bomber buildup, at the very time actually they were switching to missiles.

What is more, the Soviets wanted to decoy our vision by dramatizing one or two dangers, so we would forget other dangers and react in a way which would open up our flanks, our military, economic, scientific, psychological, and spiritual flanks. The Soviets wanted to brainwash America into an inferiority complex which would downgrade our own achievements and thus weaken our will and confidence to remain firm. The Soviets wanted us to think in terms of 1 or 2 crisis years, not in terms of an age of conflict; in terms of a numbers-matching game where Russia picked the weapons, not in terms of military forces, balanced and versatile.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration fell into none of these traps, and I want the new administration to avoid them.

Neither has the Eisenhower administration deigned to use preparedness as a political football. Despite all the partisan shenanigans during the recent election campaign, the Democratic Congresses during the Eisenhower administration increased the defense budget over the President's request only in election years. In off election years, they cut back so much that during the entire Eisenhower administration, \$1,658 million was cut from President Eisenhower's requests.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include a table to document this statement. (See table A.)

In preparedness spending, the Eisenhower administration, standing above politics, avoided the perilous peaks of panic and valleys of complacency characteristic of previous administrations. President Eisenhower and his first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, geared preparedness to the long pull, where not only would our economic base remain strong, but where there would be adequate forces in being, capable of deterring at any time and place all types of war. The Eisenhower-Nixon administration kept in mind the protracted conflict and the whole danger.

I hope and trust that the new administration will not return us to the past ups and downs of the Truman administration defense programs. But, I am quite concerned about the task force reports submitted recently to the new President. These domestic programs will jeopardize the long-pull policies and imperil our liberty.

MIRACLES IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Eisenhower preparedness philosophy gave birth to a brilliant record in research and development.

After World War II, some Americans debauched themselves in the heavy wine of a White House leadership, unaware that future preparedness would be predicated upon nuclear weapons and guided missiles. As Roman citizens once lulled themselves into false confidence over long outdated legions, the Democratic administration lullabied itself to sleep with outdated World War II ideas. Even worse, the Democratic President placed the vital Atomic Energy Commission into the hands of those against the military uses of atomic energy. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union feverishly searched for atomic means to dominate a sleeping America.

Alarmed by such a setup for disaster, Dr. Edward Teller, as early as 1946, sounded the alarm in Washington. His voice, pleading that America should not discontinue attempts to develop an H-bomb, was drowned in soothing seas of complacency. From 1945 to 1949 the Truman-Lillenthal-Oppenheimer trio blocked even Teller's efforts to make a more effective deterrent of the A-bomb. Continued protests by Adm. Lewis Strauss, plus an August 1949, B-29 flight which luckily recorded evidences of a Soviet A-bomb explosion, plus Dr. Klaus Fuchs' confession that he had been leaking atomic secrets finally awoke the slumbering White House. It was almost too late. We had forfeited much of our atomic lead, and Russia had a good chance of beating us to the H-bomb.

Even after all this, the White House had to be prodded by patriots like Dr. Teller, Admiral Strauss, Senators Hick-enlooper and McMahon. Fortunately, the Eisenhower administration later made up for these tragic lost years.

President Eisenhower inherited an equally dangerous lag in guided missiles, for which he had to make up.

In 1946, the Army, using German scientists such as Dr. Wernher von Braun, had started to rebuild the German V-2 for use as a first-stage booster rocket with the already developed WAC Corporal as the second stage. Meanwhile, the Air Force began a program, termed MX-774, to develop ICBM's.

What happened in 1947? Mr. Truman impounded \$75 million the Republican Congress had appropriated for research and development, and \$17 million of this was to be specifically for missile development. Gen. Curtis LeMay complained that this was the straw that broke the camel's back. The alarmed Chief of Staff, Dwight Eisenhower, warned that—

In the field of guided missiles we must keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appalling few hours.

Mr. Truman met these warnings by cutting more deeply in 1950 fiscal year. He impounded \$735 million of Air Force funds, and ICBM development through public funds came to a standstill.

What was happening in Russia? In 1947 the rocket theories of the German

scientist, Sanger, created such great excitement that Stalin assigned top priority to this work and ordered Col. Gueorgi Tokaev, an aerodynamics expert, to seek out Sanger and his ideas on a super-rocket. Tokaev, who later defected, reports that Stalin was almost in a hysterical clamor for such scientific data to build an intercontinental rocket, which, Stalin said, would make it easier for him to talk to the gentleman shopkeeper, Truman.

Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration did increase its research and development budget after the Korean invasion. That budget, however, concentrated on World War II type research and development, and long-range missiles were downgraded. But within the first year after the Eisenhower administration came into office, the President set up a full-scale review of the entire missile program, and in fiscal year 1954, spent over twice as much on longer range missiles than Mr. Truman had done during his entire time in the White House. In any one day last year, the United States was spending 10 times more on ballistic missiles than was spent in all of fiscal year 1952 of the Truman administration.

Marvelous miracles were performed under the Eisenhower administration to make up for the ground lost to Russia. In 1954, the Von Neuman Committee said America could have an operational ICBM somewhere between 1960 and 1963, but under this past administration's leadership the Atlas became operational on September 1, 1959.

In the remarkable Eisenhower administration space program, the United States cut leadtime, came from behind to race ahead of Russia by placing 32 satellites in orbit, obtaining a vast variety of scientific knowledge, and obtaining a remarkable series of firsts in exploration areas where Russia lags in her space program. Russia, by the way, has placed only nine satellites in orbit. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include a table listing these firsts and hence paying tribute to the soundness of NASA's broadly based program. (See table B.)

POLARIS

No development has been more spectacular than the Polaris fleet ballistic missile, originally planned to be operational in 1963, actually operational today.

Problems in shooting a missile from a submerged submarine and hitting a target 1,250 miles away were as fantastic as shooting a beer can off a far distant fencepost, when the marksman, blindfolded, was mounted on a galloping horse.

For the Polaris, a superior brain had to be created to make up for every up and down, side-to-side roll, every sway and yaw of the submarine. In determining the direction of the submarine from true north, 1° error could mean dozens of miles off target. Our other big missiles under development—the Atlas and the Jupiter, for example, used liquid fuel. But liquid fuel missiles in a submarine presented dangers of a sud-

den explosion, sailors trapped undersea in a doomed vessel. Safer solid fuel rockets, on the other hand, as old as the ancient Chinese, did not, however, have sufficient thrust.

Men like Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, and chief of the Polaris project, Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., faced and accomplished the possible in a little time and took a bit longer on the impossible. These men had the courage to make decisions, to eliminate bureaucracy, to build a superior armed services-research-private enterprise team, and to keep in mind the big picture, the whole package.

Although Washington bureaucrats would have hired a big staff for 6 months to write job descriptions for a still bigger basic staff, Admiral Raborn was no such bureaucrat. Within 10 days after his arrival as head of Special Projects, he had twisted Parkinson's law into reverse, hired his basic staff of 50 people, and was slicing leadtime in two. His men did not dilly-dally with long unnecessary redtape memoranda for the office down the street, but instead they "hot-handed" their questions in person to the person who could give them a prompt, satisfactory answer.

"Red" Raborn built teamwork within his "steering task group":

Lockheed solved the problem of shutting off thrust at the right moment so that the missile would hit the target.

General Electric produced the remarkable fire control and guidance system.

Aerojet-General Corp. tested large quantities of solid fuel which did have adequate thrust.

Westinghouse helped in solving the launching problem.

Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, and other companies, busily constructed the submarine.

Sperry Gyroscope Co. took MIT research and put together a navigational system containing more than 1 million parts.

No wonder Admiral Raborn wrote this for the guidance of many working under him:

I must be able to reach down to any level of special projects activity and find a plan and a performance report that logically and clearly can be related to the total job we have to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me pass from the particular to the general, philosophize a bit on this success, and point something out to the new administration. We want to know how America can stay far ahead of Russia. If America can cut bureaucracy, make courageous decisions, develop the free-enterprise team, and relate each facet of national activity to the total job of preserving freedom, the free society will stay far ahead of the regimented society.

For the preservation of peace and freedom is, as was the Polaris, a package program.

As to the past 8 years, cynical critics skilled in tearing down instead of building up, of course, can pick apart the package until the whole is lost. Filled with brilliant hindsight and devoid of

any foresight, they can look back over the past 8 years and show how certain things might have been better done.

Certainly, after the fog of unknowns and uncertainties have long since lifted, anyone can see how some things might have been done better. Napoleon wisely spoke from experience when he said that the best general is not a mythical general who makes no mistakes, for only the commander without a command makes no mistakes. The best general is he who makes the fewest mistakes.

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration made mistakes, but fewer mistakes in military preparedness than any administration in American history.

PEACE POWER

Even more important, the Eisenhower administration recognized that peace power is a two-sided coin. On one side is preparedness. On the other side is firmness.

It is easy to coast toward seeming peace, down a low road rutted with secret appeasement and creeping retreat. At Munich, sometime English leaders slid down this way toward what they called peace in their time. At Yalta, sometime American leaders left principle for temporary harmony with an incompatible ally. On the eve of Korea, sometime American leaders left in doubt whether we would defend freedom from communism.

In contrast to these downhill equivocal ways, it is hard to climb to those straight sunlit heights silhouetted by proper peace achieved through preparedness, firmness, and justice. This, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration achieved, and so achieved despite vast handicaps.

Prof. James Atkinson, in his recently published book "The Edge of War," recognizes the biggest of these handicaps. Too many Americans have been for appeasement, although they dared not so call it. They have been frightened into wanting an accommodation with the Russians at almost any price.

Atkinson observes that an article studying the positions of the United States and the Soviet Union, appearing in the London Economist, posed this penetrating question: The Americans' hand is all trumps. But will any of them ever be played? Atkinson concludes:

The trumps . . . can and will be played by an America that calls back again its greatness. That greatness was of the spirit. And there is yet an America that in this conflict of will can draw once more on its spiritual heritage with the call to action of the Prophet Isaiah: "Strengthen ye the feeble hands, and confirm the weak knees. Say to the fainthearted: Take courage, and fear not."

Unfortunately, there have been those with feeble hands and weak knees and faint hearts during military crises over the use of atomic weapons in defense of freedom or over diplomatic crises in regard to Berlin, Suez, Lebanon, Formosa, Quemoy-Matsu. Some have permitted fear to fester inferiority complexes which would weaken the trumps that America has. Some have been all too willing to

let the Kremlin name the suits, set the goals for space programs or economic growth, with America being the weak mimic.

But the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, unwilling to play the weak mimic, took courage, feared not, ended the Korean war, played from the highest trump of all—a free unfettered system, set our own goals, and maintained the honorable peace through military preparedness, diplomatic firmness, and high spiritual faith.

Let credit rest where credit is due. A principle taught in training for World War I has even lasted out the space age. A commander is responsible for whatever his command does or does not do.

In the past 8 years, Dwight Eisenhower was the Commander in Chief. In the past 8 years, every American hearth has been increasingly safe from war and from appeasement.

As these magnificent 8 years blend into the strong heritage that has ennobled the American spirit, I salute our retiring Commander in Chief. I pray that all Americans may be grateful.

TABLE A

Fiscal year	Defense appropriations	Budget requests
1956	\$33,082,000,000	\$33,700,000,000
1957	36,134,000,000	35,197,000,000
1958	36,648,000,000	39,257,000,000
1959	41,232,000,000	40,830,000,000
1960	40,598,000,000	40,836,000,000
1961	40,991,000,000	40,523,000,000

Summary: During the Eisenhower administration, Democrat-controlled Congresses provided \$1,658,000,000 less than the President requested.

TABLE B

Eleven major firsts achieved by U.S. space program during 1960:

Pioneer V: First to send message 22.5 million miles from earth.

Tiros I: First weather satellite—sent back 22,000 photos.

Transit I-B: First navigation satellite to help ships, planes, and submarines to fix positions.

Midas II: First heat-sensing satellite, to direct missile launchings.

Transit II-A: First to carry another satellite into space, to study solar effects.

Discoverer XIII: First satellite capsule recovered after orbit.

Echo I: First reflector communication satellite.

Discoverer XIV: First satellite recovered in midair after orbit.

Courier I-B: First repeater communication satellite.

Explorer VIII: First satellite to investigate methods of improving radio communications, in the ionosphere.

Discoverer XVII: First to record effect of solar-storm radiation on human tissue after long space flights.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) for 4 weeks, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MILLIKEN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. ULLMAN for 20 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FOGARTY for 15 minutes on today and tomorrow.

Mr. PUCINSKI for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. COOLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES and include extraneous matter in his remarks under general leave to extend on the resolution passed today.

Mr. LANKFORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, February 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 days after receipt. Accordingly, there is submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated report of the House Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives—
Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960

Name	Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
			Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ¹
MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE												
Herbert Roback	France	Franc	342.30	69.85	318	64.90	2,775.30	566.40	44.59	9.10	3,480.19	710.25
Do	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	17-12-6	49.35	24-8-0	68.50	5-3-0	14.50	4-4-0	11.50	51-7-6	143.85
Do	Belgium	Belgian franc	312	6.24	355	7.10	75	1.50	38	.76	780	15.60
Do	Netherlands	French franc			36.75	7.50	14.70	3.00	7.35	1.50	58.80	12.05
Do	Germany	do	52.73	10.76	105.35	21.50	12.25	2.50	13.48	2.75	183.81	37.51
Do	Italy	French franc	82.08	16.75	68.45	13.97	15.68	3.20	13.48	2.75	179.69	36.67
Do		Lira	7,000	11.27	3,415	5.50	760	1.23			11,175	18.00
Do	Greece	Drachma	441	14.70	1,185	39.50	150	5.00	4.74	15.80	2,250	75.00
Do	Turkey	Lira	264.50	21.82	103.60	8.55	12.10	1.00	7.30	.60	387.50	31.97
Do	Spain	Peseta	847	14.10	1,461	24.35	468	7.80	224	3.75	3,000	50.00
Total				214.84		261.37		606.13		48.51		1,130.85

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Recapitulation: Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount \$1,130.85

JANUARY 21, 1961.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

510. A letter from the Chairman, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, transmitting a report on the progress to date of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, pursuant to Public Law 85-470, approved June 28, 1958; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

511. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to the positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 3635. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3636. A bill to amend section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the rate of percentage depletion with respect to gold produced from deposits in the United States shall be 23 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3637. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 3638. A bill to permit employees of a State or local government who do not have coverage pursuant to State agreement under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to elect coverage under such system as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 3639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to

and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 3640. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3641. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3642. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3643. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3644. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize payment of operating-differential subsidy to contract carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3645. 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 thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3646. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3647. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3648. A bill to create a joint congressional committee on salary adjustment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3649. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under the State plans for aid to depend-

ent children established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3651. 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 thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3652. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3653. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3655. 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.

H.R. 3656. 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. 3657. 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. 3658. 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.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3659. A bill to prohibit the alteration of U.S. coins for fraudulent purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 3660. 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.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 3661. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from \$1 to \$1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3662. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3663. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3664. A bill to improve the working conditions of migratory and other farm labor in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 3665. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the donation of surplus property to orphanages; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3666. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 3667. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 3668. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize informal entries of merchandise where the aggregate value of the shipment does not exceed \$400; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 3669. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Elephant Butte Reservoir area, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3670. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3671. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include New Mexico among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3672. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3673. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first \$600 per year of an individual's earned income shall be disregarded in determining his need for old-age assistance under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3674. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 3675. 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. MULTER:

H.R. 3676. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 3677. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3678. A bill to amend section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an employee shall not lose his current connection with the railroad industry when he is furloughed to accept elective public office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3679. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 3680. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 3681. 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.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3682. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3683. A bill to designate the Glen Canyon Dam, to be constructed in connection with the Colorado River storage project, as the "Eisenhower Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3684. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3685. 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. SCRANTON:

H.R. 3686. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3687. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 3688. A bill to provide that the coverage of religious science practitioners under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on an elective basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 3689. A bill to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3690. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance,

repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3691. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3692. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3693. A bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution designating the week of June 4-10, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COAD:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 132. 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.

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 135. 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. BUCKLEY:
H. Res. 136. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 23; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, requesting that the U.S.S. *Missouri* continue to be berthed at the Puget Sound Naval Ship Yard at Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation and appropriations to provide necessary flood control improvements on the Snohomish River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALFORD:
H.R. 3694. A bill for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H.R. 3695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty Strul and her minor daughter Anna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:
H.R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:
H.R. 3697. A bill for the relief of Stavros Kyriakides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:
H.R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sing Ching Yih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEERMANN:
H.R. 3699. A bill for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:
H.R. 3700. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolf Edward Klawans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:
H.R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Russell R. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:
H.R. 3702. A bill for the relief of Jung Hoo Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:
H.R. 3703. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:
H.R. 3704. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:
H.R. 3705. A bill for the relief of James A. Shearer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:
H.R. 3706. A bill for the relief of Michael H. Dugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3707. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:
H.R. 3708. A bill for the relief of Randolph C. Grant, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:
H.R. 3709. A bill for the relief of John Stewart Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOKA:
H.R. 3710. A bill for the relief of Giles L. Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:
H.R. 3711. A bill for the relief of Hugh Kunhwa Kim, his wife, Grace Kyu-yun Kim, and their two minor sons, David Daiwon Kim and Timothy Dukwon Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H.R. 3712. A bill for the relief of Lee Pak Too; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Yedid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3714. A bill for the relief of Janina Maciejewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3715. A bill for the relief of Enzo Bertolotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3716. A bill for the relief of Fritz Frederique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 3717. A bill for the relief of Tomasz Grabiec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:
H.R. 3718. A bill for the relief of Matthias Nock, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 3719. A bill for the relief of Pagona Pascopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3720. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Di Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:
H.R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Domenico Carola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:
H.R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Angela Herczeg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kazimiera Banas Florkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Classroom Shortage Still Acute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, or as quickly as the House can complete its organization, and as soon as we receive recommendations from the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor will begin consideration of Federal aid to education. As we go into these hearings, we have the benefit of data reported from the Eisenhower administration on its last day in office—January 19—which showed that as of the beginning of the present school year there was a shortage of 142,000 public elementary and secondary classrooms in the United States.

These data, which are collected, tabulated, and published each year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have been a perennial source of controversy before the subcommit-

tees in recent years. It is pertinent, however, to point out that this year for the first time, in most instances, the figures supplied by the States were derived from answers to questionnaires completed by local school systems rather than on the basis of State estimates as was more often the case in the past. Therefore, the tabulations of this year's data are firmer, to use the language of the statisticians.

In any event the data which are most significant in all of these annual reports have always been the data which were most acceptable. I refer to statistics on the number of pupils enrolled and the number of classrooms available. In the case of the pupils, they are in school and countable, and it is not necessary to rely on estimates. In the case of the classrooms that exist, they are being used and they are countable, and it is not necessary to rely upon an estimate.

We find that as of last September there were 36,305,104 boys and girls enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States and its outlying parts, and there was available a total of 1,338,560 classrooms.

The report also showed that the number of classrooms available was insufficient to properly house all pupils, and

that the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity was 1,868,000. There were about 685,000 pupils in 36 States and the District of Columbia attending school on curtailed or half-day sessions. It is interesting to go back 4 years and review the data in the report showing the situation as it existed in the fall of 1956. At that time 31,527,695 pupils were enrolled in our public school systems, and they were housed in 1,086,766 classrooms. At that time the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity was 2,195,000; thus we find that although the States and local communities have been building in the intervening years at a rate of almost 70,000 classrooms annually, the total number of classrooms available has been increased by only 251,794, and the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity has been reduced by only 337,000. At that rate the gap will be closed some time during 1982 or 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the emergency is now, and every year that the Congress fails to face up to its responsibility, freedom loses ground. Unless we, at the Federal level, step in to close this gap more rapidly than the overburdened and overworked States and local communities are doing, it will be too late. If we complacently sit back and